SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE

TAPE NOTES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO THE READER

These are the private and personal briefing course notes of Gerald D. French, Frank A. Gerbode, M.D., and Julie B. Gerbode, compiled, edited, and indexed by Frank A. Gerbode, M.D. They are not to be read by anyone else, without express permission from one of these persons.

Anyone who reads these notes must do so in the realization that this is not source data, and these notes are not to be quoted as source data, nor used for technical purposes. They contain many personal observations, references, and cognition's, as well as many points of editing and interpretations of LRH data.

Whatever I was aware of as non-LRH data or possibly non-LRH data, I put in brackets: -- [ ]. Furthermore, all tables and illustrations, being to a variable extent my own origination's or interpretations, may be considered to be in brackets. However, while I have tried to be as careful and accurate as possible in putting together these notes, and while they contain no errors that are known to me, there are bound to be many inaccuracies in them, simply because alter-is has a way of seeping into any such endeavor, to a greater or lesser extent: hopefully lesser.

The notes are mainly intended to give an idea of what was said in the tapes. All the actual LRH data must be found in the tapes themselves. However, this set of notes may be helpful in finding the proper tape in which to look for the source data.

Frank A. Gerbode, M.D.
2 Nov 76

EDITORS NOTE

These transcripts were originally recorded on IBM format. In converting the data to Macintosh format, certain features such as diagrams, indexs' and page references, could not be preserved. When ever a page reference is given in the text, eg. [see also pp 123] this should be ignored other than to denote that there are other references to that data contained elsewhere.

5008C30 LECT Preventive Dianetics

Schizophrenia is caused by a superabundance of control circuitry. It is contained in the phrase, "I'm all alone." Paranoia has the phrase, "they're all against me."

The repeater phrase, "I love you," gets the PC into a sympathy engram.

Prevent aberration by keeping calm around a child. Don't quarrel, Pull attention units to PT by creating a necessity level, even if it has to be an artificial one. E.g. a person who is drowning and seeing his whole life flashing before him is coming up to PT If you can do this to a kid in early life, nothing will bother him later. Cultural patterns such as an extended period of mourning are just cultural patterns; in the absence of engrams you don't get long term misemotion.

It should be made part of the social mores not to talk or even say, "Shh!" around injured or anaten persons.

In industry, you get the situation where an individual who has worked in one place gets a chain of injuries with the same perceptics and lots of words. Therefore, he is out of PT at work and may cause industrial accidents. 100% of auto accidents are caused by engramic restimulation (whether of the driver, mechanic, or manufacturers).

Accident proneness is telepathic. One finds that engrams are the best telepathic broadcasters. This is analogous to an alarm system for the herd. Thus, of two persons who have never met, one will act out the other valence in the other's engram.

At high tones, affinity is raw cohesiveness; at lower tones, it is as if there is a herd that must be alerted and needs shock (e.g. fear, grief, anger) to be broadcast to cohere the herd into fight or flight. You can notice this telepathic alarm system when you enter a room where people have been quarreling. So when you are in the society of others, you run into this all the time. Similarly, in the vicinity of accidents, other accidents occur. Engrams are keyed in and then acted out. Thus "accidents come in threes". If you took driver's licenses away from the 8% of people who have been involved in car accidents involving injury, you could eliminate 90% of the accidents.

If you audit grief charges in pregnant women, with sobbing or self-beating, etc., you may get transmission of engrams to the child. Then, when later you try to audit the child, you may get oddities, or restimulation, from dianetic patter, which is part of the child's incident. Therefore, probably dianetic patter will have to be changed in 15 to 20 years. So auditing a pregnant woman has to be adjudicated. You should go ahead if there is a threat of attempted abortion or difficult birth. Also, you should observe how the mother behaves during auditing. By the way, girdles, etc., cause more or less continuous engrams for the child, so watch out for young kids or unwed mothers, or anyone who would try to hide pregnancy.

Social aberrations are fragments of old morals whose practical origin is forgotten. Morals, in their turn, are a socially agreed upon attempt to handle a problem for which no rational answer exists. It's a jury-rigged solution. [Thus some morals may be unethical].

5009C23-1 LECT General Dianetics, Part 1

Mental therapy is at least as old as the Aesculepian School, who used hellebore to cause chemically convulsive therapy.

Perception during surgical anesthesia -- old reference: American Journal of Neurology? 1914.

The reactive mind and the analytical one are biochemically independent. Thus it is possible to inhibit one or the other independently by chemical means.

The reactive mind is the sole source of error. [Cf. Freud, The Psychopathology of Everyday Life]

Society, as a kind of organism, can have engrams.

When a cell divides, it gives all its progeny its memory. This can be proven by conditioning cells. So the cell brings hair color, instinctive behavior patterns, and the genetic personality, but along with this comes any moment of injury. The cells have held back full power from the analytical mind in moments of danger, to enforce fight, flight, etc. There is also a somatic mind containing training patterns that can easily be changed by the analytical mind, and organic responses, which can also be controlled analytically [Cf. Yogis] But the engram bank can bypass the analytical mind and seize control of the somatic mind.

The common cold comes from the birth engram.

5009C23-2 LECT General Dianetics, Part 2

If you want to test unconscious recall, use a subject with full sonic recall and inflict a little pain to give an anchor point. Use pentothal and nonsense syllables.

The best dianetic auditors are writers.

You can do straightwire from age 3 on, and perhaps run grief engrams, but nothing heavier.

Generally, a person can run standard auditing from age 8 on.

[In this tape, Hubbard gives a lot of information on early attempts at objective validation of dianetics by means of psychological testing.]

5203C03 HCL-1 Introduction to Scientology: Milestone One Wichita HPC-1

"Science" has gotten to the point where it is just a study of piles of data. It has drawn away from being a body of knowledge and consists now of unevaluated facts. The "natural history" of science is:

1. A push out into the unknown.

2. Collecting data.

3. Align data around a few theories.

4. At the end, it becomes stultified. It is capable of producing an effect in the physical universe, but that's about all.

Dianetics was mainly interested in aberration. It was not intended to be all-embracive. Scientology is a study of knowledge, not therapy. However, we must now get back into the mind again. Although the goal is not a therapy, how can you teach knowledge to an imperfect computer?

The mind would come close to perfection except for certain things which prevent perfection. The mind can know without letting itself know. The task of the processor is to get better working methods for others, then let them help him. The blind leading the blind, however, may fail when the blind are too blind. Therefore, scientology could only be applied by the very sane; it is concerned with the able. Sanity is an absolute perfection in reason that would resolve problems to the optimum good of all those concerned. Absolutes are not obtainable. Even if you were absolutely sane, you would still lack data. Milestone 1 is complete ability. This is a necessary condition to handling the world. Rehabilitation of the insane will be accomplished as an automatic spin-off from self-improvement and improving the able.

Scientology could be defined as knowledge and its application in conquering the physical universe.

The iron cover is off what we already know; we have the complete anatomy of the iron cover: Fac One. Everything else is a lock. You can start any processes off this first engram, using the E-meter. We have a very careful map of Target One. It is booby-trapped, but when you know the booby trap, you can walk right through it.

Scientology is exact; there are no maybe's up to the point of thought creating physical motion.

There is very little self-determinism up to the point of milestone one. When you do get there you will be free of LRH and scientology too. Even what we call a clear is not there yet.

When you have arguments with yourself, you have different personalities in yourself arguing. These may exist in different areas, e.g. the stomach area. Anyone will show up on the meter as having at least three different personalities. If you see two arguing, there is a third which is kind of noble; it's adjudicating or it's sound asleep. Then there may be a fourth one. These are circuits, but they are personalities; they are always in the same place in the same people. If you shift from the left side to the right to the center, you get a somatic in the center of the forehead. Could this be the third eye? You as an individual? An engram? The proper thing to do is to run it. The point is to become one person. You have to run this thing before you can be you. It was done by supersonic waves. The engram thus created says not to know.

A basic problem with anyone's understanding of scientology is not knowing the words. A word is just a code. The semanticists ran off the road by saying that there was such a thing as an undefinable. This is not the case in the realm of the knowable.

5203C03 HCL-2 Introduction to Scientology: Outline of Therapy HPC-2

Use light tech to get to a heavy incident, then run it out using thought, emotion, and effort processing. The goal is to be able to run Fac One.

The mind is an entity. So is the physical universe. Thought is beingness. It has no wavelength; it is a true static. There is no limit of capacity; no limit of time. It can record the physical universe and use it against itself. It can animate and control the physical universe. It is not in the physical universe since it has not the properties of the physical universe. It is like a mirror in which a room is reflected: there is no real room there. Thought can pick up energy and matter in space and time and mobilize it. Thought takes the laws it has learned and turns it against the physical universe, like a mirror. The brain is to translate thought into action. The mind looks at this. The brain does not contain purpose. Thus the mind is necessary. It stores past recordings of the physical universe. It is the purpose or beingness that can exist without a body to handle the physical universe. It is hard to accomplish things in the physical universe without a body. The mind stores pictures of energy. It can project an image into the physical universe and cause an effect. Pictures have effort in them in addition to perceptions. The mind continuously makes conclusions from old pictures to estimate the future, according to its purposes. It tells answers and puts them into action. It also stores conclusions -- another bundle of old pictures. On top of this is the purpose and beingness of the person that is making him do this.

Steps the mind takes:

1. It has a thought to be.

2. Takes pictures.

3. Combines these.

4. Records efforts.

5. It takes pieces of the physical universe and combines these to make a body.

6. The body can then do things in the physical universe.

The mind's purposes:
1. to be

2. to conquer the physical universe.

Thus we have three echelons:

1. The physical universe

2. Thought

3. Who told you to survive?

The physical universe is characterized by motion, which is matter changing in space, this being the definition of time. This gives you MEST. Physics has a problem with a circular definition of space and time, in that these are defined against each other. Physics' view of the universe is that it consists mainly of motion. This is an incomplete view.

Thought is a static of unlimited capabilities that has no wavelength, no space or time. It is impinged upon a physical universe that has matter, energy, space, and time. The mission of thought is survival in the physical universe, and in order to do this, it is effecting a conquest of the physical universe. Mysticism is in the second echelon. The fundamental of physics is not complex, but the use of it can be complex. Similarly with the human mind. The mind is neither in nor out of the MEST universe. At any rate, it is not in the physical universe. The mind has an effect on the body: one reason the body is sub-optimal is because of the mind's considerations about it. The E-meter, while it does not measure the mind, measures the physiological effect of the mind's operation.

The third echelon is anything and everything that might lie north of the above. It would answer the question, "Who told you to survive? You get into questions like, "Why is nothing nothing? If nothing is nothing, then it's motion."

In handling these echelons, one must go on a gradient, getting to the top of one problem before starting on the next one. We must finish one before two and two before we get into three. People effectively commit suicide by starting on echelon three from the bottom of one. You have to handle your aberrations first; otherwise you lose your marbles.

In scientology, we try to find an effective way to handle facsimiles and memory. You can eliminate them or you can file them accurately. A truly self-determined person is unlikely to be affected by facsimiles. In fact, only one incident was strong enough to do this: Fac One. A person is as sane as he can handle memories and plan for the future.

5212C01 PDC-1 Scientology -- How to Understand and Study It

Homo Sapiens is a four part entity:

1. thetan

2. body

3. thetan machinery

4. reactive/somatic mind

The PC is what you are working with, and he is a non-dimensional point in space who is an energy production unit.

Definition: Spacation is a process having to do with the rehabilitation of the creation of space. A second meaning is that spacation is the subject of space. This is above the subject of energy.

It is a dirty trick to make a person into a theta clear without giving him data about it. He knows this data potentially, but is not aware of it. If he knew about it, he wouldn't be in the MEST universe. This subject is the anatomy of universes: the construction, maintenance, and destruction of universes of different kinds and dimensions. The study of the basic structure and experience called the MEST universe is a basic one. The laws of the MEST universe, or "natural laws", are the inevitable average of agreement. Starting with the study of natural law, we get to the study of that which made natural law: that thing capable of making agreements which become natural law. In auditing a PC, you are undoing the agreement that makes him a part of the natural law. E=MC squared probably wasn't true 30 or 40 trillion years ago in Arslycus, where the PC spent 10,000 lives working at the same job.

Arslycus got bigger and bigger. It was just built out in space. One day, people got the idea of mass, agreed to it, and got careful about it. Arslycus blew up and everybody was glad to see it go. At this point, the law of gravity was widely agreed upon.

There is a natural tendency to push out of the group those individuals who don't agree with the group. Thus a person who thinks that the MEST universe is his universe gets sent to the spin bin. In scientology, we are not trying to disagree with the MEST universe; we are just taking it and making it appear and disappear at will for any individual. Every now and then a PC in processing gets an uneasy feeling that there's some thought he doesn't dare think. He's coming up against agreement and doesn't want the responsibility of undoing it because he can't handle that much energy. If you could get him to where he could handle the energy, he'll face the thought. Probably all that would happen is that the MEST universe would momentarily disappear for him. Then he'd fish around to get an orientation point to get back into it. You just have to know how to handle space to get into and out of the MEST universe.

People use the old energy of the MEST universe instead of creating stuff from scratch. They hang onto being identities, using bodies like ID cards, instead of being individuals. This does furnish randomity and provides emotions that one can pretend to be the effect and not the cause of. The identification card permits the individual to make a living so he can feed the ID card!

The Tarot is a philosophical machine, preserved as playing cards. These cards represent concepts of human experience. Thus, for instance, the Fool could represent a person at 45 on the tone scale. Such a person would have passed out of agreement by knowing all agreement.

The sequence of events relating to agreement with the MEST universe is:

1. Agreement.

2. Agree or else

3. We don't care if you agree; we are going to punish you anyway.

4. Below agreement: a not-is of agreement.

MEST is in complete confusion of having agreed to everything, owning and controlling nothing.

Society builds into people a conditioned social tone. One has the tone level of one's society as a being + body combination. That's the tone level a PC's bank will have, the tone of his facsimiles and ridges. As a being one has a different tone level.

One cannot study scientology from the point of view of any other system. One can only study it by looking at you or the other people you know, applying the definitions and seeing what is or isn't there.

scientology consists in the study of:

1. Progressive examination of the agreements that came to bring about the MEST universe.

2. The science of how agreements are made.

3. What are the beings that make these agreements?

5406C04 6ACC-37 The Know-to-Sex Scale -- The Mind and the Tone Scale

There's a line breaking existence in half, above and below which is a know to sex scale. The upper of the two scales has something good about each level; the lower one has something bad about each level [See Fig. 1]. E.g. a person who knows sex is bad is at the bottom. Next they will know eating, then symbols, etc. is bad. The tone scale is a [logarithmically] dwindling scale; it has wide spaces at the top and narrow ones at the bottom. The know to sex scale has a distance factor to it. The particles are progressively further apart as you ascend the scale, until you reach know, where you don't have any particles. For instance, at emotion, the particles are twice as many and half as far apart as at look.

Thus, according to this gradient scale, you can't go straight from bad sex to good sex, so you have to go some to convince a person who thinks sex is bad, that it's good, or vice versa. Suppress = condense. That's why auditing appears to produce gradual results. A PC is fixed or dispersed about life, and life is divisible into these factors. Before you can get an individual to change his mind about some subject, you have to get him to change across a lot of categories. Also, all parts of the scale except the knowingness band contain particles. As long as the individual is allergic to space and particles he'll tend to cross-connect the different bands of the scale [as per restimulation] whenever he runs into space or particles. So our procedure is to get him to change his mind about various kinds of particles (gradiently) until we can get him to change his mind about all particles.

Below sex is mystery, which is like a lower level knowingness. In his study of dreams, Freud started with mystery, then proceeded to sex. If you could reveal to a patient that a mystery was not unsolvable, he would improve, but sometimes Freud would take too many mysteries from someone who had a scarcity, And he'd go down to lower level looking. With most people, Freud would get them through sex up to eat. Theorists got stuck trying to figure whether eat or sex was the basis of everything. None of them was up to effort themselves; they were in awe of anyone who could indulge in sports. Psychologists with their intelligence tests were at the level of symbols. At thinkingness, a man figure-figures to avoid effort. Engineering is the study of how to make effort use effort. This is very covert and is not a confront of effort. Psychoanalysis never got above the area of stimulus-response, with their theory of association. They didn't believe in independent thinking.

A person who reacts to Op Pro by Dup is way down the know-sex scale. He will, in the course of processing, go up and down the scale, only hitting prominent points on his way up. This is crossing barriers which the individual has put up to protect himself in the business of livingness. The names of these barriers are Looking, emoting, etc. The barrier of looking is space. Next comes a barrier of a barrage of emotional states, for instance of serenity or enthusiasm. Each lower emotion could be considered a protection against the upper ones. He uses boredom to protect himself from enthusiasm. Antagonism is a barrage of particles used to fend something off; anger is a ridge. Fear is a defense: who wants to close terminals with someone who is in fear? E.g. animals in fear taste bad. People in fear smell bad. Grief goes like this: "I'm solid here; I can't move: take care of me." It's a barrier you mustn't do certain things to a person in grief. The upper edge of apathy is the barrier, "I don't care"; the lower edge is, "Eat me." Being sick to one's stomach is an apathy of eating: vomiting. This is evidence that below the band of emoting you get increasingly deeper emotions connected with each step down. Hence the apathy of eating = vomiting; the apathy of effort would be wanting to be less than inert. This is what people experience who are having a rough time with the mind.

Efforting is observably a barrier: force used to protect. Thinkingness is figuring out where he will be when something else is elsewhere or where he will put something when he himself is not there. He's placing things in terms of force. So at this level, you can't carry a revolver; you have to figure out where money is safe, how to keep people from tripping you up, predict their intentions, etc. If you had a weapon, you could protect yourself at the efforting band and you wouldn't have to think.

At symbols we get, "Don't look in here -- it might be dangerous. I'm really not here; I'm elsewhere. Attack this symbol if you like, because it isn't I." Eating is a way of getting attention [and admiration] from what one eats and as such may be very satisfying. Sex protects one from the present by providing an escape into the future. A symbol that can't be in the present can appear on the future track. You could process someone with, "Get the idea of putting something there; now [get the idea of] moving out; now [get the idea of] coming back and finding what you have put there." That is the action of sex; it is very satisfying to the PC. Sex also says, "Don't eat me." It's something else to do.

The individual felt unsafe without these barriers. When he put something out as a barrier to protect him, he made it senior to him. Hence it's a dwindling spiral.

So far, we have discussed each of these levels as a defense against motivators. But we can also use each of these barriers as an overt level. Here, we get dispersal manifestations down the line. Tears, as a defense, are a flow. But there is an unnamed dispersal at grief that is offensive. Similarly, there is an unnamed dispersal at apathy.

Actually, what you have is a series of know to sex scales (Fig. 2). You can see this in running Op Pro by Dup. Someone might start at effort, then go to emotion, to knowing it's silly, to a sex impulse, then a figure-figure, then a new know, then eat, emote, a new look, etc. He is hitting high

points going upscale through ridges. He will linger in the upper ones longer, with more manifestations as he differentiates better and better. At the bottom, everything identifies with everything: effort = sex = the way you look, etc.

One could draw the scale to indicate a dropping dominance.

At the highest level, each band has about the same emphasis. At the first harmonic down, the emphasis will be on knowingness; at the next harmonic down, what you do with all the levels is look (a high-tones thetan loves to do this); at the next harmonic down, the whole scale is colored by emotion; at the next lower, it is colored by effort (as in German society, as opposed to Italian society, which is colored by emotion); next we get the figure-figure that is characteristic of Latin American societies, southern California, or universities; next we get the whole scale colored by symbols (here you get erudition, e.g. the idea that mathematicians have done it all for you; there's no need to think); similarly with eating, then sex. Below that level, it gets undifferentiated into an identification of everything with everything.

It all gets very compressed -- effort is sex. If he is below this level, he is nuts. This scale provides a method of predicting how long it will take the PC to recover and how long it will take him to differentiate.

5410C20 8ACC-14 The Parts of Man

This is a discussion of the parts of Man as understood through R2-61 and R2-62. The parts of Man are related to overts and motivators. [This is be cause a thetan as such cannot be harmed and therefore cannot receive a motivator. So he would have to have a confusion of identity to receive a motivator.]

Man consists of four distinct, separate, though related, parts:

1. Thetan

2. Body

3. Thetan machinery

4. Reactive/somatic mind.

Dianetics covers the first four dynamics. Even the first dynamic can be split into these four parts. When you thought you were treating the first dynamic, you were actually treating the third. The absolute Book 1 clear would be the awareness of awareness unit.

Around the end of 1951, LRH mentions that erasure of all facsimiles would result in demolishment of the body (See Advanced Procedures and Axioms). In Book 1, we were talking about engrams of this lifetime. Erasing these would give a relative clear. The only trouble was that the awareness of awareness unit, after a few years of this research, kept insisting on exteriorizing, and it turned out to be the person himself. If he felt bad when he was out -- sort of with no character -- he is not stabilized.

So the first dynamic is the awareness of awareness unit, as modified by various things. Pieces of thetan machinery are his creations, hidden and forgotten by him. All the energy used by the machines really comes from the thetan, though, for randomity, he may consider that he needs to eat to keep on going. He can also understand something from someone else, add it to his own machinery, and blame someone for giving him a machine.

The thetan invests the body with characteristics, then he is afraid of losing these characteristics. But this is really no problem. He can invest himself with these characteristics.

The thetan can also duplicate himself. He can create a new, different life unit with full determinism, power, personality, etc. It could have more power than he if it is set up that way. Sex is the super-condensed, many-times-via'd activity of creating other life forms. It is only more complex because it is considered to be. The Thetan actually needs no system to create a living being.

17

Thetan machinery is not intended to have a life of its own, but sometimes the thetan endows machinery with life. In DMSMH, LRH talks of the possibility of setting the mind alongside the body. This was misinterpreted worst in E-therapy. One can do this and get himself haunted by living beings. He can create them, then go off and leave them. This is basic life multiplication -- a 1D creating a 3D through a 2D. So mankind could have one common ancestor. It would not make that one superior, however, since the offspring could just as well be the superior ones. Furthermore, an individual could just repostulate himself back into his creative unit and thus disappear, especially since, in reality, there is no time. All one could lose would be the knowingness that he had done it. One would have to shut that off for oneself. Now do you think you understand valence a little better?

Having multiplied himself often, an individual had laid aside this ability, begun to hang on to the "only one" computation, and is holding his ability to be himself closely to himself. He tries hard to maintain an identity as a 1D. He becomes too involved in his own agreements and thinks he needs sex to create a being, but even that creates only a body, which is the granted beingness of many individualities, based upon one individuality that started that genetic line. The thetan got so complex, with all his machinery, and so interlocked with so many other individualities; he granted so much beingness in all directions that he forgot who and what he was and just knew he was supposed to be this identity and repeat the manufactured creation of this identity. This would make him solid, and his machinery would have composited. At this point, he would be a body, and his machinery would become the reactive/somatic mind. The thetan gets so solid as a body that he can be taken over and controlled by another thetan and his machines. The reactive mind that goes along with a body cannot be controlled unless another thetan comes along and takes over the body. However, the body can control the reactive mind. There is no difference between the reactive and the somatic mind.

A thetan can create another thetan. From this, we can get a species, which implies other species, hence a 5th dynamic. Thetans are generally not as anxious to control animal bodies as human bodies, since men's affairs are complex enough to be interesting to control. So animals are generally body + reactive mind: a condensed thetan + machinery.

By addressing the alter-ised complexity, as in psychotherapy, we would never get an as-is-ness, but just more mass. The auditor thus must address the right part: the thetan. Otherwise he might as well try to process a rock as a body: the rock is more complex, being denser (therefore it has more vias on the comm lines). The distance from cause to effect in a rock has so many vias and complexities in it that it loses both cause and effect for the rock. The impulse towards religion in most people is to discover basic cause; however, it leads them to go through vias, which gets them lost. The way to find cause is to find the highest level of freedom, assume it, and then know, because you will be cause and will therefore be capable of being an effect.

As processing improves, we find that the better we understand something, the better we can control it, and the less need to process it so that it can be controlled. So, in modern scientology and dianetics, it is only necessary to knock out the factors you don't want to process because you understand them well enough to control them. The first of these is the reactive mind. There is no sense in processing it since we know how to control it. Also, there's no use in processing the body -- medicine will take care of that. Machinery is interesting, but it's not necessary. So we're left with only the thetan to process, and we process the thetan just enough so that he can take control of his other parts, having recognized them. "Right thought", as in Christian Science, would work fine if you had a clear to begin with. The Christian Scientists have limits on what "right thought" is. But actually, right thought is optimum survival on all dynamics.

So, in processing, we can start with "Be three feet back of your head." For those who don't respond to that, the overt-motivator sequence is a good place to start; it's the mechanical process by which a thetan becomes solid enough to be a body, surrounded by his machinery, which has become the bank. Behind the overt-motivator sequence lies the consideration that matches the overt and motivator. You must be downstairs from pan-determinism to self-determinism for this to happen.

A justifier is the mockup or overt act demanded by a person guilty of an unmotivated act. It is something nonexistent, as an effort to justify the unmotivated act. It's a false motivator. There's nothing really wrong with the motivator-overt sequence; it balances out; no one gets insane or even hurt by it. But the unmotivated act - justifier sequence is the villain! thus the thetan is doomed, because he can never really receive a motivator. That's the whole reason for the dwindling spiral. A thetan can never be harmed, but he can consider he's been harmed, act harmed, and dwindle. Everything the PC tells you is a search for a justifier. His search through his bank quickly as-is-es

his few true motivators. So he has too many overts and must get himself sick, downtrodden and betrayed [motivator hunger]. He gives justifiers and pretends they're motivators.

The way you could get him into this dwindling spiral is to define harm for him. This gets into good and evil: R2-61 and R2-62. It only requires the consideration that harm can take place to set off the unmotivated act/justifier sequence. You just get this consideration from yourself. A person must have intended harmful destruction and succeeded to define the concept, "harmful" for himself. Only when someone destroys something he's created does he define harm for the other fellow. He had to do it first himself, because he had to communicate first to be communicated to, since otherwise he couldn't have been located.

Any solidity or departure from the static is a lie. The way we depart from the absolute truth of static is via the lies of justifiers. This is the source of all inability's and deficiencies.

The thetan also has an anxiety about creating an effect. Another thetan can never get a motivator; a thetan knows he can never receive an effect except as he considers it and agrees, so he knows he can never create an effect on another thetan. So he must consider life units as solids. He gets upset when he considers them thetans. Hence people turn away from scientology because they are afraid of exterior beings. The thetan wants to create an effect but can't without being guilty of an unmotivated act. All he had to do to get messed up was to discover he could harm others; he then tried to justify his unmotivated acts and got solid, and his whole past track would be nearly all hallucination. The insane pack along an enormous number of mocked up facsimiles = justifiers = pictures of things that never occurred.

A good violent fast way to handle this state of affairs is to have the PC mock up things that anything on the seventh dynamic could do to him. This remedies his havingness [motivator hunger]. You can actually use all dynamics. Another process: the PC spots all the spots where he or anyone considered that harm could be or had been done. [R2-61 and R2-62, in Creation of Human Ability, pp. 153-154].

5506C03 ASMC-3 History of Research and Investigation

One good thing about a hellfire and brimstone type of religion is that it at least acknowledges the existence of the spirit. The Scopes trial was a turning point, in which the theory that man is merely a machine became fashionable.

In past years, there was great spiritual awareness and perception Even as recently as the sixteenth century, duelist's used to have an embarrassing thing happen: when they killed the opponent, he'd exteriorize and zap them and pester them afterwards. As mechanical knowledge increased, spiritual awareness decreased; people thought this was progress, despite the increase in amount of madness. If there's no spiritual liability to destroying other people and their possessions, one would expect crime to become more prevalent, and so it does.

5506C06 ASMC-15 What Scientology is Doing

We need a better social order. When an organization says it's above reproach or an individual claims he's untouchable, chaos ensues. The control and direction of man depends upon the good will and good state of man, not upon iron bars, cells, shock machines. A society is as sick as it has sick members. The way to make a society well, however, isn't just to cure the sick only. If the members of the society were sufficiently well, they'd have no problem pulling the fallen out of the mud. This depends on the condition of man, not on a few specialists. When it becomes a specialty, man is dead, because the best of man comes into being when he can aid his needy fellows. When men are made to feel they have no right to assist their fellows, the society is sick.

In creating an organization, LRH doesn't want to merely replace one despotic system with another one, using the existing comm lines: This is what happens in a revolution. No nation is ever overthrown; they are just substituted for. If scientology did this, they could probably create an organization powerful enough to overrun all in its path. But then this would just have to be overthrown.

Scientology possesses great potential for good or evil, depending on how it is relayed. Poorly relayed, used just for gain, it could be very destructive. LRH has already had three offers by persons in places of power to hand over a great deal of information and stop talking.

Helping the insane is usually an effort to reverse whatever self-determinism they have left. A person who is psychotic has at one time decided to die; he has not subsequently decided to live. They abandon the body, unable to let go and unwilling to reassume responsibility. The longer you stop a being that wants to die from dying, the worse off he gets. The truly insane should not have therapy, but space, sunlight, minimal restraints, quiet, food. This gives the individual a chance to change his mind and decide to live again. Exhaustion and insanity are almost synonymous. A person who is sane, who wants to live, who is willing to take responsibility for doing something about his condition, can be in much worse shape than an insane person, but he will be auditable and will get better because he wants to live. Insanity is a death wish of great magnitude; sanity returns when a person decides to live.

Psychosomatic illness is overrated, being universally present as unwanted sensation or absence of sensation; it's not illness. It comes about when someone is called upon to prove something and fails. Some processes for this:

1. What have you got that would prove it? (not about anything specific) or

1.a. What will (disability) get you into?   b. What will (disability) get you out of?

then, when flat:

2. What can you prove with it? [the disability].

Here we run into the computation that any sensation is better than no sensation and that he should have something to get sympathy and avoid guilt. But the thetan is to be able to invent a whole new category of ills before he'll give up one he's got. [Hence, "Invent something worse than (illness)."]

Death was invented on the whole track as a substitute for insanity, which was being so irresponsible that punishment was pointless. You could get anyone to change his mind about wanting to die if you could get into comm with him.

"I want you to come into possession of all that you know, and I want you to use that knowledge with security. And any mission I have here on this planet at this time will be successful at that time when what I have just said has been accomplished."

5510C03 4LACC-1 The Fundamentals of Scientology. The Rudiments of Auditing (Part One)

While Book One has a place close to the top in scientology, the most fundamental fundamental was invented later. It appears on page 23 of the Ability issue called The HCA Manual:

The rudiments:

1. Awareness of the auditor, that an auditing room is present, and that a session is in progress.

2. Two way comm on a casual basis.

3. Delivery of the question

4. The comm lag

5. The acknowledgment

6. Duplication of the exact question by the auditor.

In order to make any auditing work, these fundamentals must be observed. If the session is not precisely conducted, the processes can fail to work. This even explains why one might not have a

practice: if the public couldn't find the auditor, there would be no practice. This also explains one difficulty in auditing one's parents: you need awareness of an auditor, not a child. To start the session, the PC must first find out he's a PC, and he must find the auditor. In the auditing situation, students must learn to assume the beingness of auditors and PCs, not students. If you exist as a auditor, there will be PC's; this depends upon an ability to be. The relationship between auditor and PC is not so much one of altitude as one of ARC; you must keep the R in. When you are auditing an auditor, for instance, it doesn't inspire confidence to have to stop and look up the process.

(There's a process that makes a PC into a PC: "What are you doing?" run until he cognites he's being audited.)

A PC goes out of comm with an auditor before he observes that there's something wrong with the session, like a code break. An auditor's code break only occurs when the PC thinks the auditor has bad intentions, and where the auditor does not repair the out comm with a little two way comm. The auditor may, if the out ARC is severe, have to use another process on a lower gradient until ARC is restored.

A gradient scale in auditing need not take a long time for each type of processing. For instance, to get the PC to remedy havingness need not take 5 hours; if you stay in two way comm and see what is really happening when the PC throws away mockups so as to really get rid of them, this could take only 6 to 8 minutes, if you've actually got an auditor and a PC.

You must continually be aware of these rudiments, since the PC can stop being a PC at any time. Then two way comm gives out. Whenever two way comm gives out, the session stops, as far as the PC is concerned. What starts this is too little two way comm and too little acknowledgment in the first place. The PC will get stuck on the time track at the point where he has not been acknowledged, and the session at that point is in fact over; it's all now in the past for the PC. When he gets restuck later on in session, he'll blow, or threaten to. Sometimes this can be handled merely by the auditor's starting all over with the session, thus subtly calling the PC's attention to the fact that he's in a session. A PC may blow 28 minutes after failure to ack.

The auditor must learn to differentiate between a PC's dropped willingness and an increased comm lag. Where willingness is not there, no auditing can occur. The only thing there in the first place is a willingness to play the game. Nations topple if they forget this fact. Willingness to work, if taxed too heavily, can become a willingness to succumb. A whip extracts the last atoms of willingness, but this can easily be turned around.

"The only thing that any nation can tax, that any group can exist on, is the willingness to play the game: to do, to survive, to continue." If you decrease a PC's willingness to play the game of auditing, you can hardly expect to increase his willingness to play the game of life. He must always audit better than he can live, or he'll never live better than he can be audited. In session he should observably be getting brighter and more alert. PC's always sag a bit when session is over, so don't be disappointed when life seems harder than the session.

Helpful hints: You must duplicate the question time and time again, without killing the PC's willingness to answer it. This can be done by adding some dunnage, but don't vary the question. The dunnage consists of casual two-way communication before and after the question.

"Two-way comm is light, ... airy.... It has life in it and can be terribly casual and fantastically therapeutic."

"To remedy havingness is to remedy the need to have."

Regret is running the time track backwards.

5510C03 4LACC-2 The Fundamentals of Scientology -- The Rudiments of Auditing (Part 2)

Here are the reasons why the human mind has not been solved:

1. I don't know.

2. No idea.

To know about something, is necessary to not-know it first. This was an incomprehensibility to philosophers of all ages. To understand the source of ideas, you had to understand "no idea". One has to be able to not-know something in order to know something about it. Dialectical Materialism is a dramatization of "no idea". "No idea" is a workable concept, but as long as the Dialectical Materialists are only dramatizing it and don't know it, it is unworkable. Dialectical Materialism says that all new ideas are the result of two old forces. Hence no idea can be really new. So there is no possibility of getting a new idea. If someone dramatizes something, as with the Dialectical Materialists, it must have existed earlier as a postulate that went solid. Things begin with a consideration and end with a solidity, e.g. a dramatization or a solid reality. So an idea is senior to all matter and conditions. Above that is the thetan in his native state. If a thetan wishes to return to his native state, he often bungles it by assuming that he is in native state, when he is actually in very bad shape. This leads to the idiocy that everything that is true of a thetan's native state is what continues to be dramatized, clear down to the bottom of the barrel, and that every aberration is a reflection of native state and the first and second postulate theory [Axioms 36 and 37].

Native state is having no idea. The thetan knows all about all. He has no ideas, because he has all the ideas there are. Now he says that he will have an idea. Here, we get Axiom 36: the first postulate gives the second postulate power. So the thetan in native state knows all. He then makes a first postulate: that he has no idea. From here, as per Axiom 36, he can make the second postulate: that he can have an idea. This is an harmonic on native state, but it is alter-ised, so it persists and we get time. The force of having an idea is the statement that he didn't have an idea before. An idea is a barrier, a stop on the track. Even a manic idea or a win can be a stop. So we get:
0. Native State: The thetan knows all but has no specific idea.

1. First Postulate: No idea. I don't know.

2. Second postulate: A specific idea. This is an harmonic on Native State: "I know something."

3. Third Postulate: Forget.

4. Fourth Postulate: Remember.

For the first time in the history of mankind it has become safe for man to know something. It was not safe before because you'd stick to it, because every mystery could then pull you into it. The more you knew about it, the more you were enveloped by it. This gives the manifestations of a thetan's blackness, dropped havingness, illness, etc. Things known on a second postulate basis are solid and persist. Studying anything will produce this phenomenon. Scientology has been a safe subject because it has progressed toward simplicity and has never pretended to contain all knowledge. There's a limited amount of knowingness and unknowingness available. What gets scarce is unknowingness. We let "unknow" go on an automatic basis; we don't take responsibility for it [so it gets pulled in on an unknowing basis.] You'd never get into trouble in processing if you kept on supplying lots of no-idea instead of using old no-ideas. When you keep on using old no-ideas to get new ideas, [eventually] the new ideas jam into the existing no-ideas which have become so precious that we interiorize into them. Here, we've ignored the first postulate which provided the power for the second postulate. One gets stuck in dramatizing no-idea and loses the volitional ability to postulate an idea into existence. People who get stuck in "know about" are in the second postulate. If they exteriorize, it's into the blackness of the third postulate, which is the harmonic of the first, not-is-ing the knowingness; thus: "I've forgotten it. " The fourth postulate is "remember": an alter-isness of a not-isness. This is getting to be very persistent stuff. From this sequence, we get most solidities and spaces, except for directly postulated solids and spaces. [Perhaps the fifth postulate would be "occlude".]

All you need to get space is lookingness, which is a dramatization of knowing. In lookingness, space is on an automaticity. That's why space continues to exist. This automatic space, because it's automatic, tends to fold up on people, producing condensed spaces and figure-figure at lower levels.

The above was discovered by the fact of the relative effectiveness of running "something you wouldn't mind forgetting" compared with the bogginess of "Something you wouldn't mind remembering." Not-knowingness evidently is the only solution to prevent interiorization into bodies of knowledge or solid objects. Per Axiom 36, if you take out the first postulate, you can knock out

the second one. For instance, "You realize that over there there's a bus running." It doesn't affect you, does it? Until you knew there was a bus over there, and then you probably got a picture of it or something. Get the trick? Probably a counter-trick would be saying, "I don't know what's standing right here," inventing something to stand here, then remembering you said you didn't know what was there. So there's automatic "I don't know" before the knowingness. Running an "I don't know" process for two hours gives more gain than 50 hours of "I know".

The unworkability of "remember" processes shows that psychoanalysis never gave stable gains. It gives solid ridges if you keep remembering. You can as-is it by having him recall all the times he remembered, or better still, use forgetting to dissolve the ridge.

Take any troublesome engram, ask the PC what he doesn't know about it, and it will blow in minutes. It upsets the PC to have him make a perfect duplicate. But this way only causes fogginess if you don't acknowledge well and stay in two way comm. This also solves the case with the stuck picture. It's also safe to use

"What don't you know about it?" on chronic somatics.

Not-knowingness is not the goal of humanity or scientology; it's just the barrier that has to be crossed.

5510C08 LPLS-1 The Goals of Dianetics and Scientology

Hubbard concluded that the problem of the mind was soluble in 1938. At this time, the USSR offered him $100,000 and a lab outside of Moscow, for his manuscripts. [Later, the Russians stole the manuscript for DMSMH.]

Structure can only modify the mind, but the mind monitors structure.

Sometimes one decides to die, then changes his mind without unmaking the first decision. This can produce chronic somatics if the person's decision to die gets restimulated. He won't be conscious of the first decision at this point; he thinks he wants to live, but has to do some irrational thing, like be a professional invalid. [Succumb postulate?] The basic datum is the Q and A of survive/destroy, neither fully decided. When one gets audited and decides to survive, his IQ can go up and he can become happy and able.

It's mathematically impossible that accidents could account for evolution. Darwinian theory suggests that there is reincarnation, although it doesn't state this.

5702C28 17ACC-4 The Parts of Man

One can get so wound up in the significance of the study of man that one gets an idea that the subject has a breadth exceeding human understanding -- which it did for 50,000 years, because people couldn't tolerate that much simplicity.

The thetan can't be perceived or measured because it's the source of perception and measuring. But an individual can exteriorize and experience being a thetan. Not being able to perceive other thetans, it's easy to feel like the only one. Now, for the first time, by various manifestations and by reason of what we know, we can observe this in others. There are many ways of experiencing the idea of someone else exteriorizing: in the first place, voice tones change. Another thing he's liable to do is to pull his head back into his neck. He's liable to do various things, all of which manifest exteriorization. He's liable to say a lot of things, none of which manifest exteriorization but a sort of mystic, buttered-all-over-the-universe. The thetan who is over there, ain't.

Exteriorization is not a stable fact. It is the phenomenon of being in a position or space dependent only on one's consideration, able to view from that space the body and the room as it is. One can view or control the body from a distance. If one has trouble controlling the body from close up, he won't get out of his head, because he for sure can't control it at a distance. "Therefore, it's only necessary for you to assume the abilities of controlling something from a distance to be able to exteriorize willingly, since all willingness to exteriorize is merely suppressed by this factor of control. "One of the early methods of exteriorizing someone was getting him to change his considerations by

running him on, "I can control this body. I cannot control this body." People who have never been out of their heads will go out on that one.

"The task in scientology today, however, is not getting people out of their heads. You could exteriorize yourself simply by grabbing your head with your two hands and keeping your head from going away." Or you could grab your head and your knees and keep each alternatively from going away, shifting attention so you won't get too fixated. How good your perception would be is another question -- it's a matter of your willingness too. If you can't see your body, there is a scarcity of bodies. If you can't see the universe, there is a scarcity of universes. "Any phenomenon which occurs beyond the point of willingness to be out of the head or control the body from a distance is regulated by the scarcity and abundance of bodies and universes." The earliest trick still works: "Try not to be three feet back of your head." About 50% will go out on, "Be three feet back of your head," because they have been other-determined a lot.

Vision depends on scarcity and abundance. Experience depends on willingness to experience, which is monitored by the amount of things available to experience. A culture is a composite of things of which there is neither too much nor too little. E.g. we have a lot (but not too many) automobiles because they can be real. Mow this country is approaching an India-like idea of human beings: the idea that there are too many of them. In a frontier society there are too few. As you get too many people, they tend to become invisible. On a frontier, until there are almost enough people, they dramatize getting rid of people. In between, you can have a progressive society, and the U.S. was such a society with 25 to 100 million people. Now there are too many people to observe them all. Even important people get overlooked.

A person could just go out of his head without outside help if he has space and universe to get out into. He must not have a scarcity of spaces as a result of being out of comm with them. His idea of scarcity of spaces depends on his willingness to view them. The auditor must get him to recognize the is-ness of the room around him. His idea that rooms are scarce or too numerous gives him the idea that he can't see this room. Likewise, if he has too few bodies, he will be unwilling to get out of the one he's in. It is the same with an overabundance of bodies. So remedying his havingness on the body he is in is necessary for stable exteriorization.

A scarcity of experience brings about a retention of the mental image pictures. So the mind gets overcrowded or goes black. The pictures can even penetrate the blackness, producing the wide-open case where the mind is in control of the thetan. This is a condition of overwhelm, not health. When the thetan obeys the records of the mind, we have behavior patterns, etc. The mind is the record, but the thetan is the needle. A scarcity of experience causes a manufacture of pictures. People that play their minds closer in haven't been living an exciting enough life.

The workings of this mechanism depend on association and differentiation, or identification and differentiation. When the reactive mind can exert its influence on a person better than the thetan himself, he has become too associative to conceive differences He can disassociate on an inverted level, where he differentiates incorrectly. He gets misidentification and disassociation when insane. When the mind is working optimally, it never identifies, but only conceives a similarity. Lack of objects, incidents, and experience causes the mind to identify, rather than associating. It is not stress or overwork that causes this. That is why problems of comparable magnitude or "Mock up something to confront," will work, relieve somatics, etc.

Things that happen to you are automatic, in that you all too of ten have no say in their occurrence. When you run problems of comparable magnitude, you not only measure up incident and add incident to the bank, but you also take over the automaticity of shocking incidents that occurred to you. When you have gone all the way up the line, the idea of "too few" becomes the idea of, "I didn't do it." Then this runs out, and it all becomes a pan-determinism of incidents, where you become convinced you can create incidents and lose scarcity of incidents. In a TV screen world, you're apt to be in trouble. The TV pictures are patterns of light and shadows, a restimulative mechanism to shove your bank around and give you again some segment of that which you've already experienced.

It can only give you experience you've already (if distantly) had. People will refuse to read about certain periods in history because of experience in those periods. A thetan will refuse to look at certain parts of his past and the bank, but they can be gotten at if necessary. Only people who have had heavy problems in a past life refuse to look at it, but if they had no scarcity of horrible incidents, they could confront them better.

The restimulated incident is held in place for two reasons. It was automatic, i.e. the PC left large sections of it done by somebody else, plus there wasn't enough of it. Those incidents that are most scarce tend to stick hardest. Anything that stands by itself doesn't get a terminal against which to discharge and fly apart.

Any old incident could react physiologically against the PC if the auditor wanted to restimulate it fully, not letting the PC ever be a cause on it, evaluating it, invalidating, etc. You should know how to do this, as long as doing something bad to PCs doesn't become a habit with you. [Cf. Gestalt, encounter, and primal scream therapies that cause an effect.]

So the mind is a mechanism for overcoming the lack of incident and experience in present time by storing pictures of the past. If you restore the PC's ability to make the pictures solid, you've really done something. He has some optimum randomity that would be the right amount of pictures. So you have to change his idea of how much motion he needs before you can change the PC. This is done with scarcity and abundance, i.e. havingness.

The body is a solid appendage that makes a person recognizable. The mind modifies the body, which is a mockup. To change a body, you have to change mental structure and also the thetan's willingness to have it in its present condition. The body surrenders first to its own electronic structure, i.e. the anchor points. It is solid only within these spaces and will aberrate its shape in their absence. So the easiest way to modify the body is to put the thetan into a willingness to handle anchor points, then remedy scarcity and abundance of anchor points, and put the actual anchor points in optimal position. Mental image pictures also influence the body by influencing the anchor points. A facsimile imposes itself by magnetic fields and currents upon the anchor point system, causing the body to change shape and size. The anchor points are golden balls. If a person is in good shape, he'll have his wing anchor points out about 75 feet. You can hold one -- pull it out of line, and the person will walk in a circle. To fix a broken arm, you have to remedy the havingness of the messed up anchor points. You could band an arm in the wrong place by moving its anchor points.

To influence the mind by influencing the body is only possible by influencing the havingness of a thetan. You can only influence a thetan in this way to the degree that it influences abundance's and scarcities of bodies. If you keep on taking things away from people, they'll eventually die of loss of havingness. The being lives in a universe which is another monitoring influence on the mind and body -- not necessarily on the being. When an incident happens to a person's body, he makes a picture of it and uses it when a similar situation occurs. He also uses it when he has a scarcity of incidents. The thetan's ability doesn't change; only his willingness to live increases or decreases in direct ratio to the scarcity or abundance of things in which they are interested. These scarcities and abundance's influence them and their culture. The cure for it is to put the individual in communication with the isness of a situation or object and let him reacquaint himself with that. He is then able to conceive himself able to experience new experiences, viewing something directly, etc., and so his life can be righted.

We can adjust a person's havingness, his ability to conceive of an isness and communicate with it, by adjusting the number or scarcity of things.

5707C15 18ACC-1 What is Scientology

Scientology is aimed at a total know. Since no other "know" is total, it is hard to describe scientology, since there is no other datum of comparable magnitude. Only one other organization of knowledge on earth has had a similar goal: Buddhism. It squirreled when it went into Tibet as Lamaism. But there was no faith in Buddhism. It was analytical. The best refuge to take, when asked what scientology is, would be a refuge into incomprehensibility, by saying that it is epistemology. Buddhism and scientology both try to select out the importance's of life and fill Man's void of knowledge with accurate observation. Buddha could be called the first scientist. "Authority has nothing to do with knowledge. Those things I tell you are true, are not true because I tell you they are true. And if anything I tell you, or have ever told you, is discovered to differ from the individual observation, be it a good observation, then it isn't true."

We have certain positive procedures. As valuable as they are, if they incline us to lock at them, not at what they help us to look at; if they lead us to believe that they are a thing, not a means to doing another thing, we will be in the same blind condition as present-day religions and social sciences, and

we will have to rediscover our blindness on the way up. Wherever we develop an area of special knowledge, such as TR's and processes, we must understand that they are a means to an end, not an end in themselves. Someone who forgot what TR's were could, in theory, do them all beautifully but be unable to use them in session, because he had forgotten what they were for: to create the proper communication atmosphere for the session.

There is an enormous wonderland below blindness. This keeps people from seeing their blindness. Using Alice in Wonderland in TR's is a joke based on this imagined knowledge. The wonderland is the dispersal that results from the individual's reaction to being kicked in the teeth when he looks at something. He won't look again. Eventually he decides not to look at anything. But if he catches sight of something, he will go on a via and look at something else instead. This is how the wonderland of the social sciences was created. Someone couldn't confront Man, so he turned around and created a myth about Man. He must have been blind never to have noticed exteriorization or to have recorded the existence of the phenomenon somewhere. A thetan has the ability to create form, to create universes. When the ability dims out, when he is not doing it very intelligently, he begins to see things in the universe that he doesn't want to look at. Then he disperses and combines his ability to create and to not-is. The universe he then builds is below the level of the universe he is in. You have to bring him up North for him to discover that he is in a trap.

5707C17 18ACC-3 Theory and Definitions of Auditing

The PC is less than or equal to the bank and the auditor is less than or equal to the bank, but the PC + auditor is greater than the bank. A person cannot audit himself because the basic ingredient of all auditing is communication, and a person cannot really talk to himself, especially in P.T., because talking to oneself puts half the cycle out of PT. Someone could mock up a circuit that talks back or assume a valence that feeds the past back to him, where he thinks something is feeding him an effect from the past or talking to him. When a person self-audits, he uses these circuits to feed stuff back to him; it gets him nowhere. The best he could do would be to handle a mental image picture which was seeking to handle him, or to handle the environment.

The only things in the bank that give the PC trouble are the moments he didn't handle, the worst moments. When he gets pictures of these moments, he tends to go out of control and backs off or boils off. An auditor would acknowledge; get him to confront it. Only communication got him into his mess; only communication can get him out. Therefore, there has to be another terminal for him to communicate to.

In 1952, we got scientology, a different approach to the problem of the bank. Instead of erasing the bank, we put the person himself in good enough condition, so that he can handle anything. That's a real clear, not someone with a blank bank. The things that are right with a person are the things that are wrong with the person. What is wrong with a being is what the being can do, and what the being is. Any scale in scientology could be drawn as a "V"-actually as a flare [exponential, perhaps?]:

Distance tolerance is the key to the affinity scales. Distance narrows as a person gets into worse condition. He has to be closer and closer to things to know they are real. High on the scale, tremendous distances can be tolerated; here there is also lots of trust. At the bottom, no distance is tolerable. A person's ability to handle things depends on his ability to handle distance; he interiorizes into those things that he can't trust, until he is the thing he distrusts. A person can control at a distance with comm; as control diminishes, he loses reach, can't project intention, can't trust, etc. Tone goes down with competence going down. Auditing is an expansion of distance. A PC starts with inverted distance (trying to escape), or with close distance (solid comm line, as in CCH-1). However, running away from things tends to make them stay with them. A body of soldiers running away from the enemy goes to pieces. They don't reform, regroup; can't sustain discipline. When you run away, part of you stays there. Also, when running away, or being unable to tolerate proximity, a being has no concept of distance: there's "no place to hide. "Anyhow, the part that stay there is the M.I.P. If one can't occupy some part of the universe, the only recourse is dispersal, which closes actual distance. [The thetan never gives up.] Running, "What part of that incident could you confront?" loosens it up; unsticks the person from it. People never have trouble with situations they have confronted, only with those from which they ran away. This is an example of "That which you resist, you become." The sub-zero tone scale shows the distance going inverted as one tries to run.

One thing establishes distance: communication. But it has to be real communication, not inval and eval. It has to be to the person. Space is a viewpoint of dimension, i.e. lookingness, i.e. communication. Communication can have a closure factor if it is just looking; but two thetans in real two way communication can hold their distance and go upscale. If you find that when two people talk, the longer they talk, the closer they get smashed together, then one of them isn't communicating.

When people don't know what something is, they have trouble communicating with it.

When someone tries to communicate with the bank, it kicks back and thus gives the thetan the idea that he is punished for communicating. But his facsimiles aren't real. In dianetics, we thought a person somehow took and stored all these pictures. But there is not really a mechanism, like the file clerk, of taking and storing these pictures. No. The object is still there, grown thin. That's a picture! Every consecutive moment of the universe from its beginning until now is potentially as solid as it was then. The only reason it isn't as solid is that you don't to confront it, so you thinned it down. The only serious reactive pictures are the "thinnies" one made before or as one way from something unconfrontable. This sounds complex, but it's only a problem in change of space. You don't carry the pictures. You left a viewpoint there when you didn't totally confront something, and it is still looking. All you need to do is to get someone to be willing to confront old universes he wouldn't confront before, and you will have a clear.

Summary: Auditing is to raise the ability of another person so that he can handle the bank, the body, others, etc. It is a communication process.

5901C22 21ACC-1 How a Process Works

"[The auditor] has to find out what the PC did with the auditing command and what he did when he executed the command.

In the absence of communication, nothing ever happens, which is why people who are out the bottom don't communicate, hoping to be safe. This doesn't work if you are trying to do other things. You must get the process communicated across to the PC and you must get the PC to communicate.

The first thing to know about pictures is that anything the PC is looking at is a picture. A bank doesn't do anything except be there, and whatever strange thing is happening in the bank is a picture of whatever strange thing is happening in the bank. That's all you have to know to unocclude an occluded case. Black fives look sane sometimes, because they haven't got anything to dramatize except looking at blackness -- not that they wouldn't dramatize if they were looking at something else.

When a PC is stuck in too heavy a picture, it is impossible to turn on other pictures on the track. The basic process for occlusion is, "Come up to present time." If that doesn't work, there are seven other processes.

1. There are several things a person can do with pictures. He may use not-isness to make them disappear as soon as they show up. Other obsessive doingnesses can be used to get rid of one's pictures (a "solution" to pictures). This case can be approached using O/W Selected people, because if he's not-ising pictures, he's not-ising people too. In so doing, he finds himself surrounded by "ghosts". First run, "What have you done to [withheld from?] _____ ?", using the person you've selected.

2. Then run general O/W to catch some more of the automaticity of this outflow.

3. ARC break straightwire is used to knock out the cause of not-isness. "All locks on the Rock are ARC breaks."

4. Next, we would use not-is straightwire (Recall a time you thought something was unimportant; Recall a time someone else thought something was important). If you run it reverse-wise, it takes away the PC's havingness and spins him in. This works on not-ising other's importance's. [I.e. it as-ises times he did this.]

5. Factual havingness (also called "third rail"), the "vanish" command of this. This also handles not-isness.

6. "What can you confront?": This because at this stage, the person doesn't wipe something out before he looks at it.

7. "You make a mockup for which you can be totally responsible." This is a top of the line process. Any of these processes turn on pictures. These processes, plus CCH's handle all occluded cases.

5911C26 1MACC-27 The Constancy and Fundamentals of Dianetics and Scientology

"What could you confront?" is one of the first principles of dianetics, as expounded in 1938. Foreshadowing of the 1952 principle of dichotomies is in the 1950 treatment of survive-succumb. As far as the thetan is concerned, surviving is bound up with confronting, in that "if something is surviving, he can confront it; if it doesn't survive, he can't confront it. And sometimes something survives too damn well, and he sits there confronting it for thousands of years saying, 'I am a black case.'"

You're right in the middle of the cycle of action. The dynamic principle of existence of scientology is Create! This is the common denominator of all thetans, even if they don't know it. Create + counter-creation = destruction. Survive is a continuous confronting. "Your license to survive is a license to confront. You have the right to look at the environment in which you are, and if you don't survive, you don't have the right, and if someone destroys your possessions, so you can't confront them, so they're not surviving, so you feel you're not surviving."

The word, "survive" can't be translated smoothly into several languages. "Suicidal races" like the Russians and the Japanese have such languages. They do confront, however. Confronting is the action; survive is the state of mind, so confront gives an action process. You can run confront on small children as, "What would you like to look at?" It's better to run the action.

"Kids are always trying to make people confront things -- showing you things." You can run the process nonverbally. Just point questioningly. This lets you out of the symbol band nicely.

The communication process kicks in Axiom 10; it vividly takes in cause and effect. It's best to run an assist with "From where could you communicate to a _____ ?" If mass is present in the room, that helps his havingness. If he's too injured, you could have him look at (confront) the injured part, using a touch assist. You could also run, "What (body part) could you confront / would you dislike confronting?" You could also use, "From where could you confront _____ ?"

Confront - not confront = Reach - withdraw = Make comm lines - break comm lines.

The confront process produces a different engram chain than the communication process. Communication intends to produce an effect; confront lets anything happen.

To finish off a person's victim button, use "What victim could you confront / would you rather not confront?" Use "rather not" instead of "dislike" because, for instance, the phrase, "dislike confronting" could implant the person with a dislike of confronting. You could also use "What part of a victim could you confront?" for a further-south case. These victim processes tend to put a person continually in a winning valence. It may throw him out of his normal valence if he is stuck aberratedly in a losing valence, but then it eases him back into his own valence. "What could you confront?" runs the PC into valence.

Probably the lowest level thinkingness process there is "Recall a communication," or "Recall communicating.,

On a psychotic, it is best to mimic his orderly actions only, not his disorderly ones. Anyone who can successfully do a thinkingness process is not a psychotic. If a person can at least be responsible for himself and his own environment, he is not crazy. These people are out of the realm of psychiatry. "Normal people" are not sane on all dynamics and cannot be trusted with all of them.

The idea of total responsibility, as expounded in Advanced Procedures and Axioms, was not and is not a popular one, although it formed the basis of many axioms. The idea of being irresponsible, as in Book 1, where people were all victims, was what was popular. A person who is not responsible on a dynamic has no choice but to be a victim on that dynamic. Absolute irresponsibility -- and

absolute insanity -- could be defined as inability to take responsibility on any dynamic. Such a person would be a victim on all dynamics.

Survive -- succumb = willing to look at -- not willing to look at. It you had someone who was willing to look at anything on all the dynamics, who could escape from looking at them if he didn't want to, you'd have a sane man. It would have nothing to do with whether he was intelligent about it. He's helping to put the dynamics there, so he has some control over them. Since he is willing to look, he would be intelligent about them as well. Intelligence is non-restimulated stupidity. One can restimulate not-knowingness by educating kids to only look at things and never to take their attention off them. Thus you get mystery restimulated. It's an unbalanced thing; it makes them wonder and go into mystery. For instance, "Keep your shirt clean," repeated at him, is the same as, "Confront your shirt so as to prevent something." This locks him into confronting his shirt. Fixed and unfixed attention, as mentioned in Elizabeth, New Jersey, can be run with, "What would you like to confront / rather not confront?" This is not as good as, "What could you confront?" etc.

So the fundamentals of dianetics and scientology do not change. The only thing that changes is relative importance's.

People believe they are obsessively separate, so they believe that if they ran this out, they would be obsessively the same person, and we'd get obsessive togetherness, as in Communism.

But actually, obsessive togetherness comes about from a terror of the separateness that comes about from committing overts and becoming more and more individuated. A person becomes more and more individuated until he finds himself doing a flip and getting drawn into a mass which for him doesn't exist. So you get a back and forth movements between these two points. Thus obsessive individuation and obsessive togetherness are much the same thing. The world is in these conditions so much that it's become [almost] impossible to prove that everyone is a separate individual. This is scientology's unsolved question: Is everyone separate or all one? We suspect that people are separate, but there's no proof. Experimental attempts to prove this are obscured by the obsessive states people are in.

6012C31 AHMC-1 The Genus of Dianetics and Scientology

The genus of scientology and dianetics was in the 20's, when LRH was a kid in the orient, seeing all kinds of oddities. While a George Washington University, he conducted tests and found that poetry gives the same wavelengths in all languages. He went to the psychology department with this discovery, got rebuffed, and found that none of them understood the mind. He calculated that there cannot be enough bits of information carried on the protein molecules in the brain to store all the memories that men have. In Austria this got published as "This is how man remembers." LRH was well known at the Explorers Club for his ethnological studies. In 1938, he got to "survival" as the common denominator to all races and possibly all life. At this point in his studies, he met Commissar Golinski from Amtorg (a diplomatic trade channel with Russia). He offered LRH a job in Pavlov's lab, $200,000, plus expenses for research. etc. LRH refused. "About two years later they broke into my quarters -- or some unknown people did -- and stole the original manuscripts. I have a flimsy copy of the research, but it's not complete."

In 1946 and 1947, LRH did the research that culminated in DMSMH. At this time, a high-ranking naval officer offered him a job with the Office of Naval Research. He was to find ways to use his knowledge of the mind to make people more suggestible. When he was refused, he was threatened with being pulled back into military service. He figured out a way to resign from the service. This was the end of a beautiful friendship with the American government. They didn't make up their minds that we were con men until LRH said no. Any government is interested in how the mind works, but against anyone that knows more about it than they do.

This has left us the only free organization on the earth.

6012C31 AHMC-2 The Things of Scientology

Scientology has succeeded in bringing the predictability of the natural sciences into the humanities. Practically every natural scientist before LRH has attempted this, but none has succeeded before now.

"There are 20 separate items in scientology and dianetics that are as solid as one of these test tubes." This has nothing to do with ivory tower figure figure. Scientology is a practical subject that has nothing to do with anyone's beliefs.

Policing of behavior is the rule today. It is based on what no one knows about. People become slaves to their ignorance of right and wrong. In such a time, one needs a practical wisdom. Whole countries have gone by the boards because their wisdom wasn't practical. For instance, India and China. Their "wisdom" always went with poverty and degradation. People's woes, difficulties, and failures stem from their ignorance, their darkness about the mind. They had no knowledge of the rules. The world needs a practical science, the parts of which are clearly visible. Having this, one can see into men's hearts, know them, and live.

One of the twenty things is the brain. It is a shock absorber which prevents electronic currents from injuring the beingness of the person. It has less to do with controlling motor actions than commonly believed. People with brain damage have had function restored with dianetics. Another of the "things" is the human nervous system. The nervous system also serves for warning, control, and arrest of pain, or absorption of pain. Another couple of things are the human body and the physical universe. Also, lock, secondary, and engram. Real things.

Another thing is the overt-motivator sequence. It is a very low-order sequence. This falls out when a person ceases to be reactive, because it is based on and is a Q and A with Newton's law of interaction (Second Law of Motion). It is more serious than, "If you do something to Joe, he will do something to you." It is used by people who are into a big Q and A with MEST. It justifies stockpiling A-bombs, etc. There's more to the overt-motivator sequence than Newton's law. If Joe hits Bill, he will believe he should be or has been hit by Bill and gets a somatic to prove it. So if someone does an overt, he will get or believe he has already gotten the motivator.

The scales and cycles of dianetics and scientology are things, not figure-figure. There's the cycle of action (create, survive, and destroy, in its most crude form). It is an apparency, but demonstrable.

"The human mind is the bag of tricks the thetan invented to keep himself from getting bored to death in this universe and has then considered too complex to understand and has gotten himself into serious trouble with."

6102C14 3SAACC-14 Fundamentals of Auditing (Jo'burg)

The fundamentals of auditing are designed to handle fixations and changes of attention. Attention is fixated or in a constant state of flux to the degree that a person is creating and counter-creating. That's what a thetan's attention gets fixed on: the creates or the counter-creates. All other things (ruds, havingness processes, etc.) fall into line on that understanding. The case is fixed on or fluctuating amongst the masses and energies it has created. the things that put them out of existence or make them unreal are of course created by the case. The person is at war with himself. That's why an "attack" process works. It's a counter-create. Most cases, especially downscale, are more dedicated to counter-creation than creation. The case is in a state of unreality about the fact that he's doing it (mocking up things on which he is then fixing his attention). Sometimes a person may know he's doing it or not doing it. But often thetans don't know that they are creating what they are fighting. So you could have a level of processing of doingness on creating, e.g. "What wouldn't you mind creating / would you rather not create?"

We're dealing strongly with havingness these days, with success. The axiom of aberration is, "All doingness harms self." Doingness processes address this fact. You could ask, "What liability would there be to doing something?" or "What could you do which wouldn't be harmful to you?" This could fall flat because the person is doing so many more complicated things that he has to come up to these basics. This process is too high for most cases.

Beingness processes are relatively easy to run. You could run an engram with, "What, in that incident would you be willing to be?" The PC must have the ability to be something before this would be a workable process. Some people can't be anything, so you have to test for this with, "Look around here and find something you could be."
You could develop the whole rationale of processing at the level of beingness or doingness or havingness, though they must eventually merge; all three are needed.

If a PC doesn't move just with elementary rudiments: no TA; no change of case, it's probable that the PC is withholding some big recent overt. Or the PC may have some unusual or secret goal not imparted to the auditor, or the trouble may be a big PTP. So in going over a case on the basis of rudiments, one takes it easy until one finds out that the havingness scale, as you have been taught to use it, doesn't move the TA. Why ask for trouble before you've got it? You go over the ruds pretty well -- no wild drops, go on in search of the prehav level, find where the PC lives, get one of his principal goals aligned, convert it into a terminal which drops as well as the goal dropped, assess the prehav scale with that terminal, then run anything that fits that level. The commands are, "What was _____ ?" for positive and, "What _____ failed?" for negative. For a terminal it's, e.g., "What (terminal) was _____ ?" and "What (terminal) failed to _____ ?" or "What (terminal) was not?" These are the all-bracket commands. They could be repeated for each level. You could run 15 brackets against the prehav scale "When has (terminal)(action)(terminal)?" There are possibilities of 32-way brackets, but five-way is enough.

[More details on prehav running]

If a PC isn't interested in the process, the ruds are out, as it's an interesting process. So beat the ruds to death. If you can't solve it with ruds, run CCH's. The PC needs this when he can't control attention and your command isn't reaching him, a no-effect case on whom no command has anything to do with him, etc.: totally on automatic, etc. So use CCH's to give them an example that control and duplication can exist, and to increase their alertness, havingness, and effectiveness. Ten to twenty-five hours of CCH's must be done, with good auditor control and presence. If the auditor can't impinge on the PC, however, and has no auditor presence, even CCH's won't work, since they depend on impingement. LRH impinges more than most auditors because of his certainty that something will happen and his not being scared to confront the PC. To LRH, it's a personal affront if the PC isn't moving. He can even get bad research results because even when using a process that shouldn't work, his postulate that the case should change and his wanting to do something for the PC will cause the process to work. So he depends on HGC results, etc., to test processes. Just asking the PC questions can do a tremendous amount for the PC. Don't underestimate what auditor presence, confidence, and interest can do.

CCH's depend on auditor presence more than any other process. Maybe 6 percent won't get gains, because of needing CCH's. The rest have ruds out, if they don't win on goals and prehav.

[More data on goals and prehav running]

The havingness processes are arranged in order of their frequency of effectiveness. A command that works on cases that have relatively uncontrolled banks and can't run engrams is, "Where is _____ ?" Frequently a person with low havingness is in a universe of objects that are mad at him, etc. As you run, "What is the emotion of that (object)?", the object goes downscale and the PC cuts in across the bottom and goes upscale. When he's upscale about the object, the process is flat. This havingness process can change, when emotion disappears out of the physical universe, to "What is the condition of that (object)?" If the havingness process stops loosening the needle, first check to see if there is an ARCB about the command, and then, if not, find a new havingness process.

Other processes: are TR-10: "Notice that (indicated object). What aren't you putting into it?" A good outside process is, "What is the condition of that person?"

When you get a rise on a can squeeze, the PC may have heavy withholds, maybe inverted interest, and won't lie-check. Perhaps the havingness test would be how much less does the needle rise in this case. If the case ARCB's all the time, you can run, "Who would I have to be to audit you?"

The prehav scale running runs subjective havingness; the hav processes run objective havingness. The objective havingness determines his havingness of the physical universe; the prehav scale determines his havingness of the subjective universe. You only run enough objective havingness to keep the PC in PT and loosen his needle.

<div align="center">
END OF PRE-SHSBC TAPES
THE SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE TAPES
</div>

6105C07 SHSpec-1 E-meter Talk and Demo

SOP Goals running: Assess for all the goals the PC ever had. When all are out and no longer give a fall on the meter, the list is complete. When the list is complete, the meter no longer registers. Reassess the list until only one goal continues to read. Now list all the terminals for the goal -- all the terminals which would represent that goal -- until the meter goes flat. Null the list until only one terminal reads (falls) on the meter.

SOP Goals is the entirety of data needed to clear all cases. This is unlike the situation earlier when LRH would develop a regimen to handle one PC's case, then develop the theory which matched it. Sometimes this was picked up by others and a whole school of therapy was based on it, For instance, the dianetic tech used to handle one individual -- Altman -- later became Gestalt Therapy.

The E-meter is a tension machine: the more tense the individual, the more off-beat is the read. Clearing is taking the tension off the meter. At the lowest level of tension, there's no point in doing anything about anything; you've got a dead thetan, totally incapable of influencing the machine. He reads as a clear, but this kind of case can still be detected because the needle is tense; it doesn't react favorably at all; the person cannot answer to his satisfaction or yours any questions about help. The needle also shows no reaction to anything, even a kick. The sensitivity has to be way up to get a third of a dial drop on can squeeze. The guy can be machine-motivated, feels he had "bad luck", doesn't believe anything can be done, so he can get no help, etc. He's a very obvious "can't do" case. Doingness is the common denominator of the prehav scale. Someone who can't do isn't even on the scale. The best case detector is the sensitivity knob, not the TA or needle. The worst case is where a person is super tense but doesn't know it. This guy would be a long job to sec check.

A rock slam is a stronger indication than a fall. It shows that you are on the chain of the first time the person ever decided to be another valence. The theta bop is diagnostic; it has to do with leaving and death, the thetan moving in and out like a yo-yo. It can be dial wide or small. It can be repetitive or even, at an extreme, one cycle (this is not very useful). "Returning" will also give you a theta bop. The rise means the PC isn't confronting. We used to be concerned about what stopped the rise, which was what was producing it, or rather the PC's non-confront of that thing caused it. Stage four needle is an indicator of a total no-effect case. It can be very tiny. It always has a stick at the top of the rise, unlike the theta bop. The bottom of it is very relaxed. It just means lousy case shape. Sometimes, you see the needle vibrate. This means that the PC has an alternating current ridge. 4.5 means a crowd; if he's stuck there, he's afraid of people or stuck with people. Stuck at 2.5 means a robot, a machine. There's a seven on the TA dial that can't be read on the meter. As a person develops responsibility (say he's a dead thetan at 2.0), he'll go down to 1.5, then "go out the bottom" through 7 to 6.5, 5, 4, etc., to in range.

A PC can have a consistent pattern; he can even repeat the same fall. In this case, a change of characteristic is diagnostic. When the PC has a charged question in his level of reality, you get a change of pattern.

The meter that would be used above clear would be an oscilloscope meter, an O-meter or theta meter, which registers flows. This is not comfortable to audit with. The meter has to be very sensitive. Someone could be clear and still have "bugs" -- because he's still using a body. The E-meter measures the games condition called the physical universe. You need something which shades the tiniest things from 20.0 up.

We have theoretically transcended MEST weapons. As someone goes theta clear, his tolerance of motion is so great that he wouldn't be hurt by a bullet. He probably couldn't even be hit by it.

6105C12 SHSpec-2 Assessment

"You, in trying to equate a relatively simple fundamental in scientology, are of course picking up a fundamental which sits right in the middle of anyone's case. And you tend to blow off a little confusion in trying to get a hold of it. It would be easy to teach you to run a Diesel engine, but the data we're teaching goes straight into the middle of a reactive computation. SOP Goals does this exact

thing, exactly reversing how the mind got aberrated." The most hidden factors of a mind were the things that aberrated a mind, because no one's ever freed a mind before, so they must have been the most concealed or they would have as-ised. SOP goals undoes all the things that plowed someone in; it consists of all the solutions a person adopted to fix all the oddball circumstances he got into, ever, that no longer apply. Who wouldn't want to have the kind of mind that could be happy doing something simple? Basically, what you're afraid of is getting bored. This happens because what you are doing is somehow inadequate to the demands of the environment. If one's simple game gets invalidated, one looks for a more complicated one. This could only happen if one had invalidated someone else already. To get kicked in the butt, you must have kicked someone in the butt and postulated that it's bad to get kicked in the butt.

If the way to do a perfect assessment were put on paper, there's a high probability that it wouldn't be followed, because we're dealing with the basic stuff of which the reactive mind is composed. And on this subject more than any other, you'll find more confusion, more silly questions. The datum restimulates the whole confounded bank. What happens is that the guy does something which eventually recoils on him in a way which gives him a new problem. He gets his motivator and gets a new beingness to have a new game. But he's now not being himself, he's being a solution to the problem of livingness. The solution eventually ends him up with a new problem which he solves with some new beingness, some new game. Every time he gets overwhelmed in some game, he shifts beingness to the new game which solves the old one. If you clear someone without clearing up his be/do/have condition, he'll realize he has no game and he'll recreate his old condition or be bored or worried. He'll go unclear. He thinks it's less dangerous to be aberrated than to have no game. If you clear (erase) his games conditions, across the boards, he'll do this.

The essence of all games is beingness and doingness towards havingness. The problem is that they get jammed into a can't have / must have situation. In a games condition, the person "has to be something, but he can't be it. There is something wrong with being what he is being, so he can't be it, and he dare not be it, and yet he must be it, and this emerges when you are auditing SOP Goals. A game or goal is abandoned because it was invalidated too many times. A guy goes into a new game and valence and ends up not being himself. In assessment, you are backtracking these valences, expressed as goals. Since by this time, the PC's comm with the world is very poor, you have to handle what's real to the PC, so that's what you handle. What's odd is that there's only one valence that's real to the PC at one time. In life, as the valence goes up, the PC comes down. This ends up with a serene valence and the PC out the bottom. So the individual goes around acting psychotic in a serene valence. This is the theetie weetie case. As you audit the person, the valence comes down and the PC starts taking over handling the game and the environment on his own determinism. As the PC gets out of fixed games, he can look around and find he's got more games. If he's got more games, he'll go more clear; if less, he'll go unclear. The act of finishing off clearing (doing more and more SOP Goals) is what stabilizes the clear. Having to play the game is what prevents one from playing the game; one can play the game as long as one doesn't have to.

[Details on running of SOP Goals]

Any goal which is to put up a mockup is liable to be a false one and is a dangerous one to audit. It is perishable, because the result of failure is to create a mockup, so that you get into an arts goal. Always be suspicious of an arts goal, because there's always the thing you can do when all else fails, and that's usually the arts. When actual masses don't work to overwhelm the opposition, they turn to aesthetic masses, which are closer to the thought band. If you go just a little further with assessment, the case will likely get into a better goals channel. You can ask, "What did you want to do before you went into the arts?" This also applies to professions in the thought band, like philosophy and law. A featherweight goal denotes a hell of a failure just ahead of it.

6105C19 SHSpec-3 E-meter

When the E-meter is reading sporadically on something, chances are what you are talking about is quite close to what it's reading on. When you ask just the right question, it reads hard and consistently. You must then get an answer to every auditing question, or the read will persist forever.

If you don't audit the hidden standard, the PC will seem to progress in the session and then say he didn't make any of his goals for the session. He'll be putting a via on every command answer to slant it through the hidden standard. You can ask the PC if there's some goal there he hasn't told you. It's

necessary to getting case progress to get it out of the way. The E-meter won't be reading well either, as it's not the question if you don't ask for the hidden standard.

A PC will not improve if he has withholds or undisclosed overts on his auditor or scientology. In fact, he'll pull in motivators and get no case gain. You can't accept help from quarters you have overts on because it seems like betrayal, since you've betrayed and the overt motivator sequence is in force. A person who has specialized in teaching by implant dawn the track will develop an identity which gives themselves implants. They amount to perhaps 5% of the human race.

6105C26 SHSpec-4 On Auditing

Before you can change people, you have to increase their tolerance for change. Change is pain, because its fundamental is a shift of location in space. On a mechanical level, change is time. Time is a temperature, the hotter the faster. This is a discovery in physics. It goes along with the discovery that the speed of light is not a constant but depends on the velocity of emission, and that zero is a variable, not an absolute zero. Time is change on a mechanical level. Rate of change is measured by rate of change, not by time, but one pretends that it is measured by time. If you find the right temperature, you can speed time up or make something timeless. For instance, after the atomic bomb exploded, nothing moved for twenty minutes, not even the twenty minutes. Temperature alteration caused this. There is a zero. There is nothing, but a nothing of what? This is variable.

Society at present doesn't know that it doesn't know. This is dangerous. Scientology points this out to society, which is painful to society. The best approach to study is always to find out what you don't know and then to remedy the situation. One should not start out study by finding out something new. The gradient approach is:

1. Not knowing that one doesn't know.

2. Knowing one doesn't know, but not knowing what one doesn't know.

3. Finding out what one doesn't know.

4. Remedying the situation. The only thing wrong with one's case is the vast area of one's beingness that one doesn't know one doesn't know about.

Things you do reactively produce the opposite result from what you intend.

Gradient of states of case:

1. Release. A release is a person who knows he won't get any worse. He has a low state of case, but he is better than a non-release, since he knows he isn't there yet. On a meter, he would give a whole dial drop on a low-sensitivity can squeeze, and the TA would be fairly near clear read. He would also have reality on scientology as a way to improve. The communication, help, and control buttons are in good shape. He can as-is certain things by inspection.

2. Stable release. This is a tested release. He has no adverse needle reactions on help, communication, or control. Life can still mess him up, but he will come through better.
3. MEST clear. This individual has an F/N at sensitivity One and doesn't react to routine questions. He reads at the clear read for his sex.

4. Stable clear. This is a MEST clear who has run lots more SOP goals, where they start blowing by inspection. For this individual, engrams have no persistence. He can erase engrams or mock them up at will. His healing rate is fantastic. Thinkingness can have an effect on the bank before clear, but a clear has more effect on the bank.

In all case states up to clear, thinkingness has a varied effect on the bank. The lower the case state, the less effect one's thought has on the bank. A psycho is total effect of the bank and can produce no effect on the bank. Then we go up to more and more effect of person on the bank, up to no bank.

Memory trouble is withholdingness. Withholding from people results in withholding from self. The PC lessens the overt and pushes it out of sight. If you increase his responsibility, he becomes aware

of more overts. The overts "unlessen" and one starts to feel bad, for instance when you discover that you have been committing overts against the Org that has been so nice to you. This is what happens when you process a person towards greater responsibility without pulling withholds: the person will cave in again. Therefore you must pull these overts and withholds and get the charge off them as they become available. This is the rationale behind interspersing sec checks with other auditing. Otherwise the PC becomes unwilling to make case gain and is likely to blow.

6106C01 SHSpec-5 Flattening Process and E-meter

On running a prehav level, be sure that you run the process long enough to get it to bite. When the PC needs a high sensitivity for a third of a dial drop, you may not get much TA in the first three hours. This can happen on a sticky level at any time. It is not flat, or it wouldn't read in the first place. So run the TA in, then out. If it is getting a little TA and never did get much, you are getting some TA, and you want to continue to increase it.

The goal becomes less intense when you find the terminal. This is because the goal is the significance that surrounds the terminal, and the PC's attention has been yanked off the goal over to the terminal, where it was fixed anyway. So the goal, after you have found the terminal, will read less than the terminal. There's nothing in the goal for his attention to be fixed on, since the goal is just something he achieved reactively to solve a problem given him by a terminal that overwhelmed him. The goal is the tag hanging out from the bank and can be used to get in there and handle the bank. This phenomenon of tags was first noticed in 1949 with engrams. For instance, with a boy who is always worried about red caps, it turns out that red caps were in an engram about which he knows nothing. Goals work the same way. The goal that won't null is the toughest one, the one attached to the terminal that most overwhelmed the PC -- that he can still confront.

6106C02 SHSpec-6 Flows, Prehav Scale, Primary Scale

A person that has flowed in one direction too long, e.g. a writer who has written too much, a shipping clerk who keeps shipping, etc. One day he will want to stop. It is an electrical phenomenon. People who are affected by gravity are affected to a degree by Newton's Laws of Motion: action and reaction. When a thetan pushes a particle out, there's a recoil effect. The law really only applies to masses of comparable magnitude. The stuck flow occurs when one neglects the return flows one is in fact receiving; one fails to as-is it, and creates a ridge from the resistance. If there's been too much inflow, a ridge may be formed from not-ised out-pushes. Newton's second law is thus the reason for solidification of flows. The facsimiles of back pushes are neglected. Therefore they stick. The stuck flow is reacted to with unconsciousness, which is dope-off.

If you have someone run a flow in one direction (in mockup), he can either get a field in front of his face going black, or an avalanche will be triggered where all the "things" come at him at once, or a reverse flow avalanche, an avalanche of resistance, an inversion. A flow too long in one direction produces a reverse flow, not just a stuck flow. This reverse flow is:
1. Not as-ised, because not noticed.

2. Resisted. [Then you get a flow in the original direction, but on an inversion.]

On running O/W, we can only do this when the PC is below the ability to tolerate change. O/W is reach and withdraw, but only from one terminal, and it doesn't account for all the possible motions. As long as the individual is below change, O/W only runs well on F-2 (See "O/W -- a Limited Theory" HCOB 5Jan61). O/W is 100% effective below change but not effective above it. [Cf. the later order of the grades.] Below the level of tolerating change, the individual's inflow and outflow get locked up, and change produces ridges on various flow lines. Therefore, the person is individuated, can't change his viewpoint. Resisting change, he gets left on some individuated point of the bracket. [E.g. he has a stuck outflow, so he can't relate to people.] If he was so bad off as to be psycho, he'd maybe get upset with flow three, and maybe get up to obsessive cause. If one is fluid on change, and doesn't resist it, he won't resist the flows and therefore, he won't create the ridge. When he sets up Newton's Second Law of Motion, he knows there'll be a consequence of every thing he does, so he knows better than to cause or experience much. The consequences of change is change; when he can't stand change, he'll go into O/W. That's why running brackets is a safety factor. When a ridge is set up, it has to be taken apart on both sides alternately. If a person goes unconscious on running a

bracket, it may be that one flow is overloaded, or maybe he isn't really doing one leg of the bracket. So you have to check and see about that by asking once on each leg, "Did you answer that to your satisfaction?" The flow three on brackets is to handle his dispersal.

In connection with stuck flows, the concept of God is interesting. What kind of shape would you think God would be in, if he'd just been creating things and causing everything? You could never reach him or say anything to him. What kind of duress must he be under to propitiate to us all that much? He must be quite spun in. Anyone who's on such an obsessive cause must be practically nuts! We should have a society for the resurrection of God. He ploughed himself in for us, so we should help him out.

The Prehav Scale is a reactive bank scale. When a person is eventually able to have, he doesn't have to have a bank, so the bank disappears, at the point of Have. The bank wouldn't be there to measure on an analytical scale. The best description of the analytical Have scale would be Axioms One and Two. All other truths are the result of postulates, agreements, and considerations, so the scale would depend on what a bunch of thetans agreed on. It could change.

The Prehav scale is fixed, a "now-I'm-supposed-to," "This is it -- why we're here" scale. It's the order of the value of postulates that are fixed and not changeable in the absence of

scientology. At some time early on the time track, this scale must have been dreamed up. Recovering it is quite a trick. All levels may not be there. Also some levels repeat in changed wording, and there are harmonics.

6106C05 SHSpec-8 Routine One, Two and Three

An auditing result is determined by:

1. The adequacy of the tool being applied.

Modified by:

2. What auditor's will use.

Which is modified by:

3. What they can use.

A good process is one that can be widely applied. A good procedure is to ask an auditor what he's had gain on himself. Let him run that until he gets reality (with training) on something else. He'll get a result where he himself believes he can get a result.

If you increase a person's potential responsibility without letting them be responsible for what they've done, it is vicious. The person will feel miserable, which is better than being irresponsible, but they'll stop getting case gain because they feel it's not deserved or safe. As a PC gets processed, his reality level on his life and overts comes up. That's why sec check reads change as the person gets new auditing. The point of doing O/W is to bring responsibility up, but this is only possible where there is some responsibility. The "dead thetan" case won't read on O/W. He has total irresponsibility. But a person can't take responsibility for his acts unless you let him do it and communicate them.

6106C06 SHSpec-7 Routine One, Two and Three

Always check for what happened between sessions if the PC has a different TA read from the end of one to the beginning of the next session, even after just a break. The definition of rudiments is what's needed to get the PC in session. They are nothing more than that. Don't use ruds to waste auditing. Ruds processes are weak. Let the PC as-is it by telling you about it, but don't two way comm it. If the PC is still dramatizing something, it's too deep-seated for ruds anyway. If needed, you can ask in several ways to find what it is. This is not the same as two way comm. You can run a rudiments process if it doesn't clean up when he spots it.

With CCH's you are auditing out a valence end bringing the PC up. The valence will fight for survival, you will get comm lags, etc. The CCH's are not run in model session. You don't pick up ARC breaks, etc., because the person doesn't easily blow them and can get quite involved in them.

Routine One: CCH's and Sec checks

Routine Two: General run of the Prehav scale, Joburg, and havingness -- all in model session.

PTP's of LD are assessed for the terminal, which is run on the Prehav scale.

Routine Three: SOP Goals assessment, assess for terminals, run flat on Prehav, with Joburgs interspersed.

6106C07 SHSpec-9 Points in Assessing

The problem with communicating scientology is that there are no agreed-upon realities ready-made in words. If you give a person one of these concepts and its name and definition, he will recognize the truth of it, but it will take awhile for him to really grasp it. and he has to get the concept first. This is almost like processing. People read DMSMH and got an understanding that changed their physical condition. But the ideas of dianetics and scientology haven't been familiar to Man, so it takes awhile, or it takes familiarity with them, to grasp them. You could teach someone the principles of scientology by teaching him the vocabulary.

You've got to get the PTP of long duration off the PC's case if he has one, before you can go on with goals processing, because the PTP LD is more real to the PC than anything else on his case. His attention is fixed on it. If the PC has his attention fixed on the hidden standard, you've practically got a computation right there. It has to be gotten out of the way to get case gain. It is always right on the goals chain, or it wouldn't be a PTP of long duration, so when you get it out of the way, you've got the case flying. It has been a mistake not to assess the hidden standard, finding out who had it, when, and what. [This is Presession 38 -- a dianetic assist. See HCOB 23Feb61 "PT Problem and Goals".] Or a more certain method would be to run the hidden standard with a terminals assessment by elimination (Whose might it be? What might it be?, etc.) This line of questioning is interesting, both to the PC and casewise, because the hidden standard is the primary source of individuation for the PC. It is what makes him different from everyone else. It is the least well duplicated part of the bank, so it will fire off as an automaticity, because it is the area that is most out of communication and most out of control. The PC could get lots of terminals from this.

The hidden standard is a substitute for the case of the PC. It is more real to him than any case or life difficulties the PC may have. It is a form of individuation. The PC is the one with the earache. This distinguishes him from others.

6106C08 SHSpec-10 Q and A Period and Ending an Intensive

[A lot of specific data about running SOP Goals.]

6106C09 SHSpec-11 Reading E-meter Reactions

Auditing latent reads is auditing the analytical mind. It is the reactive mind that we are interested in auditing. The reactive mind is a mind that acts without inspection on the basis of stimulus. It puts into action solutions to problems it fancies must exist, which may never have existed, or which haven't existed for billions of years. Put in any part of the problem, and the reactive mind goes into forming the solution. A thetan is trying to survive, who has no necessity for trying to survive at all, which is the first idiocy. So the mind is trying to solve a nonexistent problem. Then it addresses itself to the survival of form, the perpetuation of an existing state, which would take out all the MEST in a sensible state and "garbleize" it. The reactive mind is the individual's accumulated goals for the survival of forms. The reason it destroys is to get something to survive. It creates to get a form to survive. The reactive mind is the part of the cycle of action that will never move, because its keynote is survival of a form. So it is trying to make something survive that is already dead: old bodies, identities, etc.

You could remember it if you weren't trying so hard to make it survive, but because of the survival effort, when you try to remember it, you get a restimulation as if you were still in the period, because all the impulse to survive has been trapped and rides up to PT. All of these forms have nothing to do with PT, but here they are. So the reactive mind has a starvation for the other parts of his old games, e.g. the opponents, and it acts without inspection and very fast. To get a form to survive, you can't take time for inspection. This leads to such idiocies as people attacking their own planes or ships in war when they'd gotten used to attacking enemy ones. The "safe thing to do" is not to inspect, under battle conditions. The jam of the time, not taking time to inspect, results in no-inspection. When you speed up things in the physical universe to too great a degree, on the false basis that you are prone to non-survival, but in the interest of keeping something surviving, you'll run into the timeless reactivity of action without inspection.

So therefore, what you are after is instant reads. Your auditing target is the reactive mind, not the PC. The only thing wrong with the PC is the reactive mind, and there is no inspection involved there, so he can't see what is wrong with him. If he could see it, it wouldn't be wrong. This is also why the reactive mind is more in control of the auditor than the PC: the no-inspection factor. He can't think on the reactive subjects; you can. So if you take his instructions on what to do or handle, you'll always do the wrong things. One of the PC's goals is to make his reactive mind survive, so he won't let you near any part that should be audited. It dictates to you that it must survive; it throws you red herrings. "When you turn around and look; when you're running from a [battle that you're losing], you normally get speared. Therefore it's very very bad to look at the things that are pursuing you ..., so you mustn't ... so you had better prevent the auditor from ... looking at the things that are pursuing you.

There is another obscuring element: withholdingness is the comm bridge between the PC and the reactive mind. When a withhold comes out of the reactive mind, the PC will do what the reactive mind tells him to do, which is to withhold it. Withholdingness is part and parcel of survival; it is protection of forms from attacks and destruction. It's a non-duplication too: you withhold your form from duplicating the form of someone you've killed. This sets the mechanics going for survival: it's actually prior to the actual idea of survival. So the PC gets into withholding thought. The withholding of form is super-basic to all sorts of other things, e.g. individuating. The PC also withholds his body from destruction.
When the PC gives up a withhold, he's conquered a dictate of the reactive mind by being controlled by a being (the auditor), rather than by his bank. This is the mechanics by which he feels better when he gets the withholds off. Because withholds add up to keeping him separated from the human race. He can always be counted upon to dramatize the withhold when it comes up. On the meter, there's first a tick, then a fall as the PC spots it. The secondary action is not to get the withhold off the PC, but to keep the PC from dramatizing his reactive bank. So we say, "What was that?" When withholding, the PC is reactive -- he is dramatizing -- otherwise, he's talking to you analytically or at the dictates of the reactive mind. Early in the case, auditing the PC is like auditing the light bulb to fix the generators in the power plant. The E-meter helps you locate all the parts in the generator.

If the PC is left with a withhold in session, he'll ARC break half an hour later. What you're trying to do is to keep the PC from being fooled about himself. If you avoid the reactive mind, you're just doing a Q and A with the PC.

6106C12 SHSpec-12 E-meter Actions, Errors in Auditing

The E-meter only reacts on those things that the PC is aware of or capable of becoming responsible for. This responsibility factor becomes a reality factor, so you can audit what appears on the meter. Things that don't appear are beyond the PC's zone of responsibility. Getting new reads on sec checks is thus a test of the PC's advance in responsibility. If no change, there is some gross outness countering the auditing. Don't get trapped by all the little minor errors. These gross efforts come from the impulse to make nothing out of something, which goes back to productivity. The effort to produce is one half of the dichotomy. All strikes are on the other half: the effort not to produce. Many people are dedicated to non-production -- no-survival. This comes about as a reaction to a stuck flow on "Must Survive" Many operations would go better if just left alone. Today's "planned balanced economies", reminiscent of Markab, which specialized in this, generally result in unbalanced messed up economics. Produce and Non-Produce should be on the Secondary Prehav scale. The goal could also be "No Results".

Here we are talking about continually recurring gross errors, not just occasional errors. Anyone will do that. Don't attempt total perfection or you'll never complete or accomplish anything. People get so tense about doing it right that they'll never get anything done. A good exercise to cure perfectionism is to deliberately decide something is finished without the finishing touches. When you can do perfect TR's, metering, etc., you can relax and just audit with no anxiety communicating to the PC. You must exude confidence in order to give people hope, which is a fundamental necessity to making someone well or better. Mainly, it has to appear that you are trying to do something for the PC, not that you are trying to be perfect.

Using instant reads, one gets at all the held down fives in the bank; using latent reads, one is handling all the PC's concerns about why the fives were held down. This is a longer road to clear.

6106C13 SHSpec-13 Seminar -- Q and A Period

There are people with stuck valence serenity who aren't clear, like the Buddhist definition -- no effect types. Clears are in fact responsive and active, volatile, alive, responsible and not that-all serene. They want things to happen and make them happen.

Note that there is no single button one shot thought process which produces a clear. The fellow has to walk out of the labyrinth the same way he got in, which is by overwhelming and being overwhelmed. Scientology is the first mechanism which allows someone to erase the effects of having overwhelmed others. If there were any such one-shot process, LRH would have found it, but the fact that flows exist defeats the single button. People have thought that "What would you be pleased to accept?" would be a clearing process. It's been run to its ragged bottom in 1954, but didn't clear anyone. The flows at least would stick. It could produce a rapid result for a few minutes. Another rapid result-getter is "Look around here and find something you could go out of ARC with." It makes him feel great for awhile, then spins him. You could find a button for every cult. They're formed on a monomania on a single button, and if you make a reverse process on that button, you could make that kind of person out of the PC. You find what the button is that a _____ would be monomaniac about and run it as out of ARC with a stuck flow and the guy will become that _____ . [Cf. EST processing.] This has been done on the whole track. Universities do it. For instance, they tell engineering students that engineers aren't wanted anymore; then the student will try very hard to be a good engineer to be wanted. In churches they use the blasphemy button to make people feel unsafe communicating with God. This makes them religious fanatics. You can restimulate whole track fixations selectively and produce momentary resurgences in certain goals directions.

When a person can no longer be a beingness, he may introvert into and permanently permeate some object or familiar thing around the old beingness. (E.g. a headsman gets hanged, then becomes the headsman's axe) On a case that has trouble with SOP Goals, trouble finding a terminal, be sure the listing question is "Who or what..." to include 5th and 6th dynamic terminals.

Repeater technique is repeated inspection.

6106C14 SHSpec-14 Seminar: Withholds

You don't destroy records when you are pulling withholds, and you don't agree with the PC to do this. If you do, it is as much as if you were telling him you'll withhold for him, and he won't get much gain.

The only liability to getting the PC to where he can't be influenced by the reactive mind is that, in a sense, you are auditing him towards a state of no-effect: total serenity, total no-effect, the way the Lamaist did it. The individual must be able to experience to live. It is possible to plough someone in on a level and make them look good, but not clear. This is education by fixation [see p. 37]. One should be able to do anything on the Prehav scale. Repairing his ethics will eradicate his impulse to do hasty things and get action on a rational basis, as a result of inspection, not based on inhibition. This is a new thing on earth in human behavior.
There's nothing wrong, in theory, with native state processing, as practiced in 1957 and 1958 -- knowingness deteriorating by postulate to not-know, to must know, to can't know (forget), to remember. This processing was too simple and of too much generality to be functional. An OT

process, "Tell me an intention that failed," "Tell me an intention that succeeded," would be a one-button clear process if that could be run (since it's Axiom 10, Factor 2). But it's too simple to plumb the reactive mind with. A certain level of complexity is necessary to resolve cases. The worse off a person is, or the clearer they are, the more you need to run the secondary scale (greater complexity). How many buttons are there? There are all the beingnesses ever, all the doingnesses ever, all the things anyone ever had or could have. You can't force a person to grasp reactively things which are analytically obvious because it's reactive and nutty. A process must have some complexity to be effective at a reactive level and some simplicity to make it easy to administer.

If one invalidates the basic agreements and identifications of the MEST universe, MEST changes characteristics. For instance, if you stop agreeing that water runs downhill, and challenge that, it'll go all gelatinous and globby.

A security check is running all the not-know off the case that it has run on everyone and everything for God knows how long. You are actually running the native state cycle of sequences, not withholds at all. Overts consist of putting not-knows into the third dynamic. For instance, someone robs a store: the storekeeper comes in and doesn't know who did it or when, or when it might happen again. [Also not-knowing where the stuff is that was taken.] Then the storekeeper runs the not-know on the police. Now the area has a not-know that accumulates in the society, until people can't trust each other and can't produce and the society is aberrated. Someone feels better when he gets off the overt of creating ignorance. Eventually he'll realize that this overt worried people. That's another overt. Then, eventually, he cognites on the not-know overt, and he'll notice his memory improving, his IQ going up, as he runs out overts of making people not-know (or be stupid, in other words). Sometimes a case will recover totally by getting off one big overt. Auditors don't effectively run Presession ("What question shouldn't I ask you?", etc. See HCOB 15Dec60) because they aren't imaginative enough about all the evil in the world. It also requires the auditor to create not-knows about the PC. It works better to give the auditor a list of mean, nasty, vicious not-knows someone might have run on the world. This doesn't run a not-know on the auditor. This is the sec check. Different sec checks should be devised for different routines. Routine three cases need whole-track lists, otherwise, their whole track memory will get occluded. Whole track memory depends on some kind of whole track sec check. This also answers the question of why PC's feel better after giving up same withholds but not others. And what is a withhold? It's running a don't know or can't know on self or others. When the overt is on someone else, it gives a big resurge when it comes off.

Messing up time [by lying?] is a different breed of cat. It's creating, for one thing. All of life is an invented episode. Writing fiction is done with the intention to amuse and inform. The only not-know in it is to keep the reader from knowing the end before he gets there. The only aberrating thing about it, for the writer, is that it's a creative effort, which can wind someone up in the soup [Cf. the effect on some people of Step six.] If you tell a lie to obscure your own guilt, that's another not-know or false knowingness, which eventually makes the person feel that all life is a pretense [Cf. the sociopath.]. Auditing then becomes just a literary criticism of life, as a romantic episode.

6106C15 SHSpec-15X Not-Know

There's a mechanical side and a thought side of boil-off. one is prone to worry when the PC boils off, but it is only a matter of concern if the auditor ceases to audit because of it. The mechanical definition of boil-off is a stuck flow. A lot of stuck flows got parked on the track, and when the PC hits them, he boils off. Most of the time, when the PC goes unconscious, if you kept giving the auditing command, the PC would keep on doing it at about the same speed or a bit slower as when he was awake, because the PC isn't really unconscious. If he didn't hear you, there's no harm done -- it s not an implant situation. He comes right through it. The thought definition of boil off is that it is the accumulated not-know the PC has run on everybody. Unconsciousness is merely the intensification of not-knowingness. (You could even run a not-know in the course of being "kind" by not telling people that they're upsetting or bugging people. They will make enemies who eventually hit them, surprising them because no one told them they were messing people up.) Immanuel Kant introduced not-know into philosophy with his transcendentalism. This killed philosophy until scientology came around. The Greek philosophies amounted to this: if you couldn't lick them, confuse them with entertainment and philosophy. This out-creation with philosophy and entertainment was a very effective means of conquest. Many philosophies have been mere dramatizations of Prehav levels, relying for their force on bank agreement. By observing what people underline in books you can see that what people go for is what agrees with their banks.

One gets into this frame of mind as a result of thinking, "Truth is merely subjective; there is no broad truth." This is the philosophy of the only one [solipsism] . Also General Semantics. Then there's Dale Carnegie's "1.1-ism", which tries to communicate with an unreality. They run a not-know on people by being nice, and the people sense it, too. Where a reality is not present, a not-know is substituted for it. An unreality is created whenever you substitute an unknown for a known. Communism does this well with the iron curtain. Or take someone who always says, "I'm fine," when you ask, "How are you?" They're substituting a non-fact for an observable fact, giving you an unreality that eventually makes then disappear. Curious phenomena will occur around someone who is doing this: they eventually do disappear. But if there's a terrific not-know about someone, he persists like mad. For instance, the monk, Dharma, who lived 10,000 years ago in India formed the basis for most Indian religions, but nothing is known about him or what he said. The least-known philosopher is someone whose name we don't even know. He's influential in the background of Lao-tse, Confucius, and Buddha. He is held in place by the not-know. This is Dharma, who is not even thought of now as a person, but as fate.

On a personal level, not-know shows up as boil-off. An extreme manifestation is unconsciousness; at a lesser level, it's death. Not-know, at its most extreme, is when a person cannot go unconscious. We call that insanity. Death is a state of beingness, not an action. Unconsciousness is lower, well below death. One can get knocked off and go on knowing what is happening. Insanity is where a person cannot not-know the fifteenth substitute for reality -- a delusory state. They worry about these things laying in wait for them. They're in a state of combat with the unknowable. This can go on the tone scale, on a level of not-know, from serenity about the unknowable on down. They may seem fairly sane at the top, but they don't know what it is they don't know about and are looking for. They get down to grief about not having found out what it is they don't know about. The guy will also be utterly fixed on the track. If you know what you are unhappy or bugged about, you are not insane. Merely wondering -- the fact that you can wonder why -- demonstrates that you are not insane. Knowing this, one won't be baffled about insanity, for bafflement is just a Q and A with not-knowingness. The reason one gets worried about the insane case is a Q and A of trying to find out what the case doesn't know. What he doesn't know is a not-know. If you can speculate about what you don't know, you will be OK. You can introduce some sanity into someone who is spinning by getting him to think of one person who doesn't think he is insane, because you have introduced a knowingness into his unknowingness. Or you could use one command, "Look around here and find something which is really real to you."

6106C16 SHSpec-16X Confront and Havingness

Havingness gets eaten up by valences and consumption circuits until the PC is clear, or nearly so. Then it orients him and stays with him stably. As long as he has a dominant valence or dominant machinery, havingness gets eaten up. Any gain it gives is in ten to twelve commands. Any more than that is a waste of time. ARC straightwire does a lot [for havingness] at first also. Havingness works by shifting attention but doesn't as-is the bank's masses; it just moves them around.

[Details on running Routines One and Two, and havingness and confront processes.]

If a case with a lot of auditing hasn't had significant change, the policy is that, regardless of graph, meter read, or anyone's opinion, you run Routine One [CCH's and sec checks]. This is the most rapid way to make the case change. It's just the effective thing to do. This prevents you from making a mistake on the case. The only reason someone gets upset about being run on CCH's is that pride enters into processing, which is in itself a sign of some nuttiness.

6106C19 SHSpec-15 Q and A Period: Auditing Slowdowns

Test for a release: The person should not be reading weirdly on a meter; the sensitivity knob should be down -- you should get a good drop with sensitivity zero. You should get no reaction on the questions, "Do you think you'll get any worse? Does scientology work for you? How do you feel about help? How do you feel about control?"
Every time you find something in the PC struggling for survival, it isn't the PC, because he can't do anything but survive. It's a valence. Every valence fights for survival. It can be such a clever valence that it can fool the auditor. The Auditor's Code is there so the valence won't feel challenged,

so it won't kick back before you can jump it. The PC gets most upset by the auditor's failure to handle his case. The valence says, "See the red herring?" If the auditor complies, the PC will get unmanageable because he's lost confidence in the auditor's control. The auditor needn't apologize for positive, certain control. That's how to make valences lose and PC's win. Kindness validates valences, not PCs. Valences aren't hard to handle if you are certain and let it come across. Auditing weakly gives power to the PC's circuits and valences; auditing with certainty validates the PC.

Instant read is within a tenth of a second.

[The "death of the Ego" is the death of the valence.]

6106C20 SHSpec-16 Sec Check Questions. Mutual Rudiments

The perfect answer to any question is the exact question. When it is correctly asked, it is answered. Say you are trying to lay out serving equipment in a hotel kitchen. When you finally spot exactly what you're doing, you perceive that you are not arranging machinery but trying to accomplish some exact result, like trying to get food from A to B. In asking the person who's going to use it what he needs, you are getting a more precise phrasing of the real question you wanted to ask. When you have all the data to define the exact question, you will have the answer.

The borderline between the Reactive Mind and the analytical mind is the broad Savannah of "I don't know." Things get foggy on it; the PC knows something is there, but sees nothing very clearly. The auditor's action in compartmenting and clarifying the question helps to pinpoint the source of fog for the PC. [The exact answer to a problem is the exact problem, when correctly phrased, or as-ised. This is why a repetitive look at a problem and rephrasing of it will cause a resolution.]

We have made a recent discovery of magnitude. We've known that co-audit teams tended to make less progress than HGC Auditing, but not why. The answer is now known. The first clue was the D of P's finding auditors' ruds on PC's out even when the auditor found them in. It turns out that the ruds weren't out with the auditor.

It was mutual ruds of the team that were out with others but not the team. For instance, the pair agree the PC's family are swine, so it won't read on ruds, but someone else who isn't in on the agreement will find the PC's out ruds. The meter registers on disagreements. One way to solve it is Formula 13 [failed help and O/W on terminals, alternated. See HCOB 1Dec60.], cleaning up all the people who read, or on ruds, substituting "we" for "you". Even CCH's can do it.

6106C21 SHSpec-17 Seminar at Saint Hill

[Details on running Prehav 13. It's a process which combines overt running with prehav assessment and running of brackets, relative to a list of charged terminals]

At upper level strata, beingness is higher than doingness, and doingness is higher than havingness.

To do a can squeeze, get hands relaxedly in your lap, then squeeze them gently with the hand itself, not clear on up to the shoulders.

6106C22 SHSpec-18 Running CCH's

The way the CCH's are run is 1, 2, 3, 4 over and over and over. It is a breach of the auditor's code, clause 13, to run a process beyond the point where it is producing change or to stop running one which is producing change. The words in the process have very little to do with the process; they're run with meat and motion. They are all done by compulsion if necessary. The PC never has an opportunity not to execute the command. The consequences of letting a PC out of doing the command are grave. The CCH's run out surgery, shock, etc., as the PC dramatizes. You should run the process flat, which means the PC has the same aspect for twenty minutes, no matter what the aspect

is, and no matter how nutty or unconscious (as long as the PC is doing the command). Change means such things as somatics, etc. It may be necessary to run CCH's for a few hours before they bite. You don't pay attention to what the PC says; it's what he does, though if he communicates to you that something is happening, that's a change. Running CCH's permissively will also screw up the PC; you must apply control to get communication and communication to get control. Irresponsibility denies havingness, so sec checks also raise havingness. All O/W running, since it raises responsibility, results in havingness. "Prehav" really means "prevent havingness" scale. It consists of those things that prevent havingness. This is gotten off in Routine 2 [see p. 34 or HCOB 5Jun61]: the fixed reactive buttons that prevent the PC from having things are gotten out of the road. On Routine 3, the PC gets out of the road all those unrealized goals, each of which has been a defeat, hence a denial of havingness. So havingness is the end product of all this.

O/W raises havingness because the individual individuates from things because he can't have them. So he develops overts only on those things he can't have. So when you get the overts off, he can have. If you could have the whole universe, it gives you no trouble. It's only the things you can't have that you have trouble with. Next time you have a PTP, see what's in it and what prevents you from having them. Individuation from the thing, the dynamic, the universe, is what brings trouble, because you get into an obsessive games condition, which adds up to -- you can't have it and it can't have anything to do with you.

The CCH's knock out individuation from the physical beingness which has been caused from the PC to his body and (apparently) his body to him. That's why they run out electric shocks, etc. And you have to let him take more responsibility or he won't improve his havingness. You have to maintain control, or you'll show him the body can't be controlled, so it can continue to overwhelm the PC. Also, the PC will become practically unauditable. Misguided kindness is all that could let you allow the PC to control the session. It's actually a vicious thing to do. Even if the PC is right in his advice, don't follow it. He'll gain more from being run wrong, but under your control, than right under his own. If you're going to err, err on the side of control and toughness, not sweetness and light. It's better to end the process wrongly on the auditor's determinism than to end it rightly on the PC's. If you let the PC take control, you're very liable to get an ARC break a half hour later. You may not notice that it's because you lost control, because of the lag. But the way to handle it is to spot the point where you lost control and reassert it. If the auditor is in control of the session, auditing takes place; if the auditor is not in control of the session, reactivity takes place. If you flinch from auditing, it's from those times when you didn't control the session and came under attack as a result.

6106C23 SHSpec-19 Q and A Period; CCH's; Auditing

Many people don't see objects -- they've been looking at facsimiles of the objects. When the facsimile as-ises, the wall looks bright. Such people tend to have bad depth perception because they never see anything. They are easily invalidated because the reason he's making and looking at facsimiles is that the physical universe isn't safe for him. The auditor begins to be real as the PC sees that he can duplicate him, so if the auditor indicates [e.g. on CCH's 3 or 4] "You didn't do it," the auditor ceases to be real, and the PC will put pictures of him up instead. Overrunning the process tells the PC that he was wrong to think he'd got it. This makes auditing unsafe. The purpose of the CCH's is to make the auditor, the physical universe, and present time real to the PC, to show him he can observe the auditor, the room, And PT. His havingness on other-determinism is very low. The CCH's remedy it; he sees somebody else exists and the universe is here. You can run CCH's wrong by making the PC aware that the auditor and the room are real but dangerous. When running a child, take account of the child's shorter attention span. If it's biting, run it at least an hour before you'd expect it to flatten.

Exteriorization, as done in 1952-5 was unstable. LRH found that before a thetan could get along without a body, he had to be able to have a body, and people who exteriorize easily generally want nothing to do with one.

Philosophies that strive for peace are a covert operation towards making people succumb. Spots of sudden change of pace are spots which brake a person's life. They've got upsets in them and advice to take it easy, and from then on, it goes wrong. They were asked to confront motionlessness, which is most difficult to do. Medicine and psychiatry gave drugs, etc., to make a person be quiet. Unless a person can confront motion, he's dead; he can't confront life, can't work, and will become a criminal. The natural consequence of adopting a motionless philosophy is to get religion -- a peaceful one. If you enforce no-motion on someone and make him think motion is bad, he'll get Buddhistic. Road

safety campaigns make no sense because they emphasize going slowly, less motion, not keeping unsafe drivers off the roads or putting freight on trains. The more you make a population motionless, the higher the crime rate. T.V. corrupts the youth because it pins a child motionless, not because of the T.V. material.

The theory that people get seasick because of motion led LRH to think one should have pictures of very still scenes to counteract this. He chose some, thought about it, and started to feel seasick. He realized that what's needed is pictures of motion to accustom them to motion, not motionlessness. The cure for motion is motion, not stillness. Philosophies of motion don't necessarily mean no criminality -- e.g. space opera. If you could keep it up with no rest, you might manage to be OK. When you become incapable of handling the motion of life, you can then start to experience pain. The experience of pain comes about because of intolerance of motion. You can run motion or no-motion to handle this situation. Predictable motion is better, from the PC's viewpoint, than unpredictable motion, because with unpredictable motion, he doesn't know what to confront. When he gets the idea that it's bad not to be able to confront everything at once, he starts to butter all over the universe, stick on the track, etc.

Also, whenever a person gets hit hard by life, or as soon as he begins a program to coerce people into working harder, that person will obsessively start producing. Production follows defeat (as in Germany, Japan, etc.). Someone who's been defeated will produce more bank than someone who's doing well. So in eradicating, on the one hand, a person's intolerance of motion and, on the other hand, his failures or defeats, you are causing his bank to disappear. [The first can be done by CCH's], the second, by goals running. Everything becomes a cure for past failures; every goal is a consequence of not having done.

We don't erase the bank; the person gets accustomed to not needing one. The person himself takes over the automaticities of beingness (identities), doingness (creation), and havingness. Most havingness is the result of a defeat and the whole cure sequence, where nearly everything in the universe is a cure for past failures. Every goal also is the result of not having done. So we get intolerance of motion, feelings of defeat, ability to have without having defeated anything. If you can remedy those things for someone, you've produced a new being, who is not the same as an old being who's never had the experience. His knowingness of what's happened doesn't leave him, but his knowledge of the consequences of what he's done lets him emerge as a veteran of campaigns unscarred by his battles -- tough and capable. That which strips all games from the universe would normally result in motionlessness. But how about ending certain games for somebody who doesn't have the consequence of ending in motionlessness? You've broadened the person's view of games he can play. This gives him more games, not less. Play is delusory motion, about which you're not supposed to be serious, so you're not supposed to as-is it. So a person gets trapped in it because it's not real. Play is a dishonest doingness; work is not a serious activity. A person can work at a sport and have fun as his job. Also, if you don't just do what you are doing but put an "I should be doing something else" in, you'll stick in it. If one just did what he did when he did it, he wouldn't get stuck in it. Morality is a now-I'm-supposed-to which makes people not willing to do what they're doing when they do wrong, so they never as-is their wrong acts, so they continue to do them.

It's a certainty, then, that one gets a persistence of the things he doesn't want, or a tanglement of the things he does want. Then he wonders why he feels odd. So auditing is straightening someone out so he has tolerance for motion and motionlessness and can have what he should have, or not, as the case might be, as he wishes. To do that, you have to erase all the oddities of doingness, all the pain and boredom of motion or no-motion.

The Prehav scale disentangles all the doingnesses. But if you make the PC intolerant of motion or be motionless when he can't, or give him failures in auditing, or don't make it duplicative so he can't have, then you reverse the process.

Goals are, to a large extent, a "do something else" or a "Now-I'm-supposed-to". If the individual isn't doing anything, he simply isn't doing anything. There should be no "Now-I'm-supposed-to" superimposed upon the situation.

6106C26 SHSpec-20 Dealing with Attacks on Scientology

Scientology doesn't have an Achilles heel, so it's in a good position to defend itself. People do get upset when confronted with a new idea, but new theories get accepted fairly quickly, e.g. Harvey on blood circulation, Socrates on the nature of man. Proponents of new theories don't necessarily get martyred. The ones that do generally are getting motivators for their overts as tyrants. Also, if one continually fails to advance an idea, one may get suicidal and die for it, e.g. Christ (and Socrates). LRH believes in making an idea effective, not to fail at it and make everybody feel guilty because they kill you. It's not necessary to sacrifice oneself for a new idea. That's just a way to protect old ideas. Man is a great believer in no-change, while he obsessively changes everything. So new ideas are rejected. Scientology is over the top, but it is still being fought, because to the degree that one is right, to that degree he is dangerous. We threaten to upset a lot of beliefs and customs. It's only safe for us to do it because we can undo what we do. For instance, we can run out bad auditing.

The reason there is a question on sec checks about overts on LRH is that, if one had a lot of overts on Ron and scientology, one could acquire a forceful, overwhelming valence called scientology. So this is the first time anyone has said, "Try it and see." In the early days, people said we should go big on aesthetics. LRH said no. You can always overwhelm a thetan with aesthetics, but it's not desirable to overwhelm a thetan. If it's true far you, it's true, not because we've overwhelmed you. We're attacked because we have no evil motives. People get frantic because they can't figure out, "What's the Ditch?" If you can make a thetan commit overts against you or set him up where he can commit the overts and remove any possibility of running the overts, you can overwhelm him and get him so stamped dawn with a valence that he can't even wiggle. [In other words, you set a person up where he can't receive an overt from you (you won't commit one), and on the other hand, you set him up where he can commit overts on you and cannot get them run out, then you've done him in good and proper.] Former efforts at this were entrapments. It isn't really an effort towards total freedom either, since it allows for games. Man becomes alarmed at the fact of there being this selfless philosophy that doesn't demand that one become subjugated and enslaved by it, and that it doesn't say that the originator of it must be carried on an imperishable valence that everyone should bow down to.

When attacked all one needs to do is to take effective actions, not get frantic. Just keep up effective pressure, investigate loudly, and don't feel rushed about it, let it coast. When people are in terror, they make mistakes. So let them make the mistakes. For instance, a man called Ettleman had been hired by the AMA and the APA to attack scientology. In this case, which went on for three years, when it finally came to trial, his attorney didn't show, so the case was dismissed. All that can be Zone to an organization or a person is to harass them to the point where they're too worried to do their job. So keep the reaction to attack to the minimal effective actions. Don't waste time, and keep the show on the road. The more you worry about the attacks, the more motion you waste and the less scientology you get done. So all the enemy can do is to get negative gain by reducing your effect. See if it's your game before playing it.

(Nothing wastes as much time as the law, because the law has overts against time.)

If no one anywhere fought scientology, it would be as nothing, unimportant. Think of all the philosophies that must have been developed in the past eleven years. None of them have been fought. A sure sign that we have ignorance and aberration on the run is that there are attacks and fights. [The process is biting.] Start worrying when there are no more attacks. Also note that our comm lines are far more rapid and effective than the enemy's, and must be kept up. This alone discourages the enemy.

6106C27 SHSpec-21 CCH's -- Circuits

The way to bust up machinery on CCH-1 is to vary the pace. He'll jump the command if a machine is doing it.

One effect of the CCH's is to help the PC find the auditor. If he goes on automatic, he doesn't have an auditor. Just running the CCH's will run it out; varying one's pace will prevent it from starting.

If you just use intention on the PC and no verbal commands, your intention may be good, but the PC's command circuits may be goofed up, and you may not get the response you expected. He may not be hooked up the way he should. You can have fun with a meter talking to the entities in a body. You could start talking to the PC's circuit, but it hooks in harder and harder. It hooks in on a drop of

havingness, and you are making a comm line talk across to his circuit. You're validating the circuit and lowering [the PC's] havingness.

If the PC has a problem and you try to run, "Think of a solution," repetitively, the PC caves in. You are running off the core of an Area of motion, leaving the motion on automatic. The PC is not confronting the actuality of the thing; he's not confronting what's going on at all; he's confronting a solution to it. That is, he's trying to not-is what it is, and the problem mass moves in on him. If you get him to spot the mass connected with the problem, then describe the problem, then spot the mass, it moves further away. If you get him to think of solutions, the mass will move in. Problems of comparable magnitude will also move the problem out. This occurs because of confront. If the PC avoids it, it moves in. You can also move the mass out with havingness. A solution is a stable, no-motion datum amidst a confusion.

Circuits can be used to get data, to verify answers to calculations, confirm if they are right or wrong, or to give you tomorrow's weather. The latter takes the increment of time that is tomorrow and inspects it. This is possible if you can look with equanimity at tomorrow, at least its insignificant aspects. You can predict to the degree that you can confront. People who can't confront PT obsessively try to confront tomorrow or yesterday, but it's not a real tomorrow, and probably not a real yesterday either. The way you go nuts on circuits is to ask yourself, "Who put that there?" or "Who else put that there and what does it mean?" This gives you a mystery. PC's who don't control their circuits and haven't inspected them for many years or eons have things popping up all the time when you audit them. Some get auditing answers from their circuits. The circuits were put up as a substitute for confronting and are so old and forgotten that now nothing about them is confronted. When the PC nears one of them, it tells him what to do or say. Since a circuit is just a no-confront, running havingness and confront improves circuits. The PC may have originally put a circuit there for convenience and then come to believe that it was unconfrontable because there was a circuit there.

You could say to the PC, "We're going to handle your primary aberration, so make a picture of it and look at it. Tell me what you see." You'd get amazing answers. The action of taking a picture of it, then looking is, of course, an alter-is of confront. In auditing, you want people to look directly at things. Circuits encourage them not to because they think they can't confront something. As you audit a PC, these things go live. As havingness drops, the PC gets anxious, keys in circuits to predict, or confront drops. Or, as the PC improves, and circuits can be activated as the PC comes up through them. So everything goes on a via. Auditing walks him up to less and less vias; more and more confidence. The reason confront isn't on the prehav scale is that it isn't a doingness; it's an ability. [Cf p. 22, where confront is described as an action.] [Also Cf. p. 40, where confront is defined as subjective havingness, or at least the process is defined as a subjective havingness process.]

That explains oddities you get running CCH's. You're activating and knocking out circuits because direct control and communication brings about continuous shift of circuitry in terms of havingness. Then, since he's been gotten to PT, confronting the auditor, this brings his havingness up. If you talked to those circuits, they might well say anything, which is also true of the PC on CCH's. So the less attention you Day to what the PC is saying or thinking, the better. Dope off and comm lag indicate things happening to the PC's confront and havingness.

Circuits go haywire when they contain the postulate that the thetan is unable to confront. Apart from that, they can be useful.

6106C28 SHSpec-22 Raw Meat -- Troubleshooting Cases

[Details on handling raw meat cases -- tests, etc.]

If a PC has persistent out ruds, check for continuous PT overts, at least at the level of unkind thoughts on automatic. This is very common. You can handle this with Prehav 13.

6106C29 SHSpec-23 Wrong Target -- Sec Check

Herbie Parkhouse telexes from London: Auditors aren't getting sec checks done because it takes two to three hours to get ruds in. He wants to scrap model session for processing checks. This is an unusual solution. People are now in the same position about auditing that Ron was in when he started

researching life. There's been so much alter-is and counter-create, the truth is obscured. Naturally in relaying comm about the simplicities of life, these things get restimulated and people start looking around corners, when the cop is right on the sidewalk. There is no secret about life; it is just surrounded by alter-is and obfuscation's.

People aren't doing their jobs because they are so busy doing other things. For instance, government is so busy doing the work or charitable organizations that it has no time to administer justice, protect citizens from criminals, etc. In a good government, production rises, people prosper; a welfare state government attacks producers with taxes. It's all off post. Everything is trying to make you wear its hat. So in scientology, the person who is on the ground observes. Parkhouse, by not observing, caused Ron to interiorize into his hat.

The analytical mind isn't really a computing machine; it is the PC. When he, or the analytical mind, is attacked by the auditor, you'll get no auditing done. Your target in the reactive mind. This is why LRH can do in 5 hours what it took other auditors 25 hours to do. The difference isn't that LRH is good and others are lousy; it is that the other auditors' reactive minds were apparently choosing the PC as their randomity, attacking the PC because he was aberrated. No. The target is the reactive mind.

You sit down; you take the E-meter; you say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" What you really want is for him to recall, ventilate, air the reactive mind. You shouldn't assume he already knows and purposely won't tell you. When you do a sec check, because of the specific question he remembers it and will ordinarily tell you. If you get heavy reads and he say's, "No," have him keep looking; let him know there's something there, but maintain ARC. The proper attitude is, "You couldn't possibly remember this and not tell me. Let's just get the show on the road." When they look hunted, use a light touch to get them to tell you. If you're suspicious and accusative, you're cutting comm with the PC and encouraging him to withhold. Assume that if he remembers it, he'll tell it at once. It puts him in session that way. The meter check is "just to make sure we got all of it." It's up to the auditor to create an atmosphere of communication. You can use some dunnage to do it. This approach gets the PC comfortable, relaxed, confident. His knowingness comes up; he gets relief. After all, you are the auditor, not the E-meter. The guy gets to where he feels safe. His anxieties come from feeling unsafe in life, so your attitude alone can produce a great change in the PC. If you're using the meter and he says, "No," you don't assume he knows and won't tell you, but that he hasn't overwhumped the reactive mind. You're disappointed, but you assume he can remember. This builds his confidence and gets him in a hopeful frame of mind. doing it this way speeds it up enormously; gives faster gains. It's not that he's getting more confident in you. It's that he's getting more confident in his ability to overwhump his bank. You get far more off the case, faster, by this method. You'll slow it down by making sure he won't want to tell you and has to be trapped and beaten into telling you. Don't ever assume a games condition in auditing. This will also keep the rudiments in, since ruds go out with rough auditing. Set yourself up as someone who can be confided in, rather than as a cop sniffing out the crime.

Never assume a games condition (in auditing or not) if you don't want one.

6106C30 SHSpec-24 Training on TR's; Talk on Auditing

[Details on running TR's, CCH's, and Prehav 13, and Routine 2]

6107C03 SHSpec-26X Routine 1A -- Problems

Routine 1A is problems processing alternated with sec checks. It is to handle cases that are too tied up with out ruds to run CCH's.

What is it that makes a problem so deadly in processing? A problem is postulate-counter-postulate, an indecisional proposition because the two sides are in balance. One can hardly confront the two data at once; the PC doesn't see the amount of confusion on it, and the confusion mounts up around each side of it. Thus you get two separate zones of confusion, each side with its stable datum, because each side has a yes and no about it. So you don't as-is the problem and it persists. That's its most basic characteristic. People get impatient with problems, so they solve them. But a problem solved has been not-ised, not as-ised. The solution of a problem is, of course, an overt against a problem.

Everything in the universe is a cure for something else -- a solution. This is one reason the universe persists. Cures deteriorate and solutions become new problems. Alcohol, a century ago, was curing things. Even diseases once cured something. [Cf. sickle cell disease.] The bacteria that caused disease once cured something. Take an organization that is hammer and tongs on the subject of creativeness: the Catholic Church. They have the hatchet out on the 2D; they don't think creation should be done that can be prevented. They oppose VD campaigns because they think VD is a good thing, as a cure for sex. If you get VD, sex stops; so if sex stops, you get VD. No sex = VD because VD = No sex. Prostitution is also a no-sex proposition, so it gives a no-sex disease. Sex is a cure for no bodies, and no bodies is a cure for sex. You don't get a PC whose idea is, "Horses sleep in bed," who wasn't curing something with that idea. Every aberration he's got was a cure for something. His motionlessness is a cure for having killed so many people. If you pick up withholds on killing, he will be able to move again. Killing, too, was a cure for something -- maybe for hating people. Hate, in its turn, was a cure for associating with people whom you might damage. And Damaging people was a cure for people being people, etc. An aberration is a cure that doesn't cure, that you don't understand.

This all goes back to confusion's and stable data. If you have two confusion's and two stable data opposed to each other, which you don't confront, you get an endurance, because you never as-is the thing; you solve it. PC's who go through vias continually on an auditing command have some problem they've never looked at as a problem. When you run problems of comparable magnitude, you've taken the via of curing the problem off automatic and sneakily gotten the PC to take a look at the problem. Certain conditions that are designed to cure other conditions actually create them. E.g. a snake's venom makes a snake antipathetic, and snakes have venom because people (and other animals) don't like them.

The willingness to solve problems but not to as-is them is the basis for Q and A. People don't like getting the question fully duplicated as the answer. This is because they are trying to solve some very fundamental confusion they have. An effective method of teaching is to try to find the source of the question.

If you try to cure confusion, it continues. Duress and punishment are the results of despairing of solving someone's problems. Jails [and mental hospitals] are the cure for confusion's about people. This seems awfully drastic, but it is born out of despair. The effect of jails is to merely educate criminals more into hating people.

There is a way to make a correct and frontal attack on these confusion's. They often stem from withholds, so a Joburg will help. You may note that a PC may look a bit confused as he tries to find the problem he was solving. A problem, remember, is a multiple confusion. There are two solutions or ideas involved, each with its own confusion -- an encysted confusion. So one tries to back off from it, which only pulls the problem along. This is why thinking of a solution makes the problem mass move in. You can't really escape your own ideas.

Thought mass is basically composed of problems. It endures because it's not confronted. Given enough of this, the PC will be overwhelmed, and will dramatize being a problem, one which is insoluble. So you keep worrying about the PC because the PC is a problem. A PC who says he has had no gain is saying, "I'm a problem -- Solve me!" Your chances of doing it are poor. He's got two confusion's And can't confront either. PCs whose needles keep rising are not-confronting a problem. You ask, "How are you doing?" The PC says, "Fine." The needle rises. You ask, "What happened?" The PC says, "Nothing." It's discouraging. They can't tell you what it is because they can't confront it. CCH's will saw through this, but slowly.

A slow-gain case is heavy on comm lag, or not quite on the subject when he's talking. The comm lag stems from no-confront; so does the alter-is, which is a dissociation from the confusion. You ask the PC if he's got a problem. He gets upset because he can't confront it and knows he can't, and he wants to avoid it altogether.

Phenomena observed in the field stem from problems, on a no-confront or inverted basis. In fields of stress or duress, religious cults make their finest harvest. They offer an escape from problems. The reason Alcoholics Anonymous doesn't cooperate with scientology is that they have (for their very existence) a contrary datum: "Alcoholism can't be cured." You can't do anything about it, so you might as well join A.A.

48

No matter where you go, you can never get away from yourself. If you try to pretend you are not where you are, you get a dispersal of location; you'll be buttered all aver the universe. The guy who permeates everything without being anywhere is trying to escape his problems, which all carry a no-confront. You put motion and action into a thought process, and they become inextricably tangled up, inextricably, that is, short of scientology processing.

All this is a prelude to a very simple killer process, for the PC for whom all life is a problem. The difficulty for the PC is a series of ridged problems. The ridges people have trouble with surrender on this one command, which is horrendous to run because it moves very slowly at first and turns on fierce somatics: "Recall a problem." You must be very careful to get the question answered on "Recall a problem"; you should ask, "What problem was that?" and make sure he is not giving you a generality instead of a specific problem. The PC will come up with some interesting solutions, which will suddenly turn awful. He'll discover he's been both sides of various conflicts, each side to solve losing on the other. If the PC does a locational on some object he's used to solve a problem of boredom, he'll come uptone to interest. This is another reason touch assists work. (More details on running Routine 1A).

6107C04 SHSpec-27X Problems and Solutions

Only LRH could get a simplicity on auditing problems. Usually when one tries to look at them, he just gets confused. The only mistake psychiatry made about psychosis was to try to understand it, since it's basically incomprehensible -- that's its whale character. Then they have to use heroic measures, which fail and leave them no place to turn. The common denominator of psychosis is problems, of course. When the problems can't be associated with the solutions any longer, you get solutions to no-problems, which is psychosis. When a psychosis has been objectively described, there's a missing datum: what problems is this behavior a solution to? [Cf. R.D. Laing and J. Haley] The lack of this datum makes the psychosis incomprehensible. You cannot cure A psychosis by addressing the psychosis, or, more generally, you can't cure an aberration by addressing the aberration. This is because in so doing, you are running the still in the middle of the motion, the stable datum in the middle of the confusion, the solution. You're trying to cure the solution and not looking at the confusion. You are looking at the cure, which won't move out unless you get the motion off it. The whirlpool wouldn't whirl without the motionless center, but the center is motionless only because it has motion around it. You should take the whirlpool off the motionless piece, not the other way around. Here you have confusion and the stable datum, motion and no motion, sound and silence, absolute location and change. If you try to get the motionless points out, all you get is new motionless points. All that is wrong with a thetan is what is wrong at the lower and of the scale. At the highest level, a thetan can be motionless; At the lowest level, he has to be. It's a matter of determinism. At the lower levels, motionlessness is not determined by postulate, but by the mechanics of motion. If you want to see someone stiffen and go still, stand a fellow up, shake your hands in front of his face; produce a lot of motion, and say, "There's the motion!" At this point, the fellow will sort of freeze, as he becomes a stable datum. But this doesn't work well as a demonstration, because the observers will Also all go still in a sort of stupidity. They won't confront the motion; they'll put a barrier up against it and become still, so the motion will duplicate them, and they will butter themselves all over the universe and become agitated. Auditing motionlessness just makes more motionlessness in the bank. Stillnesses identify more rapidly than motion. In psychosis, the person is being stillness. The worst example of this is catatonia. There can't be such a thing as an"average" individual; there can only be someone who is trying to be a lot of other individuals and is therefore buttered all over the universe in terms of beingness. He'll be obsessively a still; the next step down is going round the bend. The operations this universe uses to try to make one assume the Average are so numerous that one accents then as normal. Insanity is the adoption of a solution to the exclusion of all other solutions in the absence of a problem.

If a person confronts no problems, takes no responsibility for them, and goes into being a solution, all problems go on automatic; they just go on all around him. There can be a million problems, but there's only one solution: him. A psychiatrist is being an obsessive solution also. He never really cures anything; he just persists with his ineffective solutions, which just hold the problem in place. He isn't aware that psychosis is a problem. He's handling people who are being obsessive solutions, so he becomes one too. The psychiatrist is the society's solution, just as his solution is shock treatment. Psychotics don't realize others have problems or that they're being problems to others. Psychiatry's research has been a search for solutions, but they hate solutions and they don't recognize the problem.

49

Man has made the mistake all along the track of not realizing that if there's a solution, there must have been a problem. Look at the "ten" commandments. Actually there's 162 -- pages of them. These are moral codes. And "moral codes are a series of solutions to problems which are neither confronted nor analyzed." Almost all the bible's commandments are prompted by the obsessive crimes of the time. Several are solutions to VD. That was a problem that descended on them that they knew nothing about, so they looked for solutions. They already had various areas of no-sex; they had already prevented true ethicality by inventing immorality with a bunch of new morals. A lot of religions, also, encourage facing motionlessness, e.g. by getting you to turn inward, contemplate the stillness within, meditate, face Mecca, etc. This is the basic operation of the track.

"I believe it's perfectly all right to do anything you want to to people as long as you don't say it's something else or try to convince people you're doing something else ... as long as other people are not ... completely ploughed under by it." The greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics gives a lot of lattitude. The main crime is the entering in of a not-know. That's the only real evil there is.

When a person reaches a stage of being an obsessive solution, with total not-know on what he's being a solution to, or when one is to being terribly still, he doesn't know what motion he's being still to counteract; obsessive stillness enters. The bug factor here is the not-know in all this. Where you have someone solving problems, you don't have an evil. It's OK to solve problems. But an individual who has put all problems on automatic can't solve problems, except with some fantastic liability of cave-in, terror stomach, etc. He doesn't dare solve a problem. There are gradients of this. There are people who can salve a minor problem but not a major one. They'll try to protect you from a problem by preventing you from solving a problem by feeding you extraneous data. This is not to confuse you; it's to protect you. [E.g. the pedant who doesn't want to make a mistake and doesn't want you to make a mistake either.]

When you see someone sitting in the middle of a catastrophe, one of two things is happening. Either the stuff is avalanching in faster than he can cope with it but he's trying to cope, or he doesn't even know it's a catastrophe; he doesn't even see all the papers all over the floor and the account book being used far a doormat. That's the condition of the thetan sitting in his bank. He feels he's got it all straight and the trouble is all over there. Since, you can't see the clutter, you say, "Well, he's behaving oddly. But that's not the situation; he's confronting "no-ly". It is all not-ised.

When you run something in an orderly fashion, you will at once get something done. In the first place, you're giving the PC an orderliness to confront, and he finds out there's some motion that can be confronted. Where you have individuals who are totally insane, you have no confront of problems, so Routine 1A won't work. It doesn't go as far south as the CCH's. But it works on most people, including the guy who thinks he's is such good shape that he doesn't need any auditing. If you run problems on him, he'll go, "Hm.... Ridges? Where did this come from?" The bank starts going solid; somatics turn on. He'll see there were some problems around. Their masses start showing up.

This is the first time we've had a good cure for this type of mass. It bypasses the liability of curing it. We're enough on top of the mechanisms of existence to pull the Overt-Motivator sequence without falling athwart of its consequences. Similarly with the problem-solution sequence. You can thus solve all the PC's problems without squashing him, unlike psychiatry, which also tried to solve all of his problems.

6107C05 SHSpec-25 Q and A Period -- Procedures in Auditing

The meter may fall on a question, but it might not be the question you asked; it might be protest or something else. Find what the meter did fall on and clean that up.

Notice that when you run Description Processing on a problem, the problem keeps changing. That's one reason we don't do any fancy problems process on rudiments. We just keep the PC on the one he brought up. Otherwise, we start to get into all this alter-is. Change as a level in the Prehav scale was developed to cure alter-is. It turns out that this was a stopgap. What cures alter-is is Problems. Pc's who obsessively alter-is will run problems like a rocket, since the solution is an alter-is of the problem. You can check every once in while with the PC, "How did you get that answer?" "What are you doing?" On running problems you have to strongly do this. You have to be sure he really did

recall a problem and didn't just get a notion of a foggy confusion. You don't have to check every command; just every few, randomly. You have to use TR-4. If he repeats the command after you, he's set up a circuit, so you repeat the command. Don't do it if the PC has had a cognition, since in that case, it can seem invalidative. Let the PC stay in communication. Don't be robotic about using the repeat statement, but stay in PT and don't put the command on a circuit. The acks are half-acks, not full stops to the cycle, and you can put a little insistence on the command when you repeat it; this keeps it from sounding like a new command. Always get the command you asked answered. You can ask him if he still has the command, if he's comm-lagging and drifting. Use this rarely and sparingly, since it does distract the PC. That's the common denominator of pcs' ARC breaks with auditors. Sudden change of attention is associated in all minds with accidents, pain, etc. So the auditor shifting the PC's attention suddenly makes the PC feel hit. You should wait until he looks vaguely in your direction. Don't jump on him. The meter action will also tell you if the PC is doing the command. If it stops registering, you can suspect he's lost the command.

The auditing command is what it is and doesn't have any understood additional agreements in it, so if you say, "Recall a problem," it doesn't include, "Tell me about it," or "Don't tell me about it." And you can't make agreements with the PC that he should tell you and let it be understood for the rest of the process. Other ARC breakers are the auditor giving you five commands without letting you answer any of them, or the auditor saying nothing -- giving no new command when the PC is waiting for it. You cannot tell the PC how to do the command in addition to giving the command. He must understand the command, but to give advice on how to do it is evaluation. Also, if the PC makes a contract with the auditor for session length, that can get tacitly into every command. The PC will get stuck in the first command of the session if you start with some agreement that wasn't repeated. The auditing track will bunch. The only understanding you have with the PC is the command given at the moment given. The auditor's control of the PC extends to one command at a time. The auditor does control the session. And not with kindness or social niceties. You can tell the PC, "You're answering things I haven't asked you. Recall a problem." There's a polite way of telling a PC to shut up: a good solid nice acknowledgement as soon as the PC starts to diverge. The mistake is not to control the PC. But note that when you've announced yourself as a control unit, you'd better stay one, since the valence will immediately test you to see if you will. If you chicken out, you'll get an ARC broken PC. ARC breaks proceed from lack of control, i.e. from lack of auditing. What you can get away with is what impingement you can make on the PC. But it must not be misemotional impingement, or you'll bolster up the valence the PC is dramatizing, which is always a misemotional entity, under the surface. You'll cave the PC in. So exert tone 40 control with ARC. There's a difference between overwhelming the PC and controlling the PC. If you don't shoot misemotion at the PC, you can say anything to him. It's a mistake to make any comment on anything the PC said or did, even if the PC asks for evaluation. It's not up to the auditor to comment, just to acknowledge. The auditor's opinion otherwise becomes a stable datum to the PC, and you are going to have to audit out the stable data you put in. Don't even imply by your acknowledgements that you agree. You're not in or out of agreement with them -- just in control.

6107C06 SHSpec-26 Routine 1A -- Problems

The cure for Step 6 phenomena or creative processing ill effects is a six way confront bracket on the pictures and responsibility on pictures. People who go solid on Step 6 type processes have an automaticity where, if they create anything, everything they've ever created gets created. Hence, since the bank is an individual creation, the bank beefs up. If you use these remedies, and you keep these things in mind, it would be safe to do creative processing. You can prove this by taking picture A, improving it, then looking at picture B. You will find that picture B has also improved. If you improve the PC's ability to perceive, you improve his ability to create. And it is only because the PC is doing it all himself that you can clear him. However, if you improve the PC's ability to create without improving his ability to confront, you've done him in. Art school does this; same with technical schools. If you make sure the school has only text, diagrams, and no real objects being studied, you'll cave the students in. Everything he doesn't like about the subject will eventually come to the fore, because you are running a can't have on him. It's a games condition; you are fixing it so he can't have what he's being educated in. The more theory on the mind you give someone, unaccompanied by an ability or opportunity to confront the substance of minds, thinkingness, and the beingness of life, the less reality they will have on it. So you'd do better to leave them alone in their present confusion. All training must be accompanied by confronting, particularly in the creative fields. The cure for obsessive create is confront. If the guy is creating his own aberrations, it must be that the road out would be confront. That would be the secret of clearing.

A mind is an obsessive unknowing creation, into which only a few important factors enter:

Create

Problems

Confront

Change

Responsibility

Not-know

Goals prevent the PC from looking at anything. He's always looking at tomorrow, not looking at what he's looking at. There's nothing wrong with having goals, but what you are looking for is the obsessive goal of the case. There's only one of these, and it prevents the PC from looking at any part of that goal's chain, because the goal is so obsessive that it removes his attention from that chain to something that isn't yet in the chain. When you find the terminal that represents that goal, you'll have found the terminal they've never looked at or inspected but have been. With an obsessive goal, the PC isn't in PT. He's down the future track at an imagined future point, so of course he isn't confronting where he is. One of the PC's goals leads to the person who most obsessively had that goal, which is the valence [the PC is in], and of course this is the total no-confront of the bank all bunched up in that spot. If you only looked at tomorrow and never observed the immediacy of the situation, you would eventually have as-ised any future of it at all. So it hangs in time 100%. You've never as-ised any immediacy of the situation, so it is all there on that chain, and all the future of it is as-ised. Goals processing undoes this mechanism of no-confront. You are taking off all the futures. If you did goals processing crudely and peculiarly, you could get the PC totally regressed so that only some back point of the track has any reality to him, and no present point does. If you ARC broke him, didn't keep him moving on the track, this could happen -- a right-now-ness of moments on the track. Those points are on the goals chain; they're moments where the PC wished to God he were somewhere else, but he can't be somewhere else, so all he's got left to escape to is a future. This solid scene he's looking at -- no part of it is actually observed. It's a total overwhelm, and he's got a future there, a future postulate. So it stays on the track as a solidity, since he can't confront it. He'll hit these and bounce into the future. This could happen quite early in SOP Goals running. The more he's confronted elsewheres than the unwanted incident, the more they have as-ised, and the more he's fixed in the incident where he didn't want to be. When you run creative processing, these points come up easily, because he's obsessively creating them all the time.

A problem is the least confrontable thing there is, being composed of unconfrontable confusions.

Some PC's will run a total irresponsibility on problems of any kind. They will perceive no connection between having trouble in life and not confronting problems in their lives. This is the clue to slow clearing. Profiles don't change when PTP's exist.

A clue to cases is the magnitude of problem the PC comes up with. It can drive kids buggy when their parents' idea of what a problem is is grossly different from theirs. You may see someone sitting in the middle of a disaster of a dramatic or a quiet sort who is worrying about the fact that the lady next door has bought a new hat. That's the level of problem which that person can confront, and the things connected with the disaster are not problems. In fact, they're not even there. Someone could say to this lady, "Why don't you straighten all this out " and she'll think they're nuts, that there's nothing to look at, or if there was something there, there would be nothing you could do about it. You could probably do a sanity and ability test by making a list of problems by dynamics -- a prepared list -- in gradients of magnitude. You could then have the test taker just check the "problems" in each dynamic. What he checks would tell you where he lives.

6107C11 SHSpec-27 Problems and Solutions

Just going into session and running "Do fish swim?" would give gain if there were no PTP's, ARC breaks, or W/H's. This is hard to teach auditors, though it's been known since 1955 that if a PTP was present, you'd get no change in profile, if an ARC break was present, you'd have a depressed

graph, and if a W/H is present, you don't even have a session. It's weird; You're trying to hold the PC still so that you can audit him.

A problem is a postulate-counter-postulate resulting in indecision. Any time you have a fixed stable postulate, it accumulates, or came about because of, a confusion. A problem has at least two stable data (the two opposed postulates), each surrounded by a confusion, so at a MESTy level, it looks like a confusion -- counter-confusion situation. War is one of these. Twenty years after World War II, traces of it persist as NATO, the Common Market, etc.

As for the bank, someone set up some idea that he should oppose to some other idea. However, the idea that he set up to oppose the other idea commits overts against the other idea in that it confuses the other idea. Then it, in turn, gets back confusion, and the other idea attacks his idea, so you wind up with two opposed confusions, which then gather more confusion. This then goes down the ages as one aspect of the reactive mind. Problems have duration; thus the reactive mind has duration. How many ways could you take a problem apart? As motion, as looking at two things, as getting confusions of comparable magnitude -- all without adding a new solution. Solving problems without being stuck with a new solution has never been done before. Psychoanalysis, by contrast, lays in a new solution that produces new confusions, then more solutions. Thus you get branches and schools of psychoanalysis.

If someone has to have a solution, he didn't confront and as-is the problem. A solution is always a no-confront; confronting produces a vanishment of the problem. If you want something to persist, just don't confront it. This gets us back to the original mechanism of structure in this universe: preventing solution of the problems of the universe to guarantee the persistence of the universe. So anybody who solved problems with regard to the universe was persona non grata with anyone who was trying to get a total persistence of the universe. The problem is that it is impossible to create and at the same time to say that something will persist. [Things created tend to as-is] [So if we want things persisting around us.] if we can't create, we've got to preserve what was created. The way to preserve it is to get in this mechanism of no-confront and solutions that we are now trying to undo in the reactive mind. This is the idea that "anyone who solves problems is a dead duck. Horrible things will happen to anyone who solves problems." And everybody agrees 100%, and everybody does it to everyone, and you get a physical universe fact that enters the mental field. [With reference to the above quote, I think Hubbard means by "solve," "As-is."] This is where structure and mind take their first divergence. If you want a shakily persisting universe to persist forevermore, you've got to prevent a solution [As-ising] of its mysteries. You've got to prevent it from being confronted. So you say, "Anyone who tries to solve this thing is gonna get it." This goes over into PC's trying to solve their problems from day to day. The terrors of having solutions [as-isings] then bring about all these other mechanisms.

The universe poses a lot of problems: why is it here; why does time go clickety-click, etc. And a person who could be a tremendous mystery thought he could guarantee to himself a tremendous persistence. Obviously, the way to live was to be mysterious, and if you confronted nothing, you'd live on and on. So we developed a whole genus of thetan who had decided not to solve anything, because to solve something is dangerous. If you just ask a PC to solve something repetitively, masses close in on him. He dramatizes the cure of the impersistence of universes.

Basically, there's nothing wrong with solving [as-ising] problems, but when you've got tremendous overts against people who were trying to solve problems, of course it becomes impossible to solve problems. The persistence of the reactive mind is a Q and A'ing with the physical universe. So you find that most physical universe principles that affect the mind are in the area of problems: gravity, being trapped, stillness, etc. The person gets threatened, "You solve [as-is] a problem and we'll put you in jail," so the fellow has a problem, doesn't solve a problem, doesn't confront the problem, doesn't create space between himself and the problem, and of course he gets embedded in a sort of black basalt of energy. He "solves" the problem and jails himself! He knows if you confront a problem, you get confused.

All this is a protective mechanism resulting from an upper-level creative failure. The consequences of creating showed up with step six. So after the universe was figured out on the basis of, "If you create one, there are terrible consequences"; therefore it's impossible to create another one. So your havingness would be shot to pieces if you knocked out the one you've got, because you couldn't create another one. You've already had, earlier on the track, tremendous problems on the subject of creation. It isn't enough to just create something and say, "That's it." You have to agree it's valuable

and no one can ever create another one like it, etc. You make something valuable by protecting it and by never being able to replace it. These are all mechanisms of value, by which people try to get you to lay off MEST. So everyone is convinced that creation carries penalties and that you have to protect creations against being as-ised, and you get the problem sequence going. We have legends against looking -- Medusa, Pandora, etc. Another threat would be, "You realize that if you solved the problem of time, all time would cease." Actually, if you could solve the problem of time, the worst that would happen would be having to put it there for yourself again. And mass without time probably wouldn't entrap anybody, anyhow.

If you told the PC, "Face a solution," repetitively, he'd get upset. In the first place, solutions are the easiest things a thetan does and the easiest things to create, and he'd practically get his head knocked off with the confusion surrounding the solutions. You didn't have him looking at the confusions -- only the solutions, so the confusions just get more confused. Not confronting the confusions, you have no reason why any of the solutions ever occurred. If we say, "Look at the confusion," they haven't much inkling where to look. What's communicable is the package of confusion + solution which is the problem. When he looks at problems, he looks at future solutions too, so it as-ises things a bit.

You're not trying to get the fellow to solve or erase problems but to get him over his horror of problems and the piability of solving things. You're trying to get him to recover from these things which were set up on the very earliest part of the track. A person who can't confront problems hasn't much judgment, so this is the clue to judgment. Judgment can only take place in the presence of observation. We can observe synthetically when using mathematics, or when mocking something up. Judgment is absent in a person who can't confront a problem. The auditor who cannot confront the problems of the PC won't see them as problems, won't handle them, and the PC won't make progress. So this resolves auditing too; the more confrontingness a person has, the better his judgment. An auditor with judgment is a valuable auditor.

So we want to get someone familiar with problems. We start with reach and withdraw on the MEST he has problems with. Any number of processes will increase the PC's familiarity with problems.

People go off onto the collection of solutions for which no problems exist, e.g. decorative knot tying or botany. Then there are people who will have nothing to do with problems but are overwhelmed with problems. Most of these problems wouldn't seem like real problems to you, just facts, as he describes them. [E.g. "Tell me a problem." "Ok... The sidewalk."] As you enter the area of problems with a PC, you'll find him in one of these two conditions, if it's a problem he's never been able to handle:

1. Pc in an obsessive automaticity of solutions

2. Pc totally immersed in the problem as a fact.

He'll never be in the center line of, "These are problems," until he wakes up to it. When you run problems on someone, he first starts coming up with solutions, then, on a gradient, he starts to relate them to the facts, which for him appear to be problems. Or he goes into the processing announcing facts, not solutions. So it doesn't seem to you, the auditor, that you are listening to problems. It's not that he hasn't told you the whole story; The fact he's given you is, to him, a problem. It starts peeling back, onion-like, until you find eventually there was some problem it was involved in, usually with an overt in it, and he can see it all and it blows.

The way to get the PC more familiar with problems is to get him to look at them. "Recall a problem," is one way; 6-way confront bracket is another. The two can be combined with profit. You can also use, "Recall a PTP." This situated him in the time of the problem. It's a head-on type of process, with no alter-is of time. [For 6-Way Confront, see HCOB 6Jul61 "Routine 1A"]

In view of the fact that the aberration about problems was originated to protect the universe and creations, you find the early end of a problems run appearing to run forever, since it was put there to insure persistence. However, you will notice that the TA is active. This then starts deteriorating, and he'll pass to either side, either facts or solutions or cognitions. He can alternate between facts and solutions, too.

6107C12 SHSpec-28 Q and A Period

Continuous lack of cognitions on the part of the PC means he's hung up in fantastic maybe's. The way to take it apart, as per the Anatomy of Maybe, as set forth in Scientology 8-80, is on the plus-minus side. "How have you done it?" "How have you not done it?" "Maybe" does not have any reality in fact; it's a manifestation of positive and negative. This is also the anatomy of problems. Maybe is counterbalanced insistence on "It is." "It isn't." or "must/must not." Since it is not a fact, it must be taken apart on the basis of the two sides. This handles the subject of anxiety, which is must-must not, is-isn't. It is a frantic state of maybe. So such a case should be run on a positive-negative bracketing. Everything you run on such a PC should be run plus and minus, even rudiments! The case will change and never seem to notice it.

It's not impossible to run solutions; just don't prevent the PC from examining the problem. E.g. SOP Goals runs solutions.

The universe has been booby-trapped with ease of getting in and difficulty of getting out, e.g. marriage, the army, etc. Scientology even does it to a degree: discouraging people from squirrelling, etc. Because it's rigged this way, the way out has to approximate the way in.

All resistance is to prevent oneself from going any further down. If you can resolve the resistance to getting worse, the PC will get better. He's preventing deteriorating, but this can produce deterioration; however, that is not his intention. All the auditor has to do is to convince the PC that he's not going to push him further down, nor to cure him, then to dissolve his resistance to getting worse, which is pinning him down, and the PC can then spring back.

If the PC didn't make his goal for the session, you can ask, "What didn't happen?" and sometimes you will get his hidden standard.

6107C14 SHSpec-29 Checking Ruds and Withholds

To clear somebody at this time, he must be in a body, just so he can be picked up and audited. A thetan who has just dropped a body has to get another one before we can clear him.

When columns A, B, C, and D consistently register low after processing, you know the PC hasn't found the auditor. This is due either to an auditor who doesn't impinge, or a PC who can't tolerate being effect or control.

A case that hangs fire has an automatic not-is, which can wipe out the needle read. He'll tell you all sorts of overts on a sec check but not consider them bad. He doesn't think it's real. He knows about it, but it's all not-ised. Don't get outraged with the auditor who missed it. He didn't really miss it. All the time you are checking the PC over, you ask about the auditing, so as to unearth the moment of not-is. You'll make it safe by putting it on a via, e.g. "Have you ever thought it wouldn't hold up your case if you didn't tell your auditor?" "Did you ever have objections to the auditing room and just fail to mention it?" "Is there any time in your life when you felt completely beyond help?" "Did you ever tell your auditor?" These are tricky questions, but you're counting on the fact that, during that fifty hours, something did get brought to view that can be re-examined when spotted. It requires a bit of cleverness to spot it. There's no sense in trying this technique before he's has any auditing; the ground hasn't been plowed yet. He's been like this all his life and thinks it's normal. The meter registers on disagreement and he doesn't have any yet. (In fact, you can use "disagreement" as a broad-sweep ruds question when nothing else will register.) The "This is normal" is in Dianetics, the Evolution of a Science, as the "Everyone knows..." The PC really knows it's not normal, but the valence he's in considers it's OK. You could ask, "What is life really like?" to find out what "normal"is to him. When we say "It's below his level of reality," we mean he has some specialized compartmented values of existence, which really have nothing to do with existence. His level of reality has nothing to do with other people. This is his reality, so it doesn't register when you ask for differences. For instance, you ask for critical thoughts; he says "No", and it doesn't register because it's all justified that he natters continually. The disagreement is in total agreement with his reality. They have everything identified with everything, so there is no sense in disagreement. The complexity of disagreement with everything is such that the disagreement is just the way things should be. Thus there is no read. An automatic not-is is an automatic disagree. You have to be clever to unveil it all. The PC has opted out of life because it was too much, but he knows he shouldn't have.

He will perhaps tell you that he has led a calm, orderly life; that nothing much has happened. Actually, he just hopes he has no past.

How do you get him back into the mainstream of life? The meanest thing you can do is to ask him, "Have you ever left anyplace?" He answers. Then you hit him with, "Why?" Now you are asking for the points of departure from the main highway. You are asking, "What didn't you confront that you feel you should have confronted?" Now the meter gets active.

It can be summed up in this way, "Did you ever have anybody demand that you put your attention on something?" "Have you ever had anybody tell you that you're wrong not to have had your attention on something?" That's the basic trick. This comes up on problems. The basic trick of life: making people confront is the overt and having to confront is the motivator. All deaths, and the whole mechanism of death, comes from unwillingness to confront. So when people leave and feel they shouldn't have left, it is because there was something there that was too threatening and it keyed in death, so they did a Q and A on death and opted out of life. They were running a no-confront on people, giving people things that couldn't be confronted. If you do that, you get the idea that you can't confront. After you get that idea, you can only leave. And when you can't even leave any more, all you can do is to go nuts. When you get the why of leaving, you can ask if that's been a problem to him at any other time. You could get his PTP that way. You can ask, "Have you ever thought of blowing session?" "Why?" What you've done here is to walk around, cleverly using all the buttons that he is using to lie there quietly unchanged. The buttons of the prehav scale can be used in this line, e.g. "prevent", which has to do with problems. The surprise element is effective in all this, so it shouldn't be rote. The PC must realize that he is being interrogated by an intelligence.

Control is associated with intelligence. The labor - management situation stems from suspiciousness of cleverness. When people are un-clever, they are easily overwhelmed by cleverness. They can protest it with a strike. Labor's basic yap is against the intelligence of management, but management is never bright enough to use intelligence as a counter-weapon. Intelligence is an altitude factor. This applies very strongly in sec checking. You won't get anywhere operating as a robot. Similarly with ruds.

If you know there is something wrong because the PC hasn't responded to the correct processes, then there has got to be something wrong with rudiments. If you can't get the PC to respond well, it's not that he is trying to hide from you consciously. He is being a dead body up in a gully covered with leaves, and you've got to work around cleverly to communicate with him so he can be gotten back into life. The trouble is that he thinks he is just lying there quietly, and he isn't. He is shooting guns and making all kinds of fuss. On the other hand, you don't want to get so helpful that he comes to rely on you totally and never looks.

6107C18 SHSpec-30 Can't Have -- Create

In 1952, the Philadelphia Doctorate Course and Scientology 8-8008 were the basic texts on havingness. Havingness is a dominant thing; it is a part of games conditions. Now we are back to games conditions and its relation to havingness. In Scientology 8-8008, we had the principle that the goal of processing is to remedy the scarcity and abundance of all things. But all that we previously had to do this was creative processing, and a lot of people couldn't run it. Now we have come up with a new way to do this and thus clear someone fast.

There is a new datum on havingness: its relation to create. After you create something, you may have it or not; create doesn't necessarily mean that you'll have. All of auditing could be considered prehavingness, hence the prehav scale. The relationship between creating and havingness has to do with the fundamental formation of the reactive bank and is very important: What a person can't have, he creates. That is the law on which man operates. It is the most fundamental law of the bank that has yet been discovered. This is how the bank is formed. E.g. whenever Italy gets beaten, they have a Renaissance, or like, when you abuse a plant, it blooms. LRH wanted a ship and couldn't buy one, so he started to build one; if a rosebush can't have a rose (if you trim it off), it creates roses. If a shipyard can't have ships, it builds ships that wear out in twenty years, so you can't have the ships either. Probably the government punishes everyone for producing in order to make them produce on a reactive basis.

There's evidently some cross-relationship that goes further than the O/W mechanism. It was described in theory in Scientology 8-8008 plus in the discussion of games conditions in The Fundamentals of Thought. Games conditions concern preventing people from having things. Things of all sorts are havingness. The thetan is only unhappy when he can't have. His idea of quality could be reformed. If you deny him anything, he'll try to obtain it (e.g. the Prohibition). Now LRH knows how to make a civilization: decide what would be good things to have and create knuckleheaded bureaus to prevent each one of them. The trouble with economics is that it tries to create demand with supply. It should use scarcity. How do you create creation? Run a broad can't have. The games condition can get so bad that if you insist on people having something, they don't want it. Police action creates crime; BBC creates rock and roll.

As long as you aren't in a games condition with the people around you, as long as you don't run a can't have or a must have on them and still have control, all will be smooth sailing. It's supposed to be a good thing on this planet to run a can't have, e.g. with strictness. But this is the way you create problems. Problems may appear to be don't haves, but how did the PC get into the condition of don't have? Actually, don't have is the last ditch of can't have. Because even with a can't have, you could materialize what you don't have, maybe even build one. But the way you got into a don't have was the overt-motivator sequence. First you run a can't have on others, then they don't have, then you don't have. So if the PC doesn't have anything, it must be because he denied it. If he's got a low quality of something, he gets it thus: he can't have a good one, but nobody wants a bad one, so he's got a bad one. The test of his havingness is that he has it because nobody wants it. If nobody wants it, he can have it.

Total lack of something doesn't mean that the thetan is without it. It'll still be obsessively created in his reactive bank. The covert creativity of the bank is a remedy of havingness. That's all it is.

Now say you run a can't have on somebody on sex; then you find people running a can't have on you on the subject of sex, and you're puzzled. You'll find 2D activities are impossible, so you're likely to do a flip -- to go off in some different direction and build up various sorts of 2D activities you could have. When these also fail, you end up with them hidden from yourself but still created in the bank. So we get the downgrading quality. The degrade is on the basis of what he can have. A common denominator of pcs at the bottom is the complaint of not being able to feel. A bit higher, they complain of not feeling as much as they'd like about things. That's a can't have on feelings. Also, the feelings degrade, and go on down the tone scale. Serenity is impossible, so the thetan becomes enthusiastic, but that's an overt, so he goes down to conservatism, but that's for bank managers, so he gets bored, but people won't let you be bored, so ... down to no feelings. But of course all these feelings are being mocked up at the back of the bank.

At the first St. Hill ACC, LRH talked about two routes: experience, and the auditing route used at that time. They are now combined, because the experiential factor is havingness. Experience is havingness, so all experience can be restored. Beingness and doingness can be junior to havingness. [But Cf. p. 42, at upper level strata, beingness is higher than doingness, which is higher than havingness, so maybe LRH is talking about a lower level stratum here.] But beingness and doingness operate on the same can't have mechanism. When you hit bottom on your own beingness, you'll mock up some very desirable beingness, and you will be that, except that you are not really being that. For instance, a kid isn't permitted to be a pilot and fly airplanes, so he mocks up being an ace aviator. A person may end up settling for a lesser and lesser beingness. Finally, he is not being much, so he mocks up a substitute reactive beingness. Little kids are not permitted to fly planes, so what do they do? They become "aviators".

What confuses people is that, while can't have produces create at a reactive level, all this can take place at an analytical level. Not all can't haves trigger the obsessive create, but if you communicate the can't have in an unacceptable (can't have) way, in a good games condition, the guy may well slip into the reactive create. Absence of ARC is almost a requisite for a reactive creation by reason of a can't have. If you run a strong can't have on war in the interests of peace, war will result. Keeping the peace is not done by running a can't have on war by propaganda, etc. For instance, at the outset of World War II, no information was given out about the war; it was not considered OK to attack the enemy, yet we did get ourselves into it. When people run a can't have on things that do exist, we get a delusory state. Christian Science does this. Try running 8-C on a Christian Scientist. The insistence of a thetan on Axiom 1 is fantastic.

On some people, if you try to run a think process, they can't do it. These people must have an O/W games condition on thoughts, because they can't have a thought. If someone withholds a thought, he's running a games condition on you on the subject of "You can't have it." This will put him in a condition where he has less of it. If you can get off his withholds, i.e. get him to give you the thought, you've stopped him from playing that game condition, and he'll feel better. But why does he have these discreditable things anyway? Because they are scarce. If a thought is scarce, there has been a cut-down of a thought of activity. So the person withholds telling you about actions agains the mores of society because such actions are scarce. If you can get hold of one, it's his jewel -- a scarcity. He also holds onto it because he doesn't want you to have bad thoughts about him. This is another games condition. To handle this, you could run a can't have process on thoughts, theoretically:

1. What thought haven't you permitted another to have?

2. What thought hasn't another permitted you to have?

You could see another mechanism from another theoretical process. You run, "Think of a (say, woman)." At first he gets a generality or nothing, then he thinks of specific departed women, then dead women, sick women, funerals too. You are making him examine the scarcity of women, and it runs backwards to the point where he could think of a present woman with perfect ease and get a 3D picture of her. Whatever it is you find him inverted or nonexistent on, you develop a process by which you can discharge his propensity for using that item in a games condition on others and they on him. Because you are running out stable data on this, you add a confusion, a problem, or a motion along with it. For instance, you could use, "When have you denied another a woman? When has another denied you a woman? What problem about women is not present now?" The "not present now" is because it is the not-is version of problem confront. This is a murderous process because it un-not-ises everything involved.

A games condition is unnatural since, in such a condition, the person becomes convinced that there is only that game, so they run the can't have, and the more they do this, the less they have of it. Eventually, it disappears from view, and they have gotten worse, not better. "Way back, people wouldn't clear because they thought it meant losing their game. When cleared, they promptly went out and aberrated themselves again to have a game. They expressed it as, "I didn't want to be detached from existence." What pinned it down was a scarcity of games. They thought being aberrated was the only game going.

The remedy of havingness of games is broadening the PC's view on the subject of games. All you have to do is knock out his fixed attention on aberrated games, so that he can look around at all the other games. If you do this, the PC will blow clear almost at once.

6107C19 SHSpec-31 Q and A Period: Auditor Effect on Meter Read

A stage four needle often sits around clear read, but the PC is a dead thetan. It has about a 2 1/2 inch swing. It goes up, sticks (unlike the F/N), and drops back. It keeps doing it, no matter what the auditor does. The PC won't read on sec check, ruds, or anything. It's an electronic transfer of energy in the mind, a machine reaction. The person distrusts himself to such a degree that he has become a machine. Machines are run by energy. You are seeing something like an AC motor, feeding its current on a surge, and then reversing its flow, repetitively. This is a charge line. The only thing that can change it is auditing. The person is a total no-responsibility case: he knows he can have no effect on anything. CCH's undercut it best; think processes are not very effective because this kind of PC's thought has no effect on the bank.

The common denominator of all cases is the degree of effect the thetan has on his bank. This ranges from absolute zero to total easy effect on the bank. The stage four needle is a retreat from the bottom. Some buttons are still open -- problems, confusion, motion, leaving, or something. On such a case, all you have to do is to trigger one of his automaticities and let it run off the case, giving the guy more control over his bank. You are not, at this stage, really asking the PC to do anything.

There such a thing as a "spook" stage four needle, turned on by the auditor's statement. It doesn't matter what the auditor says. This is very common. A third of pcs have it. That's you energizing the bank. You can have more effect on the bank than the PC has. This is something auditors find hard

to duplicate, being sold on the idea that the PC is responsible for it all. They can't see the PC's pictures, so they don't believe it.

Sometimes the "spook" stage four needle confuses you when doing a sec check. The impact of your thinkingness and speakingness will activate the bank. This is the lowest reaction, below a lie reaction or a reverse lie reaction. If you're sec checking a PC, his level of interest rises and creates an emergency level. So don't avoid a reaction on the needle just because the PC has one of these automatic reactions on the needle at first. When you ask meaty questions, he's right in there reacting. So any reaction on a sec check question that might be meaningful is always taken by the auditor as factual, providing it's an instant read. A stage four needle probably isn't an exception to this. A complicated question might not be duplicated as asked, so 3/4 sec. lag could still be an instant read. Anything more than one second lag is totally useless.

A can't have is not a prerequisite for creating, only for unknowing creation. Nearly everyone who's studied the mind has studied only the analytical mind. We're looking at reactive mind laws. But even this response was originally an analytical response; all reactive responses were originally analytical. One can just decide to create something knowingly. This other law works this way: one day you get a picture of a rhinoceros in front of you, because someone somewhere prohibited you from having rhinoceroses. But you aren't aware of ever having wanted one. This explains the mysterious appearance of a mental image picture which has been hitherto unexplained. It also explains some strange desire to make or do something: someone has run a can't have on you. But most creativeness is spontaneous and able [analytical]. Reactive creativeness is generally terrible.

There is such a thing as a negative sec check to handle not-is in the PC. You can knock the withhold into existence by asking questions which as-is the not-is, e.g., "When haven't you stolen something?" Then you could ask the the positive question.

E-meters can be pushed around by pcs, but the reactions look different from reactive reads. It looks like body motion -- jerky. If a PC is worried about pushing around the meter, he's:

1. Not in session.

2. Got withholds.

3. He wants to impress the auditor. It's what the PC doesn't know about that moves the needle. The remedy is to handle ruds.

Vitamins to be taken during an intensive: "Dianazene" (used for radiation sickness; has iron in it) Vitamin B1 - 100 mg. GUK = Dicalcium Phosphate - fifteen grains (about one gram) + Vitamin C 250 mg + Nicotinic Acid 100mg + Iron.

You can run out all sunburns, radiation flash burns, etc. This can turn skin cancer on and off. When sunburn turned on with this, you will see a flush in the shape of a bathing suit. Likewise, not smoking enough will cause lung cancer.

GUK makes the PC work better for the first 57 minutes after taking it. The reason for the calcium is the B1 "finds" calcium somewhere in the body. GUK also helps nightmares. It'll run engrams through all by itself. B1 also robs the body of ascorbic acid, so you have to replace this too.

6107C20 SHSpec-32 Games Conditions

A games condition means an agreement of can't have amongst beings. It's have for self and can't have for others in a true games condition, but as an agreement it's can't have on all flows. It's agreement that nails it in concrete. A widespread can't have agreement gives you lots of mass. For instance the Christian prohibition on sex, which is very fundamental as a can't create. Bodies are necessary as favorite vehicles and identities, but there's a penalty in the Christian system for creating them. This results in a must-must not. It is in the field of disagreement and can be processed in various ways.

But how did you get suckered into a position like this, where you could accumulate motivators like this? You must have been party to the can't have somewhere along the line; you can't suffer any

consequences you had no hand in creating, and you must have done it by agreement with a lot of others. With the disagreement you're objecting to the game you helped to create in the first place. If you get the disagreement off, you get a considerable resurgence. You could undercut it by getting all the agreements to have the game.

A games condition process seeks to isolate the basic agreements on some kind of game. "Games condition" is a derogatory term. It means a package consisting of a fixated attention, inability to escape coupled with inability to attack, to the exclusion of other games. There's nothing wrong with having games, but a game condition is unknown, arbitrary, reactive, performed outside one's choice, without his consent or will. It's a sort of mental doingness trap. In it, you've got to do things, assume a certain beingness, and have no communication with anyone not part of the game. The world thus becomes massless, timeless, spaceless, and people-less very rapidly. Most marriages that go on the rocks are in a games condition, where there's a total agreement that neither one can have anything, overlaid with another set of agreements that are in disagreement with that fundamental can't have agreement. Their tenderest moments are when they're in disagreement with the basic agreement of can't have. This gives us interesting maxims like, "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned," which reflects the later disagreement. When two people get this fixated, the rest of the world ceases to exist. They just stay with each other and shut out the rest of the world.

Games conditions can exist on any dynamic. Wars are an example on the third or fourth dynamics. One can find portions of the track where one has repeatedly gotten into the same game, e.g. defending the capitol by being part of an interceptor squadron shooting down or being shot down by the enemy right over the middle of the airport. This was a games condition because it was an unknowing fixated activity; it did nothing effective for the society.

The clue to a games condition is that the person is doing a compulsive confront that makes it necessary for him to assume a compulsive beingness. In order to play this game, one must deny a certain havingness. The US has, in its last two wars, demonstrated itself to be in a war games condition because it cannot have the fruits of any of its victories. In a games condition, no matter what the person says, he always ends up with no havingness. So you get an obsessive beingness and doingness and a can't havingness. Everybody has a few games conditions; few have complete games conditions going. The latter are in the spin bin. When you see one of these games conditions, it defies all logic because it's obsessive. It has nothing to do with the real world. This is true of all aberration. It's out of PT. The rationale which rationalizes a games condition has holes in it. But don't try to argue someone out of it; audit him out of it. You can't educate someone out of a games condition because it's aberrated and he can't look at it analytically.

The situation of a person who can't influence his bank with thinkingness is interesting. The gradient scale of less effectiveness in this regard ends in no effectiveness. If you give such a person an auditing command, he doesn't do it, and even if he did do it, it would have no effect on the bank. Such a person breaks auditors' hearts and gives people loses. It is of interest to understand the anatomy of this phenomenon, which exists to some degree in all cases, since clearing a person means putting him in control of the bank. We've been working on the question of how a person could get into a condition where they could not affect the bank since 1954.

The answer is withholds. The fellow is backing out of life; he's withholding as part of a games condition; denying something to someone else. The withhold gives him a can't reach, a pull-back. Multiply this by a lot of instances and you find that eventually the person practically exits from the dynamics. But this is really not possible to do, so he inverts on them. As far as he's concerned, his effort is to leave, compounded with the withhold and not-reach. Thus you get an ineffectiveness. You can't control something you can't reach and from which you are withholding yourself. The mustn't reach is really a mustn't be reached, of course. This is true especially when there is punishment involved. Punishment compounds withholds. So as we go downscale on reach, we get:

1. Ineffectiveness

2. Destructiveness (the PC can't communicate with something well enough to understand it, so when he does reach, he can only be destructive)

3. Inability even to destroy something.

4. Inability to have any influence at all, of any kind.

5. Inability even to affect his own mind.

Add up all these withholds and can't haves on all dynamics and you get someone who's totally withdrawn, individuated; totally ineffective on his own bank. When he runs can't have on people, he makes them less familiar and more withdrawn from things. Then, by the overt-motivator sequence, this reacts on him, so he stops reaching and starts withholding. At 100% withhold, or 100% withdraw, he can't influence anything, including his thoughts and bank. If he reads on the meter, you know something is effecting his bank. Don't be amazed if the PC has never noticed, really, the condition he's in. He can't think or rationalize on the subject; he will buy wrong why's on it readily.

So if you run a command that you haven't tested for read, you are doing something adventurous, since if it didn't read, you're in an area where he's still totally ineffective or totally effective.

A PC can be compulsively exterior: the detached case. Freud could never help this kind of case. That's someone who is backed out of the dynamics and backed out of his head. People will tell you they feel detached. That indicates a games condition in the area where they feel detached. Most homosexuals are detached in this sense. In any area a person is in a games condition about, he is detached. How do you reverse the games condition? Find something that reads on the E-meter and is therefore something he can effect, i.e. something real to the PC. Real means, "Can the PC be effective in that sphere?" Get the PC's withholds and can't have off the subject on a gradient scale. You take off the games condition, and the PC can now reach in the area and regain effectiveness. It's basically idiotically simple, but if you violate that doingness, you don't get results in auditing. Say you want to cure psychosomatics with auditing. You can find people who are so much the effect of their psychosomatics, you can have more effect on them than the they can. You can make them well, but they don't know it! So they never thank you for getting well. What you should do to avoid this situation is to assess all the person's difficulties, get the best read, get off all the person's withholds on the area, get the games conditions in the area cured, and the difficulty will right itself. You can eradicate illness and upsets, but you have to assess them first. The fact that the PC complains about something all the time doesn't prove anything. It could be a circuit or a mechanism; or it could be part of some other games condition. There is a gradient scale of difficulties. The PC may have lots of them, but may be effective only in one area. That's where you must start. That's been the barriered line on healing and help.

If you run a command that doesn't read, the PC is ineffective in the area. Therefore it's auditor vs the PC's bank, with no help from the PC. He'll be ARC breaky, hard to audit because you're just auditing bank and the PC isn't there. This violates the basic auditing principle: auditor plus PC is greater than the bank.

6108C03 SHSpec-33 Creation and Goals

The earliest unanswered question in dianetics and scientology is, "Why does a thetan mock up bad pictures?" It's remained unanswered all these years. You almost never find anyone with a fixed pleasure moment. Old validation processing was productive of more grief charges, etc.! [Validation processing = validation effort processing "This consists of discovering moments when the preclear is successfully approaching goals; when he is successfully exerting an effort; when his self-determined effort is winning." 5110CM01 OCTSER (October Series) Self-determinism -- Effort Processing, plus Validation Straightwire, "the theory of which was to validate all the good moments of the preclear's past by having him recall them (Ability Major 5, "Ability Straightwire", page 7).]

What is this fixation on death, disaster, and invalidation?

One theoretical possibility is that he's getting even. He's been made to produce, so he mocks up a bad production. Mechanically, of course, it's something he hasn't as-ised because it's unpleasant, etc., but why did he agree to those mechanics in the first place? He makes an original agreement, then revolts against it. Maybe he's been made to produce lots of good things, so he revolts with this mechanism, so when he's called upon to mock up something good, he mocks up something bad. This may happen on a 1.1 level. This can be seen running pleasure moments, when the PC slips into the badness of it all. Assuming that the fellow is in revolt, this can be very overt (hi-toned) or covert, e.g. not producing but having excuses for failure or forgetting to do it at all; the latter is a lower harmonic of direct refusal. Occlusion is this level of revolt, and we let people get away with it. For instance, Hitler's around somewhere, and we allow him to get away with having forgotten who he's

been. "I can't" is a covert "I won't." The mechanism is so lost it has become a way of life, not a revolt any more. The guy just mocks up bad pictures and forgets. Some civilizations on the track were really production-crazy, e.g. Arslycus, where the thetans were actively producing, mocking up matter. You couldn't get away; there were entrapment mechanisms. Production got a bad name because it was production against power of choice over production. The bank dramatizes this creation against the wish to create. The fellow doesn't want to mock up the bank, so he mocks up the bank. His will to create has been badly overwhelmed, partly because he overwhelmed others' will to create. Arslycus eventually fell apart. Some worker invented disintegration so that it could happen. This was the only possible response -- to out-create with a new idea something worse than what was happening to them.

Creation gets a bad name from enforced creation. There's another side to it. LRH has been unhappiest when he's produced so much that he gluts the market. Others decide they've been out-created, and they get unhappy too. That's not so upsetting; what's so upsetting is not having any market for your creation, no observers, no audience, etc., and not having it wanted. One does want one's creations to be admired. If you are made to produce when you don't want to, or if you think there will be no appreciation of your production, you will generally produce an overt product. One can also think that a good creation in some field will bring one into a state of victimization or some unpleasant consequence. In this case, one retreats, saying, "I can't," or "I don't have any talent," or "I haven't been educated."

In 1948, the answer to "Why does a thetan create a bank?" was that he creates something with resonance between his own tone and what he creates in the bank. This is not the whole story, though. An individual mocks up, or doesn't, in an effort to prevent his will from being overthrown on the subject of creation. He gets mechanisms to inhibit creativeness in order to protect his self-determinism. These mechanisms are what we run into in processing. This is why creative processing works, but it is also why some pcs eventually dreamed up that the bank gets solid. The mechanism was already there.

Methods of denying creation are the most fundamental thing you're dealing with in processing. We have to figure out what the guy's afraid of and disarm it on that angle. So what is he afraid of? He's afraid of being made to do. (You can substitute "do" for "create" to avoid some mine fields.) He considers there are bad consequences to doing; he considers that you have to hit a thetan to get him to create. This is an old-old consideration; it explains things like the high birth rate amongst the lower classes. [It also explains waiting until the last moment to write a paper, and the artistic temperament and why artists seek out SP's.] If someone hits you, you'll make a picture of it. This explains to everyone that he's a victim -- he has been made to create, and he is following the law that the best way to keep from being hurt is to create. This keeps you from being beaten. The most involved point in an engram is where the fellow thinks he has mocked up the engram in full, which should keep him from further injury, then gets hit again by something else, so he mocks that up too, and then there's more injury, or something, which defeats him. His best answer to a blow was to create. That used to get him off the hook. Then he suffers defeat and an invalidation of the mechanism of creation as a defense. Then comes a total not-is of engrams, which is another defeat, and the disappearance of earlier engrams. People with invisible fields have gotten to a chronic state of believing it won't do any good to create.

This all sums up to the thetan's responses to the accumulation of all the times his choice was overwhelmed. Someone's choice is overwhelmed, so he responds in some way, in a downscale attempt to make his postulates stick, which he never gives up trying to do. The basic assumption of a thetan and the first thing he wants to do, is the communication formula: Axiom 10. It's the most fundamental game in the interrelationship of thetans anyway. From there on, he just wants to make his postulates stick. When he fails to create an effect, he will still try to create an effect [by mocking stuff up]. Routine 3 (goals processing) is effective because you are looking over all the powers of choice he has hoped to effect, most of which have failed, and running out his failed powers of choice. Running goals is a sneaky way of getting at what postulates he would like to make stick by asking what conditions he was trying to bring about. The bank is the mechanisms of all sorts that tend to defend his assertions of self, though the effect of these mechanisms is to make a mess of the PC. The disintegration of his postulates is what's wrong with him. His reaction to this is surprisingly extreme, but the bank is still trying to have the effect. The basic of the chain is an overt, which is why overts work so well in processing. Someone who is obsessively protecting anything has overts on it. He is still trying to make his basic postulate of "effect on" stick, however. Why does he make the original overt postulate? He has gotten into a games condition on creation, that's why. He has been creating

against someone else, gets a lose on making nothing of the opponent's creation, so he overts against it. Early on the track, thetans specialized in goofy games and got into forgetting what they were doing. So there seems to be something wrong in the field of postulates. Theoretically, you could run a PC on, "What effect could you actually create?" This doesn't work because it is too direct; it goes straight through the mine field. To the PC, it seems unreal; he can't do it. Modifying it to, "What decision would it be all right for you to make?" would be more workable.

A thetan must have a feeling that there are motions and confusions he cannot tolerate, so he avoids them with mechanisms of creation. If a person's tolerance for motion and randomity is raised, his fears of consequences of the overthrow of his power of choice are reduced. Most fundamentally, obtaining a tolerance for motion and catastrophe would wash away the fear of fear.

The creation of a confusion is the last echelon of a postulate. The last echelon of a confusion is the creation of a confusion by omission. So we're on safe ground with pcs if we stress creation of confusions, especially by omissions. So you could use the process, "If you said nothing, what confusion would occur?" or, "What not-doingness would create a confusion.?"

Cases that don't move are the roughest ones. In catatonia, we have the last desperate effort of a thetan to make a postulate stick somewhere; it's a not-doingness. There's probably no such thing as a thetan who'd not trying to do something. All thetans are busy, if only trying to do things through omission. Thus, in asking for goals, we should ask for failed goals, secret goals, withheld goals, etc., since that leads straight to old postulates.

A PC can be so confused on the blow/create theory that just being talked to by the auditor can cause him to create something. Or below that, he'll mock up nothing while in session and get lots of ideas about it out of session. Ron handled this with short sessioning. The PC would hand up his case right after session. Then LRH would begin a new session and handle it. At this level, the PC is on a total reverse: he creates when he's not supposed to and doesn't create when he's supposed to.

Occlusion is the last answer, the last attempt to create an effect: an overt of omission. Here, you could use some far south process as, "What confusion wouldn't occur if you forgot?" This might get through to him if he's on a failed forget.

[So the dwindling spiral of creation or postulates is:

1. Postulate

2. Failed postulate

3. Creation

4. Failed creation

5. Creation of a confusion

6. Creation of a confusion by omission

7. Not-ised creation of a confusion by omission.

A tolerance of confusions, problems, motion, etc, is fine, but failed postulates is what you are trying to get with goals processing. You can also get this effect if you ask a PC what he hopes would happen if he kept on doing what he was doing. If he can't answer, you can undercut it with "What won't happen?" What shows up here will be caution, which seems laudatory, but he'll begin to realize something will happen too, as you get the not-is off. You could run off intentional overts with, "What would (or wouldn't) be damaged if you forgot it?" They are both aimed at getting the effect he's trying to produce. Or you could use, "What damage would forgettingness cause?" You're running O/W crossed with forgettingness. Etc. This is all at a high level of theory. It's a road parallel to the one through the minefield, even if you can't get the exact road.

6108C04 SHSpec-34 Methodology of Auditing -- Not-doingness and Occlusion

It's impossible to have judgment in auditing if one's TR's are out and one is worried about making mistakes in application of the tech.

On running brackets, a problem may be that the outer legs of the bracket may not be real to him at first. Reality on these legs may develop as he runs the process. This happens because of the dynamics. As he is audited, the PC gains reality on the other dynamics besides the first dynamic. The PC's ability to reach is directly reflected in his ability to conceive of someone else having an idea or action. So, as you run the process, the command you started with can be too narrow and limiting, as the PC's ideas reach further, and the commands could need to be enlarged -- more legs could be added. Each leg of the command stands as an individuated unit, without interchange among legs; each, in fact, could be run as an individual command. In view of the fact that it doesn't harm anybody to run an unreality as long as they are moving towards a reality, it would be OK to run all legs of the bracket from the outset. Try to choose a bracket and command wordings all of which fall. Remember that if you choose a command that restricts the PC, you limit his gains. Also, the PC will tend to look at the legs not being run as his reality comes up. He will have to withhold himself from those areas, tending to put them on automatic.

An auditing command can be broadened; it shouldn't be made more particular and specific. If in doubt, take the broadest form and run it from the outset. Running one which is too restricted can turn on somatics. It's legitimate to change the targets, flows, etc., but not the basic form. Don't change "how" to "when" or "could" to "would". You can drop portions of the command, too, as long as in so doing you are removing particularization. When the PC gets very free on flows, you can drop out the legs and go to the simplicity of, e.g. "Get the idea of (verb)."

An aberration is located as a total imprisonment, a total individuation. Auditing commands resolve the degree of imprisonment and individuation. As the degree lessens, you may lose TA on one leg of the process but now have it elsewhere. The TA ceases to move when the targets of the process are flat, so the rule is, before leaving the command, check it out for all variations which might produce new action. Remember that the reactive mind is an idiot, so you could miss something because of a wrong pronoun, or whatever.

The biggest barrier in dissemination is not-doingness and mis-doingness. There is an old unresolved philosophic question about the value of not-doingness: "To do or not to do?" Which is better, the active or the passive life? If you do, you get into trouble; if you don't do, you get into trouble. There's confusion on either side. For instance, LRH had a problem as a writer: whether to be super nasty if he was criticized or to be nice and let himself be criticized, thus protecting his markets and friends. There are contradictory lessons in this; of course neither answer is right. The missing datum is that they are both overts, longest continuous overt is not-doingness. Have you ever noticed the randomity that can be produced by a missing datum in a problem? A false datum can cause some confusion, but look at what a missing datum on the subject of the mind has done! How about a missing beingness? This is a near-ultimate in not-doingness. The ultimate, of course, is forgetting. You're not only doing nothing; you're not there to do it and you've forgotten. This really produces confusion. A thetan never ceases to try to have an effect on something, to put Axiom 10 in effect, no matter how many trillenia have gone by. You are trying to process someone who is in the middle of 10,000 continuous overts of omission. Doing something is apparently the least damaging type of overt. Thus withhold seems to be the more therapeutic side of O/W. It's his not-doingness which weighs on his case.

Doingness and not-doingness are not data of comparable magnitude. Not-do is enormously greater. That's why people who stop doing, even if what they have been doing is nasty, crash when they stop; that's also why men die before women. Underneath it all, a thetan knows he's important to life and knows it's an overt not to participate. The only greater overt is to forget. This is still an attempt to create an effect. So there's a gradient scale of effect creation:

1. You do something to have an effect. (Axiom 10)

2. You create an effect by not doing something.

3. You create an effect by being absent.

4. You create an effect by forgetting.

What degree of randomity could you produce by forgetting a whole lifetime? Quite a bit. And it's an overt; and the fellow realizes it's an overt. That's the reason for whole track occlusion: the overt of forgetting. The law behind all this is that the thetan never ceases to have an effect on those targets he has chosen, and the only thing that could ever pry him loose from those fixated effects is something like scientology. He is imprisoned to the degree that he is still trying to have a hopeless effect on something. He is his own jailer. Forgetting it prevents it from ever being as-ised.

If O/W can stall a case, how much more can it be stalled by not being there, the withhold of self? How much can it be stalled by a withhold from self and being there, and from doingness and from the subject and from any knowledge of the subject and from any communication with any beingness of the subject, etc.? That's why the more occluded a case is, the harder it is to audit. So you run cases on, "What wouldn't you mind forgetting?" This gets off withholds. Or, as a general pattern for a command, "What confusion would/could forgettingness create?"

We've looked on forgettingness as a sort of passive thing; we've looked on not-doingness as the natural state of beingness. Seeing them as overts opens up new zones for processing.

6108C08 SHSpec-35 Forgettingness

The reactive mind is basically that area of occlusion which the PC is unable to contact and which contains a total identification of all things with all things and until released into the realm of havingness, continues to react upon the person, compelling him into actions, dramatizations, and computations which are not optimum to survival. We find in the reactive mind all the residual, not as-ised material which the individual is seeking to avoid. All the discreditable things of his existence are then contained in this area. He hangs onto them, the knucklehead! He has various mechanisms of survival connected with this, one being the justification of the aberrations he has.

Psychology makes the error of saying that one is only able to create by virtue of one's reactive mind. Faculty psychology (c. the 1500's) was an attempt to understand perception and the mind. They didn't get anywhere because they dealt with the analytical sphere and got confused by the fact that men don't always react rationally. Behaviorism overlooks the unpredictabilities of men when they don't follow the stimulus-response mechanisms.

Until scientology, a theory about man was too precious not to be carefully guarded from attack. Men went to the stake to protect the theory of faculty psychology. They threw away case histories to protect the theory of behaviorism. The abundance or scarcity of all things applies. Theories were terribly scarce. In scientology, we are looking at an abundance of theories. What we care about is what works. Former theorists didn't care whether their theories were workable or not. They just felt they should protect the theory.

The cure of a reactive bank is knowingness, because the substance of the bank is not-knowingness. There's a fourth postulate: remember. The third was forget; it is senior. It's been stressed that one should run that, rather than remember. In order of making, the four postulates are:
0. Native state: potentiality of knowing everything.

1. First postulate: not know

2. Second postulate: He had to know something.

3. Third postulate: He forgot what he knew.

4. Fourth postulate: Remember.

A thetan does this on any given subject. When you enter a school, you start by postulating you know nothing about the subject. That's really a request to find something you don't know. In other schools, you're asked to not-know and then learn a lot of nonsense.

The only thing that ever blows up a false theory is the workability of a counter-theory.

We know more about the unpredictable side of man than any other body of people on earth, so any breakthrough we make in the area is valuable. The breakthrough is in the area of forgettingness and

confusion. Man wants things to be forgotten. He not only uses forgettingness as a continuous overt act; he wants forgettingness to occur. He wants all his evil deeds to be wrapped in the Stygian darkness of yesteryear. Man is basically good, so it his deeds are considered bad, then there's only one cure for them that he knows: To forget them. So, as an auditor, you can ask, "what should be forgotten?" He'll recover almost at once a screaming impulse to make something forgotten, and that is where his volition and the reactive mind cross. His volition desires occlusion; back of all his confusion is a knowable volition: he wishes a forgettingness to occur, and that wish creates a reactive bank. That is the postulate that comes ahead of everything: he must forget. So it can be reached with, "What should be forgotten?" There's a danger that this will become a forgotten point of scientology. The postulate, "It must be forgotten," must be the most forgotten of all postulates, so it must be the one least able to be as-ised, and thus best suited to accumulate the concatenation of a bank.

The hidden standard is a cousin to this. You can handle the hidden standard by asking what is hidden about it or what should be forgotten about it -- and it blows. The PC's attention frees up and he knows processing works for him. You can ask, "What would have to happen for you to know scientology works?"; strip all the motion out of the needle, and you'll have a list of hidden standards. [More details on running of this." Any psychosomatic or livingness difficulty a person has is a difficulty because there's something about it he doesn't want known, and he wants others to forget it.

Compulsive rememberingness brings about forgettingness. One pulls it in with the must have on remembering, which postulates the likelihood of forgetting. And vice versa: someone who goes off to the South Seas so as to forget, first tries to forget with women, then with liquor, dope, then death. But all his urgency to forget keeps it there. He pushes one button and gets the other. This develops an awful confusion, which is then buried with death and occluded, forming the stimulus response mechanism of the reactive mind, because his power of choice and his postulates are being overwhelmed, even if it's him who's overwhelming them.

Restoration of memory on the whole track is the index by which you can measure case gain most easily. If someone doesn't think he's lived before, he's heavily plowed into forgettingness, while the guy who has only delusory recall on track is doing a pretended knowingness of the whole track. This is a games condition of magnitude. It's denying knowingness by giving a false knowingness. It's forgetting and remembering at the same time -- very confusing and irritating to confront. The irritation comes from one's awareness of the games condition, putting you into the position of being an unwilling opponent. If it goes on long enough, your own occlusion is assisted. The target is to occlude your track by giving false knowingness about theirs.

Confusion asks itself to be forgotten because it was never remembered. That is, it is not-known. That's what makes a confusion a confusion.

6108C11 SHSpec-38 Basics of Auditing -- Matter of Factness

A lot of auditors are doing something besides auditing: they are pressing through, introducing something in an effort of make auditing work. Probably it's because of LRH saying that the auditor has to make the auditing work, that he should be on the ball, etc. A certain apathy about results creates in itself a "grind atmosphere". Desperation or apathy alike are counter-productive. LRH audits with no doubt about what he's doing, no withdraw, no question about purpose. His auditing is very matter-of-fact because he has no doubt that he can help the PC, no doubt about the effectiveness of the process he's going to run, no doubt about the fact that the process is working, so he has a relaxedness about auditing that gives him results five times as fast because he doesn't get in his own road.

The reason an auditor doesn't flatten a process is anxiety to get the job done, which gets in the way of getting the job done. LRH doesn't artificialize the way he feels about the PC; he keeps it real, unlike other auditors, whom he heard being stilted and artificial. Be effective; help the PC; don't be hidebound. This should give faster results more easily.

Not-know and forget would have run out engrams in 1950 if they had been used then. This would have avoided a lot of grinding and sweat. You'd use a command form which includes as many dynamics as necessary, e.g. "What should remain unknown about this to the public / the government / a family / your superiors, etc.?" The occlusions that auditors were struggling with were the result of

self-motivated efforts to withhold. The hang-ups in any engrams are from a desire to make these things [parts of the engram] unknown or forgotten. The pretense of knowing about it (dub-in) also blows on the not-know processing. Running engrams should not be discounted as of benefit to the case. If you get someone clear and stable, they may still find themselves with an engram there. It won't take long to run it, since he's clear. During stabilization, they're unsnarling track; they are still bumping into things which can be run. Using not-know on it makes it run even faster, since it pops the sticky point into view.

[Application of not-know to Goals processing]

6108C17 SHSpec-41 Rudiments and Valences

An E-meter ceases to register in the presence of an out-rudiment. This may fool you into thinking a process is flat. If you get the rudiments in, the process will again move the TA and needle. Keeping rudiments in is the most important part of auditing. You can find the rudiment because only the out rud will move the meter.

[Details on goals running]

A valence is a synthetic beingness, or a beingness which a PC is not but thinks he is. It can be a duplicate of any existing beingness, or a synthetic beingness created by what others have said about the other beingness. There is no such thing, really, as one's own valence". "His own valence" is just himself; he's either himself or in a valence. A valence is a package. A graph is a picture of a valence, and any change you got was because you shifted his valence. This is a very important datum. The PC will not gain in any way through any effort to alter the characteristics of a valence he's in. The PC will only change if you change the valence as a whole package, because the PC takes no responsibility for any of the now-I'm-supposed-to's or the package of characteristics which is the valence. All the person can reach is a knowingness of the identity of the valence. What does the PC use the valence for? Survival, the road out, surmounted by knowingness -- a valence is a solid knowingness; a body is a solid knowingness. A valence is an effort to get someone to know you are there, to get someone to recognize something. Therefore they are a road out of unwanted areas. Say a soldier gets hit with a mortar shell. He doesn't want to be there; he's in the wrong valence. That knowingness (valence) is now invalidated and becomes a not-knowingness. So he exteriorizes and decides that the only way to fight a war is to be a general or a war correspondent. If he can't be that, he'll keep on trying, war after war, life after life. Finally he gets it together and becomes very successful at it. Then he finds all war correspondents being shot for fomenting war. As he is shot, he decides he'll be Mata Hari. He gets a female body, moves on up the line, becomes Mata Hari in war after war. Then eventually he gets executed for that, etc. These are all efforts to solve the problem of what to do in a war. Every valence picked up is an effort to solve a problem. Valences are antiquated solutions. So you can say these identities are antiquated solutions to confusions.

The goals which go towards beingness are the more definite goals. They are the more profitable ones in auditing, because they go toward identity. A person is not himself; he is in a different knowingness as soon as he's in a valence. You can fix up a valence's broken leg, as long as it's a valence that isn't supposed to have a broken leg, which is why you can do assists on almost anyone. The only person it will fail on is someone who has a now-I'm-supposed-to of a valence. The PC has no control over this. Any PC is being dominatedly in a given valence, but may be tortured or upset by other valences which are only really the concern of the valence he is mainly in. So any PC's troubles are only the troubles of the valence he's in. The troubles are part of the now-I'm-supposed-to's of this valence. So there's no way to remedy the difficulties on the valence, because they are outside the power of the PC to touch. Here you get the oddity of, "Please audit me, but you'd better not make me well." That's what it looks like.

The valence may have somatics turning on and off as part of the package, which keep the valence from becoming something else. The PC will keep the somatics to prevent himself from becoming an unworkable solution to a future problem. Don't try to take that solution away from the PC, so long as it seems vital that it be a solution. What you've got to do is to get the PC to face up to the various factors that make that a valence. You can't make a valence well; you can move a valence. So any process run at random on a PC has a very small chance of success. This pre-selects our bag of tricks to a small bag. You must ask yourself, "Is this process going to change, familiarize, accustom the

person to identity, or is it going to handle environments which make identities vital, or is it going to alter valences?" If so, it will work and stay working; if not, it won't.

What makes a valence stick the way it sticks? Let's newly define a psychotic as someone who doesn't know what's going on in his environment and who doesn't know what is going on inside himself. It's all unknown and unobserved. Neurosis is when he's got some idea of what's happening in his environment and where he is, but this is overbalanced by unknowingness. Upscale from that, you know what's happening where you are, but not what's happening inside someone else a few feet away. You don't always know what's going on with everybody. That makes a slight unknowingness. The stuck parts of your track are the points where you knew what was going on where you were, but not what was going on around you, because there are points of disagreement: there was a know facing an unknow. The unknow can get so overwhelming that one adopts a valence to solve it. You pick up a valence which knows about these things. Many scientists are solely being valences of scientists. They've got it confused with the whole track beingness of a technician. When you see the level of pretense of a valence, it becomes spotted for you; it seems artificial. Anyone who's identified himself by some set of tricks has thereby put himself in a valence. The fact that he's in a body is an obvious valence, but it's the valence that he's using the body to be that's the auditing target. Just having a body isn't necessarily a valence if he's aware of having a body, not ploughed in below his level of consciousness.

As an auditing target, a valence is the MIP package a person has composed to solve the problems of existence which he knows nothing about. It's always easier to pick up a weaker valence than a stronger one, so your logical target in auditing is the weaker one.

If your PC has a bunch of chronic somatics, they're part of the valence picture, not part of the PC. He's got to have two counter-opposed identities in order to feel pain. 1957 was when this was worked out. To have experience, he'd have to survive; to survive, he has to be something other than himself. Otherwise, he can't survive, experience, and live. You haven't a chance in handling this person until he realizes that he can live without the valence. He's been in a games condition as a valence against some environment -- which probably no longer exists. Women are particularly confused here, because at the present time, the society is in flux and has no really clear idea of where women fit in, so women have more problems finding the valence to solve the problem of situations they're not really in anyway. [Identity crisis?]

To straighten out a case, you've got to move a valence. Say a fellow has a toothache; you've got to find out who had a toothache (c. 1950 tech) and split the valences. This is more effective than putting him in comm with the tooth, since it's not his tooth. Whatever his difficulties, find out who had it or would do it. [Cf. XDN "wants handled" rundown.] You could say, "What beingness would be a good solution for a tough environment?" You process "who's" -- valences. If you want to cure a toothache, run it back and forth with, "Who would want to cure a toothache / Who would have a toothache?" and get a terminal, to cure the toothache. You already have the goal, of course. You can also use this technique for the hidden standard.

For a long time, we had the question, "Should we handle solids or significances?" The answer is, "Solids," but the further answer is that you shouldn't handle conditions of a valence. Handle the valence. This is the limitation of a touch assist. Always handle the terminal. This brings Prehav 13 into the limelight. [Prehav 13: a process which takes a list of charged terminals and combines overt running with prehav assessment and running of brackets on levels assessed out. See 6106C21 SHSpec-17 or p. 42, these notes.] Prehav 13 will also fix up rudiments.

6108C18 SHSpec-42 Control of Attention

You might think of auditing as having hundreds of rules. As long as you think of it that way, you aren't auditing. These rules are only guideposts. Back of them, your good heart will carry the day. You are trying to help the person out. All right. There are certain things his mind will and won't do. If that is what your rules are, you're fine. Rituals, as developed by religions, represent their failure to communicate the basic truths. Here is what a PC will not do: he will not go into session with his attention fixated on something else, nor will you have his interest in what you are doing. All the rudiments can be covered with, "Is your attention fixated on something? Is there any reason you won't talk to me?" Since these questions are a little too broad, you have the rudiments. He can have a fixation on a PTP of short duration, where his attention is fixed on the immediate environment. In the

PTP LD, the PC also has his attention fixed on something in PT, but he also has something subjective holding his attention, something very real to him. When you don't parallel what the mind is doing with auditing, you fail in auditing.

The rate of change of attention defines relative pain, and the common features of every stuck point on the track is a sudden shift of attention. This has been known since 1950 at least. The processes being used are sufficiently strong that no matter what the PC's attention is fixed on, you can yank it away, but doing so will result in an ARC break. Furthermore, his attention won't totally come off what it was on, so you will create a new identification of what he was looking at and what you pull his attention to.

You can, of course, go too far in paralleling the mind and wind up in a Q and A. LRH has never seen a case progress when the PC's attention on PTP's of short or long duration isn't handled. If you don't handle attention fixation, you eventually get an unexpected attention shift that produces an ARC break. It isn't the minor flub you make that really causes the ARC break, though it triggers it. The ARC break is really caused by yanking the PC's attention off his PTP, and you won't find it by running O/W on the auditor. "Willing to talk to the auditor" is the other requirement for the PC to be in session. If the PC has an ARC break or a withhold, his willingness is out. With a withhold, there's another factor. The PC is sitting with a known where he is and an unknown where the auditor is, so the auditing session is a ridge. In view of the fact that the PC's attention is fixed on the withhold, even if only at a sub-awareness level, if you audit over it, you're guilty of an attention shift. The attention fix in a withhold is complicated by being an outward fix with an inward pull to keep it from getting out.

These mechanisms take priority over all of the PC's considerations and postulates, so no matter what he says, you can't go ahead and audit over it. I order to audit him, you've got to be able to put his attention where you want it. If there's a distracting noise outside, it's a waste of time to ask if it bothered him. You can assume it shifted his attention, so ask, "What were you thinking of when the noise occurred?" until there's no read and the PC feels OK about it.

Anything that happens in the auditing session is the auditor's fault. If anything goes wrong in session, it's never the PC's fault. If the auditor doesn't tell him how to get his attention off something by some acceptable gradient, it's not the PC's fault if he can't put it where you want it. Because you didn't put his attention on the things it's on when he comes into session, you're slow to take responsibility for taking it off. But if the PC doesn't make gains, it's the auditor's fault.

Just as the PC must be gotten to the point where he is at cause over his life because you can get him to erase all the aberrated points in an auditing session, there is another cause -- the auditor. This is in violation of the idea that the PC is cause of all effects. So you've got to be slippy, because you are being cause over a section of the PC's track. The only way it can happen is for him to have some willingness to do what you want him to do. So his cause must still be there, and your direction of his cause must be acceptable to him. Otherwise, he won't be cause over that section of track called an auditing session, and if he isn't cause over it, he'll make no gain. So, to keep him at cause, you audit him with all his attention on the auditing, not splintered elsewhere. He must willingly follow your direction and have a clear view of what he's doing. You assume, incorrectly, that the PC is delicate. But in fact the only thing you can really do to a PC that's bad is not to give him a win, which can only be done by violating his attention factors. Auditing in the absence of the PC's attention is no-auditing. How do you keep his attention? Keep the ruds in.

The earliest method of clearing was highly permissive and very delicate. It amounts to this repetitive question, "What picture would it be safe to look at?" The reason it was no longer being done by 1950 was this attention factor. It hadn't been isolated, so it couldn't be articulated. Also, everybody kept dictating what picture the PC should look at. But you could clear someone with that process, and it would not be a long route. You can speed it up by getting him to use other perceptics, e.g. "What sound would it be safe for you to hear?" etc. People who don't get any pictures are just stuck in PT to avoid looking at the disaster just earlier. But you can work him around until he can confront the bank. This approach didn't run into the attention problem because it's so permissive it lets the PC put his attention where it already is. It does take gentle, smooth auditing, and it takes quite awhile. The "engram necessary to resolve the case" is actually just the picture the PC is stuck in. So you are essentially running "What picture would it be safe to look at?"

Now it goes faster. You handle his attention, gently unstick it from PTP's and ARC breaks, give him wins and confidence, don't get into games conditions with him on goals or terminals. If the session goes awry, it's because you missed an attention factor. Try to get subjective reality on this. If the PC says, "Yow! Yow! Yow! ARC break!!", you say, "What was your PTP?"

6108C22 SHSpec-43 PTPs -- Unknownnesses

[Details on goals running]

Normally a PC is ARC breaky because he is being audited over undetected PTP's, which he will not-is in order to get auditing. The auditor should suspect it, for instance, when auditing an executive. It is problems alone which give you this terrific timelessness. They show up as a sticky meter, an unchanging graph, slow reaction time, not moving around much in life. Problems stick and float forward in time, and the guy is stuck in a past moment. Another useful definition of "problem" is "unknown". A problem is an accumulation of not-knowingnesses and a consideration of the person as to the value of the not-knownnesses. Remember that the thetan is stuck to his bank, valences, etc., by mystery. Mystery is the glue of life. If you want freedom, you must restore knowledge; if you want slavery, establish ignorance. Create not-knows. So a common denominator of all problems is an unknown. A problem cannot exist in the absence of unknowingness. As the dianetic axiom puts it, "Randomity can be caused by a missing datum." [Axiom 105: An unknown datum can produce data of plus or minus randomity. Axiom 107: Data of plus or minus randomity depends for its confusion on former plus or minus randomity or absent data.] Man's difficulties were getting more and more involved because of the missing data: a technology about Man, based on the fundamental missing datum, "What is Man's nature?" or "What is Man trying to do?" When the PC runs, "Describe the problem," he may well be giving lots of
 aspects of the basic unknown problem. If you run unknownness on the subject of problems, you cut through to this central problem rapidly. A thetan is a mystery sandwich.

Two way comm is an inquiry of the PC as to what is going on and an invitation for him to look at it. It should be limited to such questions as, "How are you doing? What's worrying you? What is that all about?" Processes aren't two way comm. No process is involved in two way comm except 2wc. If you start a process, be sure you flatten it. This datum has never varied; it applies to running unknownness of problems. It's OK to handle a PTP by asking what unknown is connected with it. This runs PTP's fast. Use any version of the odd-numbered postulates: not-know, forget, doubted, pretended. Don't use 2wc to handle problems. You don't have to be repetitive; get all versions of not-know off of it.

[More details on running of PTP's]

Routine 1A consists of everything you can think of in terms of problems processes. It gives a total ability to confront problems without being upset by the unknownness of them. Man doesn't like having to confront the unknowns of life. It's hard to do, because there is nothing there to confront. We're back to processing loss when you process unknowns, since a loss is a not-know. So someone with lots of problems experiences a sense of loss. What is so maddening about a loss is that you don't know what is happening with the thing lost. The PC will misassign causes of loss, too. Because some terminal is gone and there is lots of unknownness on it, the guy will go to the bottom of the Prehav scale and pretend some knowingness and pretend cause. The two are closely associated. It makes someone who is a real inventor feel strange when he gets down to the Inventor's Club and the others "know all about it" and "invented it two years earlier". Someone in that state can't duplicate; if they were asked, "What did you invent?", they'd answer with some irrelevance, so that's a good rebuttal.

Pretended knowingness and pretended cause are blood brothers and continually come up together. This is at the bottom of the not-know scale because it is a substitute know. The way you handle it is not direct. You go at it by way of problems. The guy has had so many problems, he has begun to substitute false solutions. Those are the pretended knowingnesses you see on the case. So you don't process the pretended knowingnesses. You process the problems, and the PC will fly. You enter at the level of reality of what a problem is, and the false solutions and pretended cause fade out. Flattening Routine 1A means getting the guy comfortable confronting unknowns. Then he won't be obsessively escaping from them and no longer experiencing a lot of anxiety about them. [Cf. Alan Watts' The Wisdom of Insecurity] Jealousy is basically an inability to confront the unknown. The

sickness one experiences with it is not because of betrayal. It is just another aspect of the unknown of faithful/unfaithful, or "something they know that I don't," etc.

Why does a case suddenly dive into the middle of the bank and refuse to come out? The guy is unable to not ask why. There's an unknown in the incident. The guy gets some glimmer of the unknown, and he dives into it. He cannot confront an unknown and becomes hectic at the idea that an unknown exists. The oddity is that all knowingnesses are invented knowingnesses. With sn inability to confront the unknown, you eventually get an inability to confront the known. Then this goes down to an inability to confront at all, so any little tiny incident of the day becomes a problem he dwells on. So don't judge by the apparent size of the problem whether he will be stuck on it. If he can't confront the unknown at all, he will be totally glued into all his unknowns all along the track.

You could run, "What unknown about an auditing session could you confront / would you rather not confront?" You will solve anybody's difficulties with auditing. You could run it on an old timer who doesn't much like auditing anymore or on someone who is having trouble learning to audit, etc. One old timer would get every PC's somatic -- because it's a mystery! He instantly snaps terminals with these unknowns. This process would blow him out. It is a very workable, specific process. It could be used for anyone who has left off doing some formerly successful activity, or someone who is having trouble learning something, e.g. a language. "What is unknown about a German?" would handle problems with the German language.

The treatment of a condition is an attempt to alter a valence without addressing the valence, and this just doesn't work. So some process addressed directly at the condition, unless it aimed at solids, like engrams, won't do it. Address the valence; find whose condition it is; handle the terminal [Cf., again XDN "wants handled" rundown]. Long lists of goals won't be that useful, but long lists of valences could be. Out of this, you could get a process for PTP's of long duration: "W/W would have (condition)? What isn't known about that person? What might you have done to him? What might you have withheld from him?" You would strip off valences and get off problems and O/W at the same time.

If you run lots of not-know, you've got to remedy havingness because the whole bank is coming unglued.

6108C23 SHSpec-44 Basics of Auditing

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.

6108C24 SHSpec-45 Rudiments

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]

6108C30 SHSpec-47 Auditing Quality

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.

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.

6109C07 SHSpec-51 Reality in Auditing

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".

6109C12 SHSpec-52 Clearing Breakthrough

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

ARCB 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.

6109C19 SHSpec-55 Q and A Period: Prehav, Sec checks, ARC Break Processes

[Details on prehav processes]

With the 5-way brackets and different flows, you are trying to knock off the PC's obsessive valence, which he's stuck in by some stuck flow. E.g. a sergeant always orders troops; no one orders him. Thus he gets a stuck flow and eventually does something weird like becoming a troop or inability to accept orders from officers. If someone kept giving orders, it would unstick the flow, eventually.

Flows are the mechanism by which someone snaps terminals and gets valence closure. You run a body continually; it never runs you. So you're in a body. One day you get a reaction from a body and you succumb. The stuck flow has snapped and is making the body and you succumb. The stuck flow has snapped and is making the body run you. If you start consciously driving a car you've been driving unconsciously, i.e. you start taking the car somewhere instead of just letting the car take you, all sorts of weird things are liable to happen. You might lose your ability to drive temporarily. In driving the car unconsciously, you've already succumbed to a stuck flow. We have the idea that a skill should be unconscious so one doesn't have to think. This is a big reactive trap. When one has run out all the flows on a terminal that the PC has as an obsessive valence, you'll have discharged the PC's compulsion to be interiorized into it, or to command it or be unconscious about it.

The overt act / motivator phenomenon has to be part and parcel of this stuck flow phenomenon. E.g. a sergeant tells his troops they're going for a picnic. When they get out in the field, they find they have to build fortifications. The lies and prevarications are part of what causes the valence closure. If you start teaching a student about scientology and pushed a bunch of false or misinterpreted data on him, that would be an overt. In order for the stuck flow to come about, you have to have an individuation and unease, an unconscious reaction, plus something unknown, something hidden. An overt in instruction at Saint Hill, far instance.

On the auditor process: a beingness is in the middle of a confusion, so the process, "What are you willing to be? / What would you rather not be?" is a limited process. It picks the stable datum out of

the confusion, which is reverse auditing. It is very good only on a limited basis. If you were going to run a case with this, you'd have to run some 1A processes (Problems and sec check processes alternated. See HCOB 6Jul61 "Routine 1A".) as part of the auditing command.(See also p. 57 paragraph 4 for the theory behind this.) E.g. for a long run, use:

1a What would you be willing to be?   b What would you rather not be?

2a What would Another be willing to be?   b What would another rather not be?

3a What confusion could you confront?   b What confusion could another confront?

You can use "problem" or "motion" in the confront command, instead of "confusion", whichever reads best. To run a whole case with it, add two more commands: the negative confront parts. That could run the whole case to clear, maybe, after a very long time. If you ran it without the problems part, it would run the PC right into engrams within a few hours.

On withholds, you first find some doingness, e.g. fish around for anything he thought he should tell you that he's forgotten about. Clean up with 2wc if possible first, asking, "What was it? when was it? What sort of thing would you find it hard to tell me?" etc. You could use Peter Williams, version of O/W: "Think of something you've done/withheld," for 3 or 4 cycles, then, "Is there anything you'd care to tell me?" to give the PC a chance to get the withhold off. You could use this latter after 2wc doesn't get it. Or you could use, "What is unknown about my reactions?" to shake it out, clearing the auditor so the PC can talk to him. You are not trying to run a sec check on the PC however. If you get a read on withhold, the PC tells what it was and it still reads, you release it with, "To whom wasn't that known? / To whom shouldn't that be known?". This is the nastiest withhold process ever dreamed up!

This process cleans up basic-basic on the ARC break chain: "What didn't an auditor do? When? / What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?" You can clean up the immediate session ARC break with, "What weren't you able to tell me?" "When?" Or a shorter process," What didn't I do? When? / What weren't you able to tell me? "When?"

This is the final descendant of the discovery that communication is the most important corner of the ARC triangle. As long as you run a recall, it's perfectly safe to run, "What weren't you able to say?", but don't put it in the present or future, or it will be an out-of-ARC process, e.g. "What wouldn't you be able to say?" This could even be unanswerable. You can use the past tense process with specific terminals, e.g., "What weren't you able to tell your mother?" Psychotics have gone sane on, "Think of communicating with somebody," run for 25 hours, despite the stuck flow aspect. But it wasn't communication that aberrated anybody; it was the not-communications. So a recall on the not-communications operates as a very powerful process. To round it out as a total valence process, get the other flow, "What wasn't (terminal able to tell you? When?" That would be a powerful valence splitter. So skip Prehav 13* as a way to clean up PTP's with present time environment terminals. Run the above. * Prehav 13 is a process which combines overt running with prehav assessment and running of brackets, relative to a list of charged terminals. See tape 6106C21 SHSpec-17.

There's a booster to this. The PC is in a position where he is expecting somebody to do something because he is depending on somebody to do something. If somebody doesn't do it, he's left in She soup. So in a session for an auditor not to have done something and for him not to have been able to tell the auditor is a frequent source of ARC breaks. Running that out picks up all the times he wasn't in session and cleans up past sessions.

To make a long run out of this, use, "What didn't an auditor do? When: / What didn't you do? When?" and "What weren't you able to tell an Auditor? When? / What didn't an auditor tell you? When?" That Would made a well-balanced process to clean up the PC's auditing track. She full dress parade would be to assess all the people who the PC is having ARC breaks with, take the best reading one, and run it in the above commands. This moves the valence out. Don't run it very long on any of these terminals, or it's dangerous. Use it especially on terminals who are connected to the PC but object to scientology.

If you put ritual ahead of getting auditing done, you would be wrong every time! Form can get in your road. The time for using perfect form is when everything is going well. The whole world of diplomacy is a world of form rather than doingness. The idea that the safe thing to do is to adhere to

ritual because then you are not responsible is the whole basis of diplomacy. If you think form will get you out of trouble where you need wit, you are wrong. Always put getting the job done ahead of doing it by the rules. The rules will only fit a majority of cases. Being well trained to use form doesn't excuse you from being clever when necessary, staying within the Auditor's Code.

6109C20 SHSpec-56 Q and A Period: What is knowable to the PC.

Why do you get a reaction on the meter at all? That which is in the ken of reaction is in the knowledge of the PC. That which will react is knowable. An E-meter can only react on those things which are instantly and immediately restimulated by the preclear himself. The reason why you assess for an engram is not to find the hottest charge. The reason you assess is to find out what is real to the PC -- what the PC can connect with. E-meters always used to be backed up with clever interrogation. This is especially true in sec checks. If something reacts, it is real. Don't enforce a reality on the PC contrary to what the PC says.

Groupers give the PC an apparency that all time has jammed. A grouper is a number of incidents becoming apparently located in one time instant. The "collapse of track" that the PC experiences when they hit him doesn't in fact occur in session. It occurred at some earlier track point.

The anatomy of a grouper is commonly a cold-installed vacuum associated with implants. A person who has a grouper has implanted people. The only thing which can mash electricity like that is a cold vacuum. You could brainwash someone by smashing dry ice in his Face and holding it there. His bank would collapse. Cold is extreme stillness. Time is a temperature. No temperature equals no time equals no motion. Therefore you must not run no-motion, particularly near a grouper. So all you can run in the vicinity of a grouper is motion and time. It doesn't necessarily work fast.

Add unknownness to that and it really gets interesting. You could ask, "When was the time unknown to you? What haven't you known about time? What time was unknown? To what person has time been unknown?". "What motion wouldn't you care to undertake?" gives motion and restraint, or "What motion was unknown?", which runs surprises and produces mean somatics. The grouper will look like it's stacking up and getting worse no matter what you are doing, but it's not. That's just the apparency.

You could relieve the grouper by running out the auditor and the session where he hit it. All you have to do to free up a grouper is to find the picture that the PC isn't grouped in and run it. This rehabs his confidence in his ability to run pictures.

What does a grouper look like? Like an art gallery, all of whose pictures were thrown in a heap and glued there. The incident which produces one is like this: a rocket jockey lying on a bed. being hit by electronic rays, so as to prevent him from exteriorizing and going back to running one of those planes that's been strafing the capitol. They do an implant in which he thinks he's being hit by moving rays, when implant they move in a cold vacuum on him and plow it straight into his body. A thetan doesn't move out of that easily, especially if he's done it to others. The incident is of a person lying on a bed with pictures flying at him. In running it, keep the PC's attention on the bed, not the pictures. Find whether he's administering the implant or getting it. Keep his attention on the bed and off the pictures. Use, "What don't you know about that patient?", etc. You can unveil a grouper by running ARC break straightwire. Flatten this before starting to run the grouper. And always assess engrams. Don't take one up just because the PC seems in it. Don't run the grouper. Get the PC out of it. A PC is so fixated on it; he is so sure it happened in session that he thinks the session should cure it. It was intended when put there to keep the person from getting out of it.

What kind of person applies groupers? Just about everyone in space opera is liable to decide the enemy's habit of exteriorizing from a body that's been shot down, getting a new body, etc., must be stopped. He must be made to forget the information. Specialized implanting was the answer. The most antipathetic things about the implant are that it's cold, lonely, black, etc. Put those things together and you get a grouper. Someone who's alone in his scout craft for a few years has only his own pictures to look at; he'll self-audit. Space itself does a lot of brain-washing. You hit a meteorite shower and suddenly you're in space falling into the sun, having just been hit with a red-hot object. This mades a hefty engram. When they implant the guy, it's presented as a big ARC break, betrayal, etc. He gets the implant and never knows if they are his pictures or theirs. The pictures will all be of a class. He'll be sure they're not his, which is a nice trick. He disowns them; he takes no responsibility

for it. He dramatizes the irresponsibility by saying it happened in the session and he can do nothing about it. But you can always find other pictures he can run, and some day he'll run the overt side of it.

A grouper turns on with a big somatic that makes the PC very uncomfortable. This somatic can be turned off with, "What was unknown about that pain?" That's a very good assist, too. A PC who's gone into a grouper can be hard to audit, so it's a good thing to find out what he's in.

When running engrams, look at why you're running a particular engram. It's on a terminal chain and should be run as, "What don't you know about it?", etc. You're trying to get the PC, as "you" to run a package called a valence. The engram is the engram of the valence the PC is in, so you should mention it while running it. If you found as a terminal "a looper", you should use that in running it as, "What wasn't known to a looper?" This also applies to running groupers. It's a more serious problem when you have a PC who's in a grouper and you don't know his goal or terminal. Well, go ahead and find the goal and terminal.

Running engrams in scientology, you run them more symbolically than verbally. The same mechanisms are present as in Book I: bouncers, groupers, deniers, call-back, etc. You should use this trick when you find a still picture: direct the PC's attention to the motion on the other side of it, or just before or after.

The Egyptian area is a bad one to get into, because it's confusing and violates the pcs' beliefs. It was space opera from one end to the other. It was a battleground between two space groups. Pcs have trouble running it because it violates their reality, as gotten from history books. LRH ran an incident of Egyptians printing books of orders of the day from the invader force. He knew there must be motion, and sure enough, he found a battle after the death of the Pharoah.

Always audit the motion, the heat. Never call for the still or the cold, and you'll keep your PC out of groupers. It is what happens in the picture. The picture is held in place by an avoidance of motion or a not-knownness on the subject of motion, not by someone saying, "Stay there." You audit the motion, not the words and not stillnesses.

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

93

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.

6109C28 SHSpec-60 Grades of Auditors

[Describes three classes of auditors. For details, see p. 152, below, and HCOPL 29Sep61 "HGC Allowed Processes".]

When you run into the imponderables -- the PC whose case doesn't move -- you're tempted to use some extraordinary solution instead of finding the gross auditing error. This permits the error to go uncorrected. You'll be adding new errors to old ones. The error may be that the PC isn't doing the auditing command, which could involve the PC doing something different or doing something else in addition to it. If the PC has a hidden standard, he'll do something else to produce an effect on his hidden standard. When a PC has a PTP of long duration, he'll always try to create an effect on it with whatever auditing command has been given, so you can't just audit over it. You have to get ruds in and also be curious to know what the PC is doing with the command. The PC with a PTP of long duration will apply the auditing command, not to his terminal, but to a terminal of his problem. It is a good idea to ask the PC what his idea is of the terminal he is running to be sure it's the one you assessed.

Now that you have the rule of the prior confusion, you have an undercut to the PTP of long duration. The terminal the PC is complaining of is the solution to the prior confusion and is a stillness, a no-motion point. You don't audit stillnesses anyway. You get rid of the chronic somatic by finding the prior confusion by assessment. Take the personnel of the prior confusion and sec check them. This is a bit similar to doing O/W on the terminal of the PTP, but better, since it is auditing a confusion, not a stillness. This might even apply to engrams. You could find where the fellow is stuck, assess the prior confusion and sec check its terminals. That's just a guess, at present. Don't Q and A with the PC telling you he can't confront the confusion. Get the terminals involved and sec check them on a check made up to apply to the possible overts. General O/W may be too permissive to get him to confront it. So that's the anatomy of a stuck point on the track.

This also predicts that a lot of confusion went on before the person picked up the valence he's in. There's a possibility that you might get the valence and goal to blow by looking at it, but it's not likely. The earlier on the track they were, the beefier they were as thetans and the more confusion there would be. It gets pretty unreal when you get them looking at it now, if they can even confront it at all.

Other gross auditing errors which could be preventing the PC from making progress could be grossly out ruds, or the auditor having an attitude that drives the PC out the bottom. Or try to audit a scientologist who has been around awhile without sec checking him on the auditor's sec check and the last couple of pages of HCOWW Form 3.

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."

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.

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.

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]

6110C18 SHSpec-68 Valences -- Circuits

"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.

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.

6110C24 SHSpec-70 Clearing

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.

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.

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.

114

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]

6111C09 SHSpec-78 Effective Auditing

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.

6111C16 SHSpec-81 Points in Assessing

Assessment by elimination started because auditors had trouble differentiating which read was biggest. It was found that you could assess down to one item left.

The phraseology in the modifiers gives the illusion of elsewhere, and the PC responds with a total dramatization of the modifier. A call-back like, "but I will leave and come here" gets the PC in PT. Anything you can give which acts as a command to move in some direction will be a bouncer. A denyer is something that denies knowledge of something. Stickers, formerly called "holders" park the person on the track. It's an oddity that these modifiers exist and are appended to the goal.

[More details on running Routine 3D. See 6111C14 SHSpec-79 Routine 3D, SHSpec-82 Running 3D, HCOB 20Nov61 Routine 3D Commands", and HCOB 3Dec61 "Running 3D Levels" 6111C21 SHSpec-82 Running 3D, HCOB 20Nov61 Routine 3D Commands", and HCOB 3Dec61 "Running 3D Levels"]

You'll find that the majority of the skills a PC has in this lifetime are those of his goals-modifier terminal. He'll push his education just as far as it would be needed by his goals terminal. Even though it's no longer an existing doingness. A goals terminal, when found, is only the total answer to the current case from the mental aspect basis. It will take care of so much in a lifetime that it would be easy to make the error of considering that one goals run of Routine 3D and one level knocked out should resolve the whole case. Not so. It will go a long way, and it looks as though the case should be resolved, but the PC will still have chronic somatics, circuits, and a whole new goal-valence chain to get out of the road. You've just gotten off the most available series out of 12, 15, 20. They resolve the case, not just the first one. After all, how did the PC get in such lousy shape that he could get this valen

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.

6111C23 SHSpec-84 Auxiliary Prehav 3D Scale

[This scale is contained in HCOB 23Nov61 "Aux. Prehav 3D Scale". First part of tape contains details on running Routine 3D. GPM mentioned for the first time, here, at least in non-confidential tapes. It's also mentioned in HCOB 20Nov61 "Routine 3D commands". So that it appears that the GPM comes into existence with Routine 3D.]

Run inexpertly, Routine 3D slams the gates shut for the next hundred trillion years for a thetan. What it takes is expertness in metering. If that's what it takes, you'll do it. Back a few years ago, LRH decided, "Well, if that's what it takes to break this barrier and push this thing through for a big win for all of us, well, that what it takes." [Quote:] "It isn't a question of me being bright, or me being extraordinary. I do know where I came from, you see. I used to tell my grandfather... to explain my red hair to him. I fell off Mars and got into a bucket of red paint. was two when I was telling him that, and he thought I was joking! It wasn't a question of what I could do or what my ability was. It was a question of what would it take to get it done. All I'm asking you to do is -- do the impossibility of do it. I couldn't possibly have done it; you can't possibly audit it. I did it. You do it. Is that a good bargain?" That's what it takes.

If you don't know how to read a meter, of course you don't have much confidence in your ability to run one, and after someone has thrown the meter at you or you've thrown the meter, and someone has missed your withholds a few times, of course, your ability to read a meter deteriorates like mad. What you are really beaten by is not the meter, but the operator of the meter.

Einstein had the concept of the observer. He even wrote a paper on the subject, entitled "The Viewpoint of the Observer" An observer is somebody who, without the introduction of an opinion, can look exactly and directly at a needle or registering item and say exactly what it did without further introduction of an opinion. Psychologists and psychiatrists do not observe. They are so interested in doing something that they never notice what they are doing it to. Thus, these disciplines, not knowing what an observer is, have denied us data because they introduced opinion and evaluation. The ability to observe as a single action is what is required to run an E-meter. If you take that as a separate action of the auditor, you will get the whole problem compartmented properly. And only when you do that action do you do anything else. We don't sit there and worry about what we will do if the needle does something.

Why should the observation of the needle assault reality? It's just an observation. Keep the observer independent of the doer and you are all set. The needle acted in a certain way. What it means and what you will do about it are utterly separate from the observation that it acted in a certain way. Try just observing a tree sometime, with no opinion or think. You'll find it very interesting. Now look at the tree when the wind is blowing. If you can hold this as an observation, independent of an emotional reaction, opinion, doingness, summation, or prediction, fine. It is characteristic of the human race that they predict without bothering to see.

As far as the E-meter is concerned, an auditor must be purely an observer who can look and see exactly what the needle is doing. It may take only one tenth of his attention, but it must be pure attention. The analysis of what the PC's mind is doing is another activity, a perfectly valid one, but one which follows the observation. One must not be so fond of one's theories that one slants the observation to prove the theory right.

The fact that LRH is willing to observe and very seldom goes to sleep and keeps his mind on what he's doing, as an auditor, is what gets him good auditing results. To observe for one second is a skill of sorts. That's what metering takes. What happens is what happens, with no alter-is connected with the observation. Where you have a bad assessment, it's because hopefulness or pessimism has

entered in. You need the willingness to put something to the pure, reliable test. An observer needn't know anything about scientology or the mind. All he needs to know is whether something happened or not, and what. Pure observation is a nice trick.

If you get a PC who talks during an assessment, just get him to shut up so you can assess. He won't ARC break as long as he sees he's getting your attention. You don't care what he does, as long as he holds the cans and lets you assess.

The mechanics of it is thus: It doesn't matter whether he is thinking about it or not. You're assessing his bank, and no power on earth could prevent his bank from reading on the right level for that terminal. Many systems may be followed, but they would all share the principle of getting the maximum number of levels in a minimum time with a minimum restimulation of the PC.

If you jar someone's attention onto his terminal, it'll stay there awhile -- for several levels. You can take advantage of that by assessing several levels without repeating the terminal.

6111C28 SHSpec-85 Havingness

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.

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.

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.

6112C14 SHSpec-93 Anatomy of Problems

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.

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".

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.]

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.

134

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."

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.

6202C01 SHSpec-108 Flows

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:

FISH FOR   NO FISH
<------------------------------->
          SUPPER

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.

6202C06 SHSpec-111 Withholds

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.

6202C14 SHSpec-117 Directing Attention

If you can't easily release an ARC break or easily get a rudiment in, it is always safe to assume that havingness is out. When the PC's attention is distracted, havingness drops and the bank tends to collapse on him.

[Details of running Routine 3DXX]

Don't hesitate to check a ruds question twice if you are in doubt about a read. Be careful; be precise. Don't put looking good over doing a good job. Put accuracy first. The only person who loses, otherwise, is the PC. It is the same with being "kind" to the PC or failing to direct the PC's attention or anything that adds up to no-auditing. And keep the "should have knowns" cleaned up, and you will never get ARC broken PC's. It is interesting to note that if you look over an old sec check and find the missed withhold at the point where the PC went into a past life, you will find one in this lifetime. It is connected, and it restimulates the past life, and maybe it is a hot one that got missed by going backtrack. It is true that withholds in past lives are causing all the PC's real difficulties, but they are handled in 3DXX, not missed withholds.

The PC never forgives you if you let him give up. If you don't direct the PC's attention, you will get no gains in session. If you let a PC's attention wander, that is more productive of ARC breaks than directing his attention, even if it doesn't seem nice or kind. Your attitude to the PC (mean, kind, or whatever) doesn't much matter, as long as you are effective. You don't overwhelm the PC with mood; you overwhelm the PC with inval and eval. It is not being ladylike or gentlemanly that gives the PC gains. It is directing the PC's attention, however crudely and badly, and being effective.

The liability of prepchecking and the withhold system [of HCOB 12Feb62] is that every time the PC comes close to the key withhold, he is likely to get cross with the auditor. It is an indicator -- the missed withhold mechanism with a curve in it. You innocently ask the PC, "Who didn't know about that? Who should have known?", or whatever, get down to "All?" and have the PC irritated. Now you are on the edge of it, that's all. If you don't head the PC on down the alley to face that withhold, you will have an upset PC.

Primary withhold pulling flubs:.

1. The PC natters about Joe; the auditor gets only motivators, thus letting the PC commit more overts by making damaging statements.

2. Letting the PC give you other people's withholds, that being interesting gossip. A waste of time.

3. Taking critical thoughts without getting the underlying overts. This gives no gain.

4. Stenographic auditing. A failure to direct the PC's attention.

It lets his run his havingness down and commit overts of defaming people.

Critical thoughts are an indicator of overts and can be used to "trap" the PC into leading into the overts. Fifteen or twenty seconds of listening to them is enough. Under the withhold system, a critical thought can be a one question. "All" will get the rest, where you can coax the PC into revealing the rest. The "one" question is never the question you work hard on; it is just used to test. This is especially true when it is a critical thought. You are after all the "done"; the critical thought question won't clear until you've got all the "done".

The withhold system helps you direct the PC's attention to where it should be put. But it is still not a rote, robotic action. Put a little invitation and coax into it, plus a little insistence to look. If you want to know the answers and you are interested, you will operate much more effectively. You can meter-

date to help the PC to look, because withholds do scramble or group the track and make it difficult for him to spot "when". Your rancor, if any, should only be directed at the aspect of the PC's looking not at his telling you. Even if the meter reacts, the PC doesn't know. In fact, it is because the PC doesn't know that it reacts. If you imply that he is deliberately not telling, you put him into a games condition.

Use whatever trickery, persuasion, or skill you like to direct the PC's attention. But direct it. Get the PC's interest in it, too. If you get an irregular response to the withhold question, ask the PC if a repetition of the question is causing an ARC break, because the E-meter has a confusion point. Data in the bank and an ARC break can both give a response. [Cleaning a clean will produce an ARC break on the missed withhold of nothing.] A lot of auditors ran goals and terminals lists up to thousands of items by getting protest reads on the demand for more items. Commonly, though, after you clean up the ARC break, in running the withhold system, the PC will have more on the withhold. The PC gets misemotional with the auditor because the auditor represents all the people who should have known about the withhold and didn't. If the PC doesn't get misemotional, it is a sign that you are not getting anywhere because you haven't hit anything hot. If the PC stays bright and cheerful through the session and never gets anything that makes him feel bad or look bad, he is liable to ARC break after the session, feeling that it was wasted time.

Don't expect the PC to go on a gradient scale of getting better, on the withhold system. He goes on a gradient scale of looking worse. Life has begun to loom as a grim, serious proposition. They may go into this curve and out in twenty minutes, or in four sessions, depending on the beefiness of the zero question -- how hot a button it is, with how much avoidance in it.

The hotter the question, the more charge there is to be bled. The milder the charge, the shorter the cycle of action. This cycle is not the usual processing cycle. It is: "Is alerted; goes down to the bottom; then shoots up to the top."

The entire force of an aberration is directed to pulling the attention in while buffing it off. You don't have to pull the PC's attention to the middle of any aberration because it is fixed there. Dut every aberration has a buffer that bounces the PC out again. It is not a clear inflow or outflow. The mind is actually concentrated on it 100%. So the more you get him to look in that direction, the paler and worse he will look, until he gets it all cleaned up. Then you get to the last remnants of it, you really have to help the PC out, because he is stonied; he just can't force his attention into it. So letting his attention ride all over the place is letting the PC be the effect of the withhold and the charge, and he will never forgive you. As the cognition approaches, the attention is harder to direct into the center of the withhold. Given something the PC has really non-confronted at the time, he will often have some bit of it that he has utterly fictionalized, written script for, etc. He backs out of all responsibility for it, and, as his attention gets directed at it, he tends to veer off and gets chargy and irritated at the auditor. You must differentiate between the PC who is ARC broken because he is in a games condition with the auditor and one who is introvertedly ARC broken and snapping at everything. They look quite different.

If you direct the PC's attention terminatedly to the whole precise withhold, you will get a fine resurgence; if you don't, the PC will be miserable because his whole bank is kicking him in the head, because there is no one helping him hold it down. You have to keep your eye out for the PC's tendency to go general on you, to never give you anything specific, and to just gloss over the top of it all. You have to get the PC to look. He has to tell you when he has seen it, but he will tell you only when he knows. If he says, "I don't know," just say, "Let's find out; let's look; let's dig a bit." Don't think the PC is upset with you when he is upset with the bank. Emphasize looking, not telling. The PC will tell you what he can see.

You can clean up a PC who has had some auditing, some sec checking, with recurring withholds, by getting what withhold kept coming up and using the withhold system [steps 2, 3, and 4 (When, all and who. See page 186 above.] used repetitively to discharge the "what" question, or one question] on it to find what has been missed in it. You can also start from who the PC has complained about a lot. But, knowing 3DXX, you won't sail in towards a target that is a terminal. Your zero question should be on doingness, knowingness, or havingness, not beingness. Probably any terminal that has been located on 3DXX could be moved in on and prepchecked by this system. This hasn't been tried yet, but those would be the beingnesses to take up, if any.

6202C15 SHSpec-118 Prepchecking

150

[Details on running of prepchecking. See HCOB 1Mar62 "Prepchecking (A Class II Skill)" for an outline of the procedure. Prepchecking can be used in a Problems Intensive, as given in tapes SHSpec-65 to 67 and pages 23 to 27, above, and well outlined in HCOB 9Nov61 "The Problems Intensive -- Use of the Prior Confusion". Taking the terminals from the prior confusion, you can make up a zero1 question with, "What about your difficulty with (e.g.) Fred?" Then you can get the one1 question and do the withhold system on that to clear difficulties with Fred". If you get a new "What" question, you could call it one2, etc. You can also make zero questions out of the dynamics, e.g. zero1: "Are you willing to talk to me about yourself?", zero2: "Are you willing to talk to me about sex and family?", etc.]

An auditor has to get the highest possible degree of relaxation on the part of the PC. If it is built up, the PC will stay in session come Hell or high water, even if he is mad at you. Prepchecking is particularly liable to send the PC out of session because in it you are asking for very intimate activities. Also, just before he hits one of those big withholds, it is a missed withhold and has been for several seconds at least, i.e. for as long as he has spotted it and before he has told you. He is actually influenced by it before he hits it, but misattributes it to the auditor. So it pays to clear the auditor well, early on.

When you are pulling withholds, "self" is the one the PC feels he is damaging, because giving up withholds threatens personal survival. Sometimes pcs run themselves down and make the overt worse than it is in a desperate effort to make it blow.

If you are going to be handling some subject in the body of the session, and it comes up on ruds, don't try to handle it with the ruds. You can let the PC know there is something there and that it is what is in the session. If you are caught short without knowing the PC's havingness process, a nearly sure-fire one is one that has him reaching and touching things within his reach. The only danger in it is, with some small number of pcs, that it takes a long time to flatten and can turn on tactile pain. If so, this process was what was needed.

Prepchecking solves an old problem: how to bring a PC who is reading below 2.0 on the meter up.

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.

6202C21 SHSpec-114 Use of Prepchecking

In prepchecking, you are trying to find underlying overts; that is what the when, all, who refers to. You are not just getting withholds. You are interested in chains of overts. The anatomy of the mind is that the basic incident holds She chain of incidents in place. You are not looking for the hidden part of a single incident; you are looking for the hidden earliest incident. The PC sees only the most recent incident until you get him to as-is by telling you the when, all, and who. We aren't looking for basic-basic on it because that is anchored in a valence which you will only find in 3DXX. Prepchecking is limited to this lifetime; the chain will blow if this lifetime's basic is found.

So "What" questions never apply to only one incident; neither do the when, all and who. You have great fluidity in what questions you ask. The "what" question, however, should be specific enough to find a chain. Different dates come up on question two. You try to clear the "What" you've got. If you

can't, find the subsidiary chain and clear it. If you can't clear that, clear the subsidiary chain it depends on, etc., etc. Stay on the same subject.

The zero question is just a rudiments question that gives a starting point. You can go with these by dynamics, get a kind of one question, then follow that down to a withhold and get a real one question. LRH has used, e.g. for the initial one question, "What about your physical difficulties?", the question, "What physical difficulty would it be unsafe to reveal?", got a list, got an item reading well which now gives a proper one question, "What about rectum trouble?", and one can go back to work. The only riskiness in this case was that it led to an identity, the PC's little brother. We try not to use identities in prepchecking, but if that is all you can get, well.... The inevitable question, if some subject doesn't clear up, is, "What have you done to _____ ?" There must be something there, just from the basics of the overt-motivator sequence.

You don't treat every withhold as a new "what" question. When the PC gives one, ask, "What about this chain of withholds?" That is, you should phrase it as a more general action, but not so general as to take in the whole reactive bank. You work your way down to something that clears, then work on back. You may get hung up along the way back, requiring some new chain. The PC could jump chains. Follow along as necessary, but be sure to retrace your steps. It all depends on the fact that hidden information exists on the chain someplace. When you get that, the whole chain will unravel. The overt may be quite mild. You are looking for a needle in a haystack, so don't look. Just run the system and it will show up.

The best way to establish the question is by the approach described here. It is called prepchecking, because it is preparatory to clearing. Prepchecking gets the PC's rudiments sufficiently cleaned up so 3DXX can be done with more ease. That is why the basic prepcheck questions are ruds questions. For the withhold rud, use a Form 3 [see p. 186] and Form 6a. [See HCOPL 3Feb62 "Auditor Processing Check". This is a shortened form of Form 6 and is intended for students who have done a fair amount of auditing.] For problems, you have the Problems Intensive. You prepcheck the withholds the PC comes up with in prior confusion areas. You can do the same with end ruds: half-truths, untruths, etc. For the question about influencing the E-meter, you can handle it more broadly, with "meters', "electronic gear", "mind reading", etc., so the PC can be at ease with the meter. Get his ruds in with a thud and they won't get in the way during 3DXX.

When you change valences because of 3DXX, new areas will come to view. But finding a new valence because of 3DXX doesn't mean the PC moves out of and abandons all his old valences. The 3D problems mass pulls apart a bit; it has less influence on him than before, but, just before you find this, the PC will dramatize the new valence coming up. That dramatization influences the case and tends to throw ruds out. Put if the PC is already capable of being kept in session, the influence of it is minimal. You don't have to pay a lot of attention to it. The PC will have cognitions, come up with withholds, not as part of ruds, but as part of 3DXX. You could omit the prepcheck, in fact, but then the 3DXX would take about four times as long to do because of the upsets that 3DXX tends to produce anyway. Prepchecking tends to improve stability on a case by handling O/W's, so the PC is not in for a big shock when running 3DXX uncovers new material. A well done prepcheck is like a complete psychoanalysis every three or four hours.

A person can become very morose, upset and low doing 3DXX. If you will ever have trouble with his ruds, it is now. So it is nice to be able to get ruds in. Prepchecking is also valuable just in itself.

After you have all the PC's terminals and oppterms all laid out on their line plot, don't be sure that you have seen the last of prepchecking. Probably a similar technique will be used to take these items to pieces. Therefore, you are not concerned, before you have the GPM isolated, with any past-life activity. Those are the withholds of a whole life, which you find with 3DXX.

Since the basic holds the chain down, you don't struggle too hard with some sticky withhold; if it keeps reading and doesn't clean up with your 2, 3, and 4, there is something else to look for.

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]

6202C27 SHSpec-115 Prepchecking

Don't take withholds you, the auditor, have and assume the PC has them. This does tend to happen. If you ask an auditor to list the withholds he thinks the PC has, he will list his own, especially if he doesn't know the PC very well. You could take that list and check it against the auditor's list of withholds and come out pretty close.

Sometimes the auditor doesn't even realize what chain he is running. He may recognize it afterwards. This happens especially if the auditor doesn't take some time at the beginning of session to sort out the area. For instance, once LRH started from a PTP, then, after 5 1/2 hours, he realized that the subject of the chain was women. Once the auditor knows the basics of metering and repetitive questions, TR's, etc. and the mechanics of prepchecking. he just needs to practice doing it until one day he finds it quite natural. Nobody can lay down what the PC will give you as withholds, so you can't make it into a totally rote procedure.

Don't try to impose your moral code on the PC, and don't let yourself get talked out of pulling a withhold because it doesn't offend your mores, when it does bother the PC.

A 3DXX item that gives the PC pain is the PC's terminal; an item that gives sensations and misemotion is the PC's oppterm. To prepcheck a terminal, take whatever the terminal's doingness is and get what the O/W in the area is, even if it is totally backwards. E.g. the item could be "a moral man", the zero question for this would be, "Have you ever been moral?" You can get into the whole area of laudable withholds. If the terminal was withheld, all the terminal's actions were also withheld; there is also a lot of withholding just in the laudable withhold area, which could add up to withholding oneself from living.

[More details on running Routine 3DXX]

An item isn't a winner; it is only an apparent suppressor of other things and items. There are two kinds of withholds for each terminal: the withholds of dramatizing it and the withholds of not dramatizing it. So, if you dramatize the item, you are obviously wrong, and if you don't dramatize it, you are wrong. So you get withholds off both doing it and not doing it.

The easiest time to start to clear the PC is when the PC is clear, of course. Now you have all the data you need to do it; you know all about it. But you have to apply the mechanics of scientology to a case at a time when you don't have all the data. What you do have is all the rules, axioms, parts of the mind, be, do, have, etc. You also have procedural systems like the withhold system to get what is keeping the PC from communicating. But what are the withholds? How are they formed up? It is up to you to find that out. You will find that if you give the PC a good, controlled session, going right down the groove of something the PC can talk about because it is on the chain of withholds the PC can

talk to you about, that are real to the PC as withholds, and if you can keep the PC's attention directed and if you make the PC go on and look, you will find that the PC makes his goal and gets gains.

A test of whether you are doing well with the PC is whether you know more every few hours about what makes this case tick., whether you have a higher understanding of the PC and of the human mind. That is what you would expect of a prepcheck activity, as well as the PC making his goals and gains. If your prepchecking is bad, it could be because your auditing is bad, or it could be that you can audit but you can't prepcheck. You may have been expecting the PC to grow wings during prepchecking. If prepchecking seems very arduous to you, you are probably not doing it right. It is really easy when you are doing it well, like riding a bicycle. It is easier than other auditing and gives more gains per unit of time than any other auditing.

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

157

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.

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.

6203C21 SHSpec-124 Prepchecking

A PC's attention can become so concentrated on a particular part of the GPM that he does not recognize that the GPM has some 40 or 50 combinations in it. Trying to get the PC's attention off the last combination you found and onto the next combination you have found sometimes takes some doing. The GPM is areas of stuck attention on identities. The PC ordinarily runs through this cycle:

1. They didn't want it.

then

2. They think it is fine.

Some items are hotter than others and explain more than others. You have twenty or thirty items before you get to the middle of the GPM. The ones at the middle are the last ones the PC finds. 3DXX bypasses and cuts through running items. By the process of finding items, 3DXX gets the bank down to the point of what is holding the bank together. It is rather difficult, since it is over the PC's last hundred thousand dead bodies. Fortunately, only a few of these items are remarkable. The PC has probably been every item he puts on the list. We are only trying to find the items that he is stuck with.

The process of listing keys out fifty to a hundred of these at a crack, and we are left with the one that doesn't key out: the GPM item. The rest are locks on that. What is holding that item is in some more basic, deeper combination. Thus, after you have found some more, some of the ones you found earlier may drop out. But only when you run the central package will you get rid of some of them. The most horrifying ones the PC finds early on are liable to blow as locks, later on, though they may seem very important at first.

The reason auditors had so much trouble doing Routine 3 [For definition of this, see p. 34, above.] is that it is really a much better, though less accurate, way of getting the actual package. It reached deep into the GPM and the case and is more accurate when done absolutely right. Done poorly, it was deadly to the PC. Running the wrong terminal was awful! Routine 3DXX doesn't require the some degree of accuracy and the PC shows continuous progress running it. Eventually, too, you get much more fundamental items than the original Routine 3D items.

The object of prepchecking is to find chains of withholds and relieve them on the PC's case. Auditors seem to be having trouble duplicating this datum. They don't seem to realize that you don't ask a "what" question until you have a specific withhold delivered into your lap. Auditors keep confusing zeroA questions with "what" questions. [See HCOB 1Mar62 "Prepchecking (A Class II Skill)".] The zero question gives you a vast generality; the zeroA question gives somewhat less generality. The "what" question should give you more specific withholds, not just generalities. The zero question is about a whole dynamic. The zeroA gives a generality. It is not a "What" question, even though it can begin with "What".

When you do get the specific overt, then ask, "What about (overt)?" Get When, All, Appear, and Who. If it doesn't clean up, ask for an earlier one. Don't take something else which is vaguely similar but is not the same doingness. Run the whole chain of doing what you started on. There must be an earlier one if it doesn't free on two runs through the withhold system.

A chain gets charged up only because the first part of the chain is suppressed and forgotten. Finding the data of something will cause it to blow. So if you have taken off the When, the All, the Appear / Not appear, and the Who should have known from some incident, it would blow if that were all there was to it. All that will keep it reacting is some earlier withhold. You can help the PC tell you by the "murder" system: suggesting incomparably exaggerated overts so his don't look so awful.

Sometimes you will hit a chain which goes way back, probably as part of the GPM. You can still run it; it just takes a long time. And sometimes your PC throws you a red herring. He gives you PTP's and missed withholds in the beginning ruds. This can lead you off on some new chain which has nothing to do with what you had started and left unflat. The PC has moved into control of the session, which enables him to stay away from some almost uncovered area. Sometimes you can get away with ignoring the out-rud; sometimes it is fatal. Don't, in any case, use withhold processes to handle an out-rud. In checking for missed withholds in ruds, ask a severely limited question so you only pick up the ones between sessions.

Don't let a 3DXX session become a prepcheck session because of the PC's out ruds at the beginning of session. If his ruds keep being out and needing repair, take a few days off 3DXX and prepcheck for awhile. Otherwise the PC will feel he is getting no auditing. If it takes more than three days to find a 3DXX item, you will never get it because the PC will be ARC broken about no auditing. Ruds will just go further and further out. You can even get the PC to put his own out-ruds in by insisting that you are going to find his item. This promises him auditing.

6203C21 SHSpec-125 Prepchecking

The amount of case progress is directly proportional to the amount of TA. No TA = no as-is of mass; nothing was restimulated.

[Details on running of Secondary Prehav Scale for Overts, a way of hitting the overt chains the PC is trying to avoid.]

In assessing, the auditor should be brisk and interested, not so much helpful. If you assess slowly, it gives the PC more time for random thoughts, critical thoughts, all sorts of out-of-session producing stuff. The less time you take, the less MEST universe gets into the session.

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.

6203C29 SHSpec-127 Q and A Period

When you get a TA knob alternating between two different locations, it is a circulation between two masses. This is similar to a stage four needle, but on the TA. It is the case shifting between two valences. This is not the same as TA motion. It is a sudden shift, not a gradual change.

If running a CCH turns on a somatic, you run it until the somatic turns off. If it is not a matter of somatics, run CCH's until the PC can do them all willingly and well. Run out gross changes. Somatics are the most gross; little objections and raggedness are less gross. If you can't detect the somatic by physical manifestations, it doesn't exist for the purposes of CCH's. Too many pcs dramatize victims and make up somatics, etc.

If you wanted the greatest possible gain and the least possible blow, on pcs who were pretty sensible anyway, you would do ruds on the meter along with CCH's. This makes a different breed of CCH's, when it is done this way. You would ease up any tendency to blow and it would make it easier for the PC to stay in session. On many cases, you can't do ruds, but if the PC is fairly upscale, it would probably go better with ruds put in.

[Details on running 3DXX]

The PC is his terminal. The terminal has pain on it, and it is always facing outwards against enemies. So you give him an enemy, an enemy, an enemy, and he will get dizzy from too many enemies. But on the pain phenomenon, he is simply being someone else. You won't get 3DXX turning on constant pain.

If the PC has the same pain, grief, or fights you for 20 minutes, that is no change, but the pain must be something more than the PC's statement about it. You must see some physical manifestation, since CCH's are non-verbal. If the same grief or whatever has gone on for 20 minutes with no change, it won't just run out, so that is why it is OK to leave it.

Why the pain is on the PC's terminal: It is just an observation. However, it doesn't seem too unreasonable that he should get pain as himself. If he has created pain, he will feel it as himself as the motivator -- that is highly probable. You can run an oppterm flat, sometimes, and the PC will feel better. The terminal will still be live.

On CCH's 3 and 4, you handle PC originations, but only out of courtesy. You don't really care about how he says he is feeling, because what you are running off can cause the PC to say the damnedest things, most of them lies. It runs out all sorts of counter-creates, verbal and non-verbal. They will throw you all sorts of red herrings. A PC running CCH's never originates; he only dramatizes. You don't have to get into a games condition with the PC. Just run the process.

As an R-factor for CCH's, you can and should tell the PC what you are doing and why you are doing it, as a sort of rudiment to start the session. Try to get the PC's agreement before the session starts, and then you run the session anyway. After session, you can talk about the CCH's, provided you don't evaluate for him, if the PC wants to talk about them. When a CCH session goes into screaming fits, it is probable that the R-factor could have been established better. You can tell the PC anything, like, "It's a drill; I'm gonna do it; let's see if you can do it, etc."

Dramatizations on CCH's are closely connected to oppterms [and terminals], but nothing can be read out of it. The worst the PC is sitting in will discharge, because a circuit is unable to:

1. Duplicate

2. Have

or

3. Be controlled.

So giving someone control, communication, and havingness inevitably gets them into 3DXX items that are banging in and out. Usually, there will be one major circuit that tries to discharge via the PC's dramatization, the circuit he is sitting in. CCH's knock out the not-is on masses he is sitting in, and he will see them for the first time. Weird things show up from the vanishment of the not-is: heavy masses he has "never had before"; somatics he hasn't felt, etc. He will move on the track in the valence he is in to a more comfortable position. CCH's knock out not-is; you get an "is". The phenomena you see with the PC is the valence. The phenomena that occur around the PC is the oppterm. CCH's also familiarize the PC with phenomena that he will encounter later on, in 3DXX.

SENSATION: That which is produced by reason of other beingness and dislocations of space.

PAIN: Alteration of form. Pain is produced by direct contact between the thetan and an identity. Pain is heat + cold + electrical shock, combined. The PC is always more directly connected with the terminal than the oppterm and thus feels pain. He must be touching the mass with the idea that he is it in order to feel pain.

One of the biggest mistakes someone can make is to regard his body as self.

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.

174

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."

175

6204C17 SHSpec-132 Auditing

The best frame of mind for an auditor to have is one of calm competence and an intention to go on and do his job. This gives the PC certainty that the auditor will go on and be effective; this gives the auditor altitude.

The processes we are counting on today are CCH's and 3DXX. They take a case all the way south, and auditors can apply these processes well. The first test of a process is, "Can an auditor other than Ron do it?" An auditor can do any process that does not require of him more adjudication than can be given him by an E-meter. If you ask him for further judgment, some will be able to do it but the majority will not.

Auditing the CCH's requires that an auditor be able to observe constancy or change. Instructors must make sure that students learn how to do this. An auditor can be taught to list and to read a meter against a list. What requires is instruction of a precise nature. There is only one right way to do CCH's, to list, and to null. Given a high level of competence in these spheres, dissemination will proceed by leaps and bounds. You can do these drills in the absence of a complete understanding of them, though it is better to have understanding to avoid introducing unnecessary ritual. Fortunately, we know why these processes work.

You've also got to be able to prepcheck so you can audit an ARC breaky PC who is madly withholding from you. The least common denominator of ruds is withholds and the least common denominator of withholds is missed. Sometimes you have to find them to get things moving again, to get TA action, etc.

All of Freud's work and all of the work of faculty psychology is wrapped up in prepchecking. With prepchecking, you can find and eradicate childhood traumas. We have also wrapped up the work of Freud's squirrels: Jung, Adler, etc.

Pavlov wrote a four hundred page manuscript for Stalin on how his data on animals could be applied to humans. This has never been brought to light abroad. Communism used it to fixate attention on the third dynamic to the exclusion of all others.

CAPITALISM: Capitalism lets you have what you've got if they can't get it away from you.

SOCIALISM: Socialism lets you have half of what you already own.

COMMUNISM: Communism doesn't let you have anything that you own. This is a total games condition between the individual and the state.

Early faculty psychology tried to relieve people of things. From Pavlov on, psychology has tried to do things to people. Therefore, Pavlovian conditioning would have to be undone with CCH's, since it is an effort to do things to people, rather than to alleviate things in people.

[Details on difficulties with prepchecking. LRH states that he is taking it out of the lineup.]

On a sane case on CCH's, if you ever have any trouble getting them to do the actions, their ruds are very probably out. Prepchecking missed withholds will get them in. You could approach it by doing a white farm and getting off the withholds that all She reading terminals have missed.

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 gradually 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.

6204C19 SHSpec-134 Gross Auditing Errors

If a few sessions go by with no TA Action, one should assume that something very gross is going on.

The oddity of scientology is that the textbook solution works, unlike any other field or previous practice. In practically every other subject, the guy on the job is meeting up with situations that aren't covered in the textbook. Rut in scientology, it is when you depart from the textbook solution that you get in trouble. This flies in the teeth of all one's past experience, so you tend to approach the solution with a little variation and deviation. Every PC is individual, and all his originations are different from every other individual's, but what the auditor does is always the same. If the auditor departs from the textbook solutions, he is asking for trouble. Auditing takes no imagination to speak of, no unusual solutions, just a good ability to communicate.

The best of auditors goof at times. The commonest mistake is not realizing that when the PC has said it, it is blown, and taking up all the PC's answers or origins for further discussion. Such auditors underestimate the power of 2WC. The auditor should assume, especially in ruds, that it has blown until he tests it on the meter and finds differently. He should acknowledge well what the PC says, because that is part of the blow mechanism. If the auditor goes on to take it up, it keys the PC in again. When you acknowledge it, look pleased and relieved that it is all handled. If it still reads, give it only as much time and attention as is needed to slip it out of the way, using same brush-off process. If you are unlucky enough not to have the process work, you must have been doing something else.

By giving a flawless session, the auditor can hold the ruds in. Anyone can make goofs, but they shouldn't be frequent, since we want the PC to be confident. Confidence is a result of auditor consistency. Ruds on the environment will stay in if the auditor is consistent about the auditing environment. The PC's confidence drops when you Q and A or act inconsistently. The result is difficulty of keeping ruds in. I.e. lack of consistency leads to lack of confidence, leads to ruds going nut. A PC notices the care that is taken with him. This aids in building his confidence. He gets unconfident if each session is full of surprises and the auditor keeps changing things around. If you keep having to use middle ruds, it is probably something you did during the session. Even a very nervous PC can gradually come to realize that the auditor won't permit anything to happen to him during the session. He will permit the auditor to be responsible for the environment.

Checking on those pcs who were getting no TA disclosed the fact that, while TA doesn't necessarily take place just because ruds are in, if rudiments are out, TA will not take place. This means that TA is proportional to the degree ruds are in, not to the state of the case. That is monitored by what is being run on the case, to be sure, so the truth of it depends on the fact that the right process is being run.

6204C19 SHSpec-135 Determining What to Run

[Details about currently used processes, especially prepchecking and 3DXX.]

The Rock is the first thing the PC had been.

TA drifts during session don't count as TA motion, e.g., on a Problems Intensive that you are doing to see whether the TA moves, with a new PC, if the TA is generally between 4.75 and 5,0, that is not TA motion, to speak of. Motion is what happens in twenty minutes, and it is up and down.

The way to get TA when the PC doesn't have much is optimally to alternate CCH's and prepchecking. Good CCH's and good prepchecking will be a real winner. But even indifferent CCH's and prepchecking will be a winner. They should be done in different sessions.

A person who can't as-is things because he is being it all won't as-is much on either CCH's or prepchecking, but there will be a small effect. Note that the TA he gets while talking to you isn't adjudicative. It is the TA he gets while thinking that counts. If he doesn't get adequate TA during subjective processes, you will know that it will be difficult to get and keep ruds in on him. So he needs CCH's and prepchecks to keep his ruds in.

If CCH's turn into a wrestling match, the auditor has missed a withhold. Finish up the session. Next session, prepcheck with the zero question, "Has a withhold been missed?" Clean it up, if you can do it in not more than three sessions. If it is that sticky, he is having trouble as-ising, but he will have gotten some missed withholds off, so CCH's can operate again. When they are fairly flat, go back to prepchecking, etc. If in doubt when to switch over, go by the Auditor's Code [No. 13, Auditor's Code of 1954: "Always continue a process as long as it produces change and no longer." See The Creation of Human Ability, p. 3.] and run the process to no-change, or switch over when you have gotten a gain on CCH's or on the prepcheck, whichever you are doing.

The goal you have is to get the rudiments in, because then you will get TA. The PC has out-ruds in life, continually. If You could get rid of all the bad feelings he has about his environment and people, you would have done more than any earlier therapy. He would also be able to be in session.

With a PC who is getting no TA, you will bring up his external ruds with CCH's and his internal "think" ruds with prepchecking. The combination of the two acts as an introvert-extrovert action. Havingness goes down on think processes [and is remedied on CCH's]

You should realize that the longer it takes you to get an item, an overt, or whatever; the longer it takes to accomplish something with auditing, the harder it gets, because length drifts in the direction of no-auditing. An item per month is far less auditing than an item per week. The longer it takes, the more ruds go out, and the more violently they go out, the less chance you have of getting the item. Ruds are the most out on the least auditing. They can go further out in auditing than they ever do in life. This gives another reason for auditing in the direction of wins for the PC.

Pcs at first set very large-effect session goals, despite the fact that they can have only very minor effects. The win has to be real to the PC for him to know that he has had one, so it has to be consistent with where he is on the effect scale. If you keep giving him effects you know he can have, he will come up by little gradients. The worse off he is, the longer it will take to get a win. Alternating CCH's and prepchecking gives a good chance for him to start getting wins. He will then start getting TA, as he gets confident in his auditor and feels safer in the session environment. He will start looking around as he realizes that he doesn't have to be all the things he is being in order to survive. He can look at one of them, out of eight million things he is being. You will then get some TA.

Prepchecking had the virtue, as a training process, of giving pcs wins at the same time as it was giving the auditor lots of familiarity with the E-meter.

If the PC fell apart on 3DXX; if he got all messed up and out-ruds, he could be put back on a CCH's and prepchecking routine.

6204C26 SHSpec-138 Professional Attitude

Rundown on Prepchecking

There are several things that monitor the success of auditing. One of these is a professional attitude. The substance of the professional attitude is that someone is here to be healed and the auditor is going to heal him, regardless of the PC's politics, religion, or pace, etc.. The auditor is a professional who is healing beings who need healing. It doesn't matter who the PC is. This is a very hard-boiled attitude, actually. An auditor is as good as he can assume a professional attitude towards the PC in front of him, regardless of any personal opinions or the PC's opinions, creed, etc. That attitude alone has brought the healing professions along through the trillenia.

There are splinter groups of healers who may be far more effective than medical doctors but who don't have a professional code of conduct. These practitioners are far less well respected because they are not that professional or they haven't created a belief in the public that they have a professional attitude. This is also why husband-wife teams don't audit each other well. There is too much personal concern and too little professional attitude.

As an auditor, you will have terrific wins when you realize that a case is a case, no matter what the PC's body looks like, and when you audit with a professional attitude. Having a professional attitude is also necessary because failure to do so will get in the way of your processing results. Push it home and stand by it where the public is concerned, and you will inherit the world of healing, where other splinter groups have not. This doesn't necessarily mean having a particular mockup or appearance. It just means that anyone who comes for processing gets audited as himself. Don't process anyone because of anything. Just process him. This will become a very comfortable attitude to have in session, one with no additives or personal quirks. It will result in Public trust.

You had also better not be an auditor after the session, or the PC will tend to continue to be in session after the session is supposed to be over. Act like an auditor during the session, not before or after.

The public demands only that they be treated by someone who is interested in them. If you always do a good job, both technically and professionally, you will be in good shape. Technical perfection itself is very impressive.

Prepchecking is harder to do than Routine 3 processes. It is the first test of whether an Auditor knows his business. Furthermore, if you can't do a good job prepchecking, you will never do a good job on Routine 3. There will always be something missing.

Don't ever decide what should read and what shouldn't. Observe.

Prepchecking gets the PC in session and frees up his attention so he can be audited. It can also give fantastic changes and gains, if run searchingly. As a total psychotherapy of this lifetime, it completes the work of Freud and any cathartic-type therapy. It is therefore very comprehensible to the public. It could he used to help someone clean up some troublesome area. If you expect too much of prepchecking, however, you will have some loses.

The basic thing that has been going wrong in running Routine 3 is that the auditor doing the process was also trying to do a sec check or ruds session -- trying to mate an eagle with a shark. This also accounts for the fact that people couldn't find goals -- because the ruds were out. You can't combine a sec checking or prepchecking session with a Routine 3 session, but a green auditor will try. If the auditor starts to give one sort of session but finds he has to go on to another sort of session, he gets the impression of loss of control of the PC. If keeping the PC's ruds in is that big a problem, he shouldn't be doing Routine 3 processes. He should be on CCH's. Prepchecks also get him used to being Model Sessioned and get him so that he will stay in session. You will have enough difficulty with Routine 3 without adding the difficulty of prepchecking at the same time.

The whole reason Routine 3 kept being varied and moved around was that the ruds kept going nut on people, and they weren't able to find items. Prepchecking is the remedy for that. It sets the PC up so that when you list, you can just list and find goals, terminals, and oppterms. It is luckily also very interesting to the PC.

From the viewpoint of auditor training, Routine 3 processes are too hard on a case to be done wrong. They can't safely be used as a training activity. Prepchecking, though it is harder and has the liability that you can miss withholds, with devastating results, is a better training activity.

The theetie-weetie case walks around with the idea that everybody should know all the time. This is the perpetual missed withhold case. He is in bad shape. Whenever you ask him a question, you get a missed withhold because you should have known the answer. If you ask three questions, you miss three withholds. He thinks everyone should know everything he is thinking, so there is a mass of continuous missed withholds. Prepchecking will handle it as a key-out. On 3DXX, you will come up with an item like "a swami", and then the circuit ceases. But these cases are Hell to prepcheck, because they think you must know if they know, so they "don't have any withholds"; they "have never done anything". You have to know this phenomenon so you can straighten it all out. That is the hard case to prepcheck, not the sinner.

Prepchecking is not easy, but it is very precise and must be done very professionally, since your personal reaction and personal interest interjected into the session ruins the PC's willingness td get off real overts. He will only give up "safe" withholds if you have anything but a calm, professional attitude. It is also necessary to keep missed withholds cleaned up, particularly if he gets misemotional on you. Auditors have a terrible time getting this through their heads and just pulling the missed withhold. Prepchecking is easy to do if it is done right. It makes doing Routine 3 ridiculously easy by comparison, also.

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.

SHTVD-4A Prepchecking

(Auditor: LRH; Pc: Dorothy Broaded) [Demo tape.]

6205C02 SHTVD-4A Prepchecking

(Auditor: LRH; Pc: Dorothy Broaded) [Demo tape.]

SHTVD-4B

[Above, continued.]
6205C02 SHTVD-4B

[Above, continued.]

A session missed withhold is anything the PC thought but didn't tell the auditor. That is fins for the session, but in prepchecking, you want meat, not skim milk. You want meaningful acts. It isn't necessarily antisocial or unmannerly acts like masturbation or nose-picking -- embarrassing acts -- that you are looking for. What you are looking for is overts, not just seamy withholds. There is a difference.

[Comments on the above TVD]

You can have a chain based on a not-knowingness, even if there is nothing there to be not-known. This isn't common. [Missed withhold of nothing.]

You never give up on the fundamentals. When the PC gets nattery, he has a missed withhold, whether the natter has any basis in reason or not. Not many. You audit by those. You should get your own reality on this. It can be crammed down your throat, but it is better understanding, since a stable datum fixed in by a confusion and not by understanding isn't available in a tight spot. This leads to auditing by being reasonable. Fundamentals are meant to be used. If I tell you something is a fundamental, don't just believe it is. Find out if it is or is not in your own universe. It will be, but if you never find this out for yourself, You will just keep going on by rote and ritual. If you do find this out for yourself, you will not need all your old stable data or superstitions.

"What I expect of an auditor is to audit the PC that is right there in front of him by the most fundamental fundamentals that he can command and understand." He will always get wins that way, and he won't be in a fog about any of it. He will be able to evaluate importances in the ritual.

In prepchecking, your "What" question will often miss the mark by a bit, because, after all, until you have done the prepcheck, you don't know exactly what the chain is. And if it is that unknown to the PC, how could you know all about it before you found out from the PC? Besides, all basic incidents must be unknown at least in part, or the chain would blow. Auditing by fundamentals, you know enough about the chain to formulate a "what" question that will come close enough to get what you need. As you go earlier, you find yourself asking about similar things, but not the exact same overt at the earlier time. You get a "what" question that describes the incident in workably general terms and go from there, hoping for the best. All you have to null is the incident that you got the "what" question from.

Prepchecking is not an exact activity. It depends on the PC in front of you. Because it is inexact, you must do it in the framework of total exactitude that is given in Model Session, TRs, metering -- all your fundamentals that must be known solidly. When you have that, you can play by ear with confidence and results.

Any craftsman can create the illusion of terrific ease and offhandedness. However, the common denominator of all great art is "a great ability to do a small detail." If one tries to shortcut the ability to do the details and just does the offhanded action, the result is slop. An auditor's tiny details consist of the meter, TRs, Model Session, etc.

How do you get to be a superb auditor? By knowing all these small parts perfectly. If you find yourself wondering about any one of them, you must practice, drill to get it straightened out. You can go over these items and ask yourself if any of them have been shaky in recent sessions, and work on what you find. Don't let embarrassment stop you from finding out [what needs to be worked on]. Only when you have mastered the detail will you be free to audit the PC in front of you. You won't be free to audit the PC in front of you as long as you are enslaved by "don't knows" among your auditing tools, because you get a chain of error that mounts in She session, based on the basic not-knowingness.

Don't think that you will get results, real, honest-to-God results, if you are anything less than a master of the craft. That is the discouraging point of auditing. The running of repetitive processes without attention on the PC, hoping far the best, does make a lot of people well, as does engram running. This could get long-time auditors stuck in a win. But we haven't had techniques prior to 1962 that reached all cases. We have them now, but they require precision auditing, a master's touch. You have to find out that the technology we have does give the PC wins. You find that out by auditing and seeing the

results. If you know all the parts: TRs, metering, Model Session, etc., then you can audit by fundamentals with confidence and ease. There is no more tension.

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.

6205C15 SHSpec-144 New Training Sections

[See HCOPL's 3May62 "Practical Auditing Skills"; 14May62 "Training Sections"; -- Issue II "Training -- Classes of Auditors".]

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-146 Auditing Errors

There are two types of auditing activity in which you engage:

1. Rudiments type of activity. You are trying to straighten something out right now, not to dig something up. Done against the needle.

2. Auditing activity. Done against the tone arm. Long, wide sweeps of the needle may count as TA motion. Here you are trying to dig something up.

You have to get good at sliding from one type of activity to the other. Say the PC suddenly declares that the list is complete. You have to shift fast to middle ruds and check for missed withholds.

There are also negative middle ruds, e.g., "In this session, have you tried not to withhold anything?" or "In this session, have you tried not to invalidate anything? Suppress anything?", etc. There are two reasons why your PC keeps picking up more and more missed withholds. One is that you have missed a withhold and the other is that the PC is strenuously and attentively keeping his ruds in, running the session, And being very careful not to withhold, etc. It doesn't matter what you use as a middle rudiment. It could be an end-type rud [half-truths, untruths, etc.] or whatever seems to be needed to keep the body of the session going. The faster you get the rud in, the better. You are not looking for more than a clean needle, even if it only stays clean for ten seconds. If you want a rudiment to stay in, you get your session ruds in and use the body of the session to prepcheck a particular rudiment so it will stay cleaned up.

You can drive yourself and the PC nuts by not acknowledging everything the PC says in answer to your questions, even if what the PC says doesn't actually answer up. You have to be clever in prepchecking to probe around and actually help the PC to find out things he didn't know about. It is possible that there will be no chain and that the overt will blow after he tells it to you.

When you are doing rudiments, don't go into a process to handle an out-rud until you have given it several chances to blow by inspection. If you do run a process, get in and out fast; treat it as lightly as possible. The best ruds process is the one that gets the ruds in fastest. Time spent on ruds is time robbed from the session, so don't get started handling ruds [if you can avoid it]. Just dust them off. Pc's will obligingly get rid of things that you don't seem to think are very important. When you are in the body of a prepcheck, you want to give some importance to the overts you are searching for. By apparently taking responsibility for the PC's overts, just to the degree of being very interested and thorough about getting them, you throw an element of responsibility into the session, and the PC will come up with more data.

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. L. Ron Hubbard Type = 3 iDate=22/5/62 Volnum=1 Issue=151 Rev=0 rDate=0/0/0 Addition=0 aDate=0/0/0 aRev=0 arDate=0/0/0 SHSpec-151 Missed Withholds   6205C22 SHSpec-151 Missed Withholds

Q and A is really Q an A. Some of the forms of Q and A are:

1. Double questioning. Auditor questions the PC's answer.

2. Changing because the PC changes. You are questioning the fact that he is changing.

3. Following the PC's instructions. That is a Q and A of Hubbard.

You are questioning his answers, by assuming that the PC knows more about his case than you, the auditor, do.

The auditor must stay at cause over the session and put the PC at cause over his case. If the auditor doesn't make the PC confront, the PC will obey his bank, which says, "Don't confront."

A full cycle of action must exist with an auditing command. This puts a tremendous responsibility on the auditor to ask the right question. So there can be two mistakes:

1. A wrong auditing question, like "What should we run on you today?" or "Have you had a motivator lately?"

2. A failure to let an auditing cycle complete itself.

You can get in trouble by asking, "Have I missed a withhold on you?", because the PC can give a motivator response. This throws end-ruds out [The first end-rudiment question is, "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me or tried to damage anyone, in this session?" See HCOB 21Dec61 "Model Session Script, Revised".], which puts the PC out of session. Then you have to question the PC's answer to handle the situation. So don't ask an ambiguous question. Ask the type of question that makes a Q and A very unlikely. A perfect question is one that produces an answer that doesn't have to be questioned, since, if you question his answer, he will feel unacknowledged; he will feel he can't talk to you and will go out of session. Even, "Do you have an ARC break?" is imperfect, since if he says, "Yes," the non Q and A response is only an acknowledgement, not, "What is it?"

An auditor who changes when the PC changes is demonstrating so much impatience to produce an immediate effect that he will never give anything a chance to get completed. He lacks confidence in "the usual" working, often because he is unaware of what "the usual" is. He will easily go off into extraordinary solutions because he lacks confidence in the ordinary solutions, because he has never done it. Sometimes auditors Q and A because the PC gets nasty and furious and they back out.

The commonest form of Q and A, however, is failure to acknowledge the PC's answer because one is questioning it. This can cause a PC to react furiously or, eventually, to go into apathy, as an extreme response to being made to feel that he is having withholds missed. Before this point, there is a twilight zone of semi-out-of sessionness, where all the rest of the ruds keep flying out as a result of occasional non-acknowledgement or wrong questions.

If you ask an auditing question like, "Do you have a PTP?" and get an inadequate answer, you can meter check it. If it still reads, don't just keep asking the same question. Ask something that will be answerable without producing Q and A.

When a PC drifts out of session, he is drifting on his feeling that he is unable to communicate with the auditor. The way to throw him out permanently is to punish him for getting off withholds and to make him feel that he will never be able to communicate his withholds to the auditor. The auditor doesn't have to be sweet and nice. He does have to get his auditing questions answered. Permitting the PC to answer something else also throws end-ruds out and makes the PC feel the auditor didn't hear him, since he knows (really) when he is really answered.

You must ask a question that can be answered and get that question answered. If you do that smoothly, pcs will do almost anything for you. When you see a session running off the rails, don't look at the PC as a peculiar ape and don't develop a good Communistic self-criticism. Just look at the questions you are asking in session, ask yourself if they are answerable by the PC and if you are accepting the PC's answers. If you are doing these things right, it must be the PC's environment that is caving him in.

6205C23 SHTVD-6 Check on "What" Question + Havingness Probe

[Demo tape of finding havingness, mainly. Same as MTS-4]

6205C23 SHTVD-7 Fish and Fumble -- Checking Dirty Needles

[Demo tape of cleaning a dirty needle with fish and fumble. Some prepchecking. Same as MTS-5]

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.

6205C29 SHSpec-152 Question and Answer Period

Routine 3G4 is another untested process that might get used on cases which don't get plowed up enough with 3GAXX: You find a goal, then find a goal that would oppose it, then do another assessment for goals that would not oppose it, then assess for goals that would want that goal. You get four goals that all tick alike. Then you list all four and you would theoretically get the four items, which are actually two items, in the same way as in 3GAXX. I can't say what the life expectancy for this process is; it is probably longer than 3GA.

In answer to the question, "Since we don't have a modifier now, how do you keep a GPM keyed in if it should key out and you get a free needle?": Actually, the modifier is only the label on one of the items that you are listing on that listing. You are still fighting the same package as in Routine 3D. By listing each one of those lines, you keep it pulled in as much as you would anyway. You might have more trouble keeping things stirred up for the second goal, but by then the PC should be able to approach the GPM more closely, so there should be no trouble.

Stabilization is just going on and on, getting more goals and more four-lists, until you couldn't get the meter to read if you hit the guy over the head with a club. You are not likely to find the guy flying off in a key-out, because every time you find a goal, you will wrap your paws around every element of it that was part of the GPM. Stabilization is getting rid of any masses the clear might run into which would get him re-involved with the bank. Formerly [before stabilization] he could have gotten enturbulated again. But by doing 3GA again and again, you will get to where there is no GPM to key in. It is so intricate to keep the GPM there at all in the first place. As you get rid of more packages, you get rid of things that could cause the person to go unclear again.

Something else can be done with the person: Drill him into the re-acquisition of skills. That is not doing anything to a clear. It is going into OT, which is the recovery of skills of the thetan. Clearing is just getting the bricks off the track, not the recovery of skills. It looks to the thetan as if he will get his head knocked off if he does certain things. What really knocks his head off is his inability to reach sustainability, which is inherent in his bank, not in the physical universe. As long as he has aberrations, he will key himself in by indulging in such exercises. If there is nothing to key in, he won't get keyed in.

Prepchecking is the best set-up procedure, assuming a very competent auditor. A Problems Intensive [See HCOB 9Nov61 "The Problems Intensive -- Use of the Prior Confusion" and p. 134, above. Note that, as used at the time of this tape, prepchecking was used in place of sec checking, in the Problems Intensive.] is like a junior grade prepcheck, but it can be done by a not-very-skilled auditor. With a skilled auditor, prepchecking and CCH's are by far the best, difficult though it is to teach auditors to prepcheck well. "I've been experimenting the past many weeks, trying to work out some repetitive process which could be used at lower levels to get some benefit. There is a lot of value to it, no doubt. [This involves] a three-way bracket: 'What have you suppressed? / What has another suppressed? / What have others suppressed?'. Same phrasing with 'invalidated'; same with 'failed to reveal'; same with 'been careful of'. You've got these buttons, and you could run them back and forth and undoubtedly get somewhere.... In 37 1/2 hours, you could get as far with this as I could in one hour of prepchecking." The Problems Intensive, using the changes list, getting the biggest self-determined change, finding the chronic PTP, and so on, gives you a way to do something for the PC, particularly if you are not very skilled at prepchecking. But if you are, it is to some degree a waste of time. There are pcs who don't respond to much else besides prepchecking. The "changes list, prior confusion, people in it, prepcheck them" route is very interesting to the PC and gives wins, but otherwise it is an excursion. It is also useful for teaching the auditor to assess, because you get everybody the PC knew prior to the time of the change. This means that the auditor learns to list. The importance of havingness is that if the PC's havingness goes down, he will have odd reactions. You check, "Look around the room and tell me if you can have anything." If it reads, turn down the sensitivity and get a can squeeze. Havingness being down brings masses in on the body, and the PC will get reads with small body motions, as when he looks around and moves even his eyes. The PC is

a bundle of piano wire with masses packed in against the body. With low havingness, these masses are likely to start talking; circuits turn on. The reason a missed withhold reads with a double tick is that the person is pulling back against himself, pulling masses against the body, the same as when havingness is down. Extreme no-havingness results in getting needle action when the PC moves his ear. Watch it in Routine 3 especially. You don't want to do goals assessing on a low-havingness PC. When you find the right havingness process, the drop on the second squeeze, after a few commands, should be a third to a half a dial drop.

6205C29 SHSpec-153 Security Check Prepchecking

[The material of this lecture is summarized in HCOB 10May62 "Prepchecking and Sec Checking".]

[Details on prepchecking procedure.]

When prepchecking ruds, you are talking to the person about those things which are very pertinent to the subject of auditing. These we have to have in. If the PC is living a life of secrecy, we will find that ruds will go out even after having been put in broadly with prepchecking. There is possibly something so wrong with the PC that a Joburg [Same as Form 3.] is needed to clean him up. Cases that go mad actually have a number of missed withholds. It is the missedness that makes them go mad. Their reach into an area is very difficult; their departure from an area is difficult, and the number of crimes they have under their hats is incredible. Their ruds go out as fast as you can get them in, because there is a tremendous weight of unknownness on the case. The more closely the crimes are related to injuring scientology, the less you will be able to get ruds in.

Do recognize that if you can't keep the PC's ruds in, the PC has overts, no matter how innocent he may seem. People who invalidate E-meters and have a Hell of a time in session are having a Hell of a time in life, just because of their overts. The easy way to get it off is to take some broad, pervasive thing like a Joburg, which has every crime known to Man or beast on it. Using the Joburg, you will clip some corner of what they have been doing. The PC would be damaged if the withholds were known, so he doesn't give them up easily. When one gets too many overts and withholds that are too damaging to oneself, one wants to get the Hell out. The extremity of blowing from missed withholds is dying.

If you are auditing such a case, expecting that his overts will be of the magnitude of picking flowers in someone else's garden, you will let them go ahead and croak, out of kindness. Such a PC has a short attention span -- like if they are sick, etc. -- so the auditor has to be fairly quick. He must parallel what the mind is doing, find where the person doesn't want to go back to and what the people there don't know about the person, what he is hiding, etc.

Since the pat list doesn't go straight to the area where the PC has his attention, it has the liability of boring the PC to death before you get to his particular crime or item. You must do it well and positively to minimize his dispersal of attention. So handle things swiftly when you are cleaning up the relatively uncharged questions, the ones that clean up with one incident. A good speed would be ten to twelve chains really prepchecked well per hour, plus twelve or so null questions. That speed keeps up the PC's interest.

A fairly precise patter is being developed. You need to word a question so it keeps getting a hot read, and you need to get the question itself answered, not some motivator version. If you take a motivator, you will often find yourself spending a long time and going nowhere, just throwing end-ruds out [E.g. half-truths, untruths, damaging others, etc. See p. 244, above.] like mad. When you realize you have done this, go back and check it. Don't go on pursuing the wrong course.

Canned lists scrape up areas that pcs are trying to avoid. Done well, you can now prepcheck rudiments so that they will stay in and you can go on to Routine 3. In checking up on past prepchecks, look over only the "what" questions, not the form in toto or the zero questions. The process of prepchecking increases the person's responsibility, so Form 3 questions may now be alive that weren't when it was done before. The "what" questions that have really been nulled won't come alive again. If you find one of these alive, you are justified in chewing out the auditor. The ones that are null will be stably gained.

6205C30 SHTVD-8A Getting Rudiments In

[This is a demo of LRH running ruds and havingness on Reg Sharpe.]

6205C30 SHTVD-8B Getting Rudiments In

[Continuation of the above demo. LRH is running Mike Rigby on ruds and havingness.]

[Note that middle ruds are present-day prepcheck buttons done repetitively, each to a clean needle, e.g. suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal, etc. See HCOB 11Jun62 "Prepchecking the Middle Rudiments".]

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.

6206C12 SHSpec-161 Middle Rudiments

When you ask a second question or double question a PC, you are omitting TR-2 and Q and A'ing gorgeously. TR-2 is an auditor weak point. An adequate acknowledgement is worth a great deal. "Do you have a PTP?" "I had a fight with my wife?" "What about?" -- this is Q and A. In trying not to Q and A, one can err by not getting the auditing question answered. It is not Q and A. is a comm lag that exists until the PC answers the auditing question. This requires that the auditor hear what the PC said, so TR-2 should include understanding and acknowledging. Auditors create more ARC breaks by failing to understand but pretending to. The auditor now has a missed withhold. Just put the onus on the auditor for failing to understand and get the PC to repeat it. On TR-10: "Point out something," the auditor should know what the PC is pointing at and may need to ask. It is fins for him to do so.

All rudiments must contain an answer to the question asked. If they do, the auditor must just understand and acknowledge. That is all that happens. Only when it is manifestly impossible to clean it up with repetitive single questions does the auditor resort to a ruds process. The rudiments are now good enough so that if the PC gets the auditor's question and answers it, and the meter is cleaned on that exact question, and the auditor's TR's are any good, then you don't need any rudiments process.

In using a repetitive rudiment, you ask the question, acknowledge the PC's answer, and check the meter. If not clean, repeat the question until, after a cycle of PC answer, acknowledgement, and meter check, the meter is clean. This actually acts as a process in itself. Don't wait around for the PC to find, e.g., a PTP if the meter is clean when you ask for it. If it is null, just acknowledge and go on. You are actually thereby giving the PC his answer, or you are giving him the answer the meter gave. The last question is thus answered by the auditor for the PC. This completes the communication cycle.

Just repeating a phrase to the PC will de-intensify it in the bank. If it is equivocal because of a dirty needle or poor metering, check it again. Let the PC know what you are doing and why. Do this enough so that the PC isn't left wondering in the dark. Always keen the PC's R in. Tell him what is going on. A PC who is screaming is less ARC broken than one who won't talk to you.

You should put in middle ruds when the PC is having trouble listing more goals. Give the package question slowly enough so that you can stop and clean whatever reads. Then go back to listing goals. You should attack mid ruds so as to spend minimal time on them, so every time listing slows down, zip through them. Every fifth session or so, they have enough out-of-session nonsense going to benefit from some prepchecking. Suppose the PC gets resistive in a session, where you did get beginning ruds in. Go ahead on middle ruds and prepcheck, using middle ruds for zero questions. This will pick up things like inval of goals as a subject, or listing as a subject. That is the commonest thing that causes the PC to stop listing.

On a PC who is on the verge of telling you what to do all the time, a critical PC who is continually suppressing suggestions about your auditing, you can use She buttons, "suggest" and "fail to suggest". These fit in well with a prepcheck. In middle ruds, you are only interested in the immediate session, to keep the needle clean and readable and to keep the PC in session. When doing your four-line list on the goal, do mid-ruds between lines. In prepchecking, you put in middle ruds after each "what" question is null, then recheck the "what" question. This is a fancier way to ask for missed withholds, so don't also ask for them. If She PC is down on havingness consistently, you could do middle ruds, then havingness, then recheck the "what" question. Use mid-ruds when the PC has slowed down, shut up, run into problems, etc.

Middle rudiments make an excellent communication bridge. You can put anything in with the middle ruds following it.

If you are prepchecking against a prepared sec check list and you get five or six questions cleaning up with only the zero question, do the middle ruds in case he is suppressing something. If the middle ruds were found to be out, you go back and do what you were doing over again, except in listing.

The use of middle rudiments can be extended to a specific subject, object, or activity. If you are checking out a goal, for instance, you can put in mid-ruds on that goal. Keep it fairly specific or you will be getting into a prepcheck. You could probably put in every other rudiment with the mid-ruds. For instance, say the PC gives the same PTP twice and it still reads, on beginning ruds. You could put in mid-ruds on that problem, naming it in the commands. LRH doesn't advise this, but it could be done.

Sometimes you add "half-truths", etc., from end ruds, but if you really have to do this, it is smarter to end off and restart the session. If the PC needs this, short sessioning is better anyway. You can also do end ruds on prepchecks, where they are useful to pick up overts and withholds.

If you can't get mid-ruds in, you can try prepchecking them. A PC who has a somewhat dirty needle and has to have mid-ruds done often will benefit from a mid-ruds prepcheck. If that doesn't do the job, the PC should probably have more CCH's and general prepchecks.

LRH has become expert in fish and fumble. Ig the PC's needle was dirtying up and not getting cleaner after ruds, he would start the session with fish and fumble to clean up the needle. Before doing anything else, he would say, after beginning ruds, "I want you to carefully consider your auditing." Nothing happens. "Now carefully consider your wife." Lots of reads. Now clean it up, tracing down only one pattern at a time. The double tick should be handled first, because it is a missed withhold. It takes a bright auditor to clean it well. It is necessary to ask something that will keep the read, or just to pursue the read one started with, or to formulate a what question. You can really clean it up so the needle doesn't get dirty again. The way bad auditing could dirty it up again is for the auditor's TR-2 to be so bad that everything the PC says is automatically an inadvertent missed withhold. [Fish and fumble procedure is also given as a TR in HCOB 14Jun62 "Class IIc TR's".]

One of the virtues of fish and fumble is that it is a fast way of cleaning up the needle, though it could be overused. It is usually necessary only two or three times, The vital read to clean up first is the double tick, the missed withhold. It is pretty easy, using fish and fumble, just to clean it up. Fish and fumble make it possible to do a goals assessment, which otherwise would be virtually impossible, It does require the auditor to be inventive in figuring nut what overt might be connected to the read that

the PC is telling you about. You need to get the pattern of the mind, which is that if there is something the PC is reading on, he has either done something to or with it.

If you are doing prepchecking, fish and fumble gives you a wide-open chance to clean up the needle. Fish and fumble cleans up the needle so that you can prepcheck, and is a barbaric cousin to the prepcheck.

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.

[At this point, LRH mocks up a "World Mental Health Organization" which would inspect hospitals, etc. It would subscribe to the "International Congress of Ethics in Healing", and it would require

doctors to give an account of their facilities, results, technology, credentials, etc.] The right to inspect gives the right to command. It is the first step in taking control.

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!

202

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.

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."

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.

6206C28 SHSpec-166 Rudiments

[Part of the data on this tape is contained in HCOB 2Jul62 "Repetitive Rudiments -- How to Get the Rudiments In".]

Here is why you have difficulty with rudiments, when you do. Let us consider an E-meter on a totally ARC broken PC. It won't read. The gradient on this is: the more ARC broken the PC is, the less the meter reads. It should go by the opposite gradient: the more the ARC break, the greater the needle response, but it doesn't. The fact is: the more the rudiment is out, the less the needle responds.

In a session, you often find the second, third, and fourth ruds out when checked later. This is because, when you don't get a rud in, the later ruds don't read well. A auditor can blunder by not checking what he is trying to put right, after getting something answered. For instance, say you are putting havingness in in beginning ruds. You run the PC on some havingness, then skip checking the question ["Tell me if it is all right to audit in this room."] on the meter. The omission of that step throws the remainder of your rudiments out. You would be amazed at how many answers the PC has that he never has a chance to give you, all of which become missed withholds. He only stops giving you answers after you have made a flub on metering rudiments.

There might be several ways to get ruds in. The current one is to ask, get the PC's response, and test it on the meter. If it is clean, leave it. This works fine, as long as you never miss. If the PC is a bit ARC broken and you don't get a response, you say it is clean, and from then on you have had it. That is the frailty of that system.

There is another system: Ask the ruds question. Indicate, "That reads. What was that?" The PC answers. Check the question. If it is clean, ask the PC, "Do you agree that that is clean?" That gets you off the hook, somewhat. Another system is the one that used to be used in sec checking. Ask the PC the question until the PC runs out of answers. Then check the meter. If there is a read, get what it is. Recheck. If it reads, say, "There is another read here." This is the correct phrasing, while "It still reads," will make the PC wrong and ARC break him. This system prevents missed withholds from developing because it gets the PC talking to the auditor about his case. You get a more fundamental read that way, but you will have to steer the PC, because what you have got is unknown to the PC. You are plumbing the bank. The disadvantage of this system is that some auditors can't leave the middle rudiments alone. They spend all their time on them in a goals session. You should be getting middle ruds in only when everything goes null and you are getting no reads of any kind on any goals. You won't go over several goals without getting a read unless the middle ruds are out. Don't try to cure no-situations. If the PC says something while you are nulling the goals list, just use TR-4. Be sure you acknowledge him, or you will have to put in middle ruds, because he will feel you missed a withhold. You expect the goal to read at least once on your three-time repetition. Get middle ruds in when you get consecutive X's.

On listing, you put in middle ruds when the PC runs out of items. You do it when you change from one list to the next, also. But the important time to put in mid-ruds is when one of the four-lists is shorter than the others and the PC runs down. You use mid-ruds as a booster, in listing or nulling and to test flatness of a "what" question in prepchecking. In you overuse them, you will drive the PC out of session, because it is a no-auditing situation.

So using the "sec check" system to put middle ruds in can overdo the amount of time spent on mid-ruds. But this system will get out the unknown rud that is the real killer. Watch out for the PC who says, "No...." Also, don't get caught up in repetitively asking ruds questions against the meter. Three times, maybe, but if they are that hot, the PC can find the answers. This system does get the PC into session if not used senselessly and at length in the middle of goals listing.

The best time to use this system in a prepcheck session is on beginning ruds, to be sure everything is grooved in. There is a problem there. LRH can't say there is one perfect system. There are a number of types of pcs, but all pcs agree that auditing is scarce and that it must take place and be effective. So any system that wastes auditing time, or seems to, will rut ruds out. So ordinarily, in a prepcheck

system, get beginning ruds in really well using the "sec check" system, but polish off middle and end ruds.

Routine Three is not as interesting to the PC as prepchecking, though it is important. The PC is anxious during nulling, more than interested. So don't use the "sec check" repetitive ruds system on Routine Three. The PC is impatient; he hears the padlock rattle. If you have to use an extraordinary system to get ruds in, the PC is too nervy for Routine Three anyway. The system is just too time-consuming for any PC in the middle of Routine 3. He should already be in shape to stay in session when you put him on Routine 3, anyway. Don't give ruds that much importance.

Suppose your PC always has latent answers after you have found the rud clean. In this case, you can say, "We have the significant withholds off of that," or "That is clean of important answers," or At least we have the reactive answers off it." You want to indicate that there is no needle response, not necessarily that the PC may have no more answers. However, you don't want the PC to carry on after it is clean, nor to invalidate his having thought of something. The PC can get a whole theory worked out on how some thoughts aren't important and some are reactive, etc., etc. If you are going to make an evaluative statement, at least make it an accurate one.

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.

6207C10 SHSpec-168 Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking (Part I)

[See HCOB 2Jul62 "Repetitive Rudiments..." and HCOB 3Ju162 "Repetitive Prepchecking", relating to this tape and the next.]

We are back to basics today in auditing. The forerunners of practically everything done today can be found in DMSMH and Dianetics: The Original Thesis. [See p. 270, above.] Suddenly, also, we are back to repetitive processes, which auditors have always had success with, except for the question of whether the process is flat. In the 17th ACC, LRH had just lectured on comm lags. The next day, he asked how you could tell whether the process was flat. No one could answer! The difficulty is solved with this method of using repetitive questions. They are flat at a precise point. One's troubles can come only from not reading the meter or not believing it. Either will bring about an upset PC.

Model session, repetitive, per HCOB 4Jul62 "Bulletin Changes", [Significant change is havingness, or the room rudiment, being dropped from beginning rudiments, although retained in end ruds. See also HCOB 23jun62 "Model Session Revised".] has all ruds   (except havingness) as auditing questions to be handled repetitively. You would think that slugging the PC with this many processes in one session would be catastrophic. It is, if done poorly. If you overrun by one question, the PC is in the soup. Likewise, if you ask one question too few, you get missed withholds. So either never

ask for O/W or do it right. You can't avoid the fact of missing withholds, no matter what you try. You can miss a withhold just by walking in the room. So you can't just not ask questions, and if you ask a question, you must ask exactly the right number of questions. Some cases -- one in twelve -- even think you should know everything they are thinking. In these cases, any question you ask shows that you didn't know, so you miss the withhold. [See HCOB 12Jul62 " Motivatorish Cases". This is the "theetie-weetie" case.] The way someone got in that state was too much pretended knowingness on the part of others, plus overts against questions.

If this type of person exists, or if many people get into this state, and they do, and if Man keeps being active while being secretive, which he will, then it is inevitable that you will miss withholds an people. So you must learn to run O/W and repetitive processes perfectly, not just fairly well. It is rather easy to do repetitive ruds and repetitive prepchecking perfectly. The only problem is that, with some cases, you have to add "to another" to the "done" question. Otherwise the PC will give motivatorish answers, which spins him in, and the question will never clear.

Auditing is as successful as it is predictable to the PC. Auditors get spoiled by a howling success following an unusual solution. This includes LRH. Such a success can hang an auditor up and get him stuck in the win. The more we learn about the mind, the fewer unusual solutions we need and the more textbook the solutions become. This is a measure of an auditor's understanding of what he is doing. If he wins with an unusual solution, it won't give consistent wins. As time goes by, he may get so many loses that he ultimately stops auditing.

The closer we get to clearing, the fewer unusual solutions we look for. To clear everybody, you have to know how everybody's mind works. We've got that. At this point, we only need to modify the tech to make the result easier for all auditors to get. Two things monitor our tech:

1. The results.

2. The ease with which auditors can be trained up to where they can obtain the results. The ease of application of the processes.

The problems are these: A PC is built like a universe. There is a pride postulate, on top of which mass accumulated. human being is determined to be such merely by having a human body. A doll has the same kind of bank as a human. "The PC's bank is not native to the corporeal self he is packing around as an identification card." Incidentally, doll bodies Rot drunk by inhaling alcohol vapors. Actually drinking would wreck the machinery. We dramatize this nowadays with the brandy snifter. Any mass accumulated to the PC accumulates on his prime postulate. The prime postulate is the basic purpose or goal of a person. There can be a secondary "prime" postulate in any lifetime. It is the alteration of the prime postulate that occurs in the course of trying to put it into effect that causes mass to accumulate, from the shift of attention and direction that inhibits the person's ability to as-is. Change of attention is change and energy is change.

There is a lot to be understood about how mass evolves out of alter-isness. If something goes from point A to point B with no change, point A must be point B. By introducing space, you introduce a via. Space is a via that causes and necessitates change in or of anything occurring within it. That is one of the first things that happens in the course of building a universe.

Once you have time, shift of attention causes motionlessness in time, accumulation, dissipation, interchanges of masses, dislocations in space, etc. After awhile, we get an individual who obsessively changes.

There are two things wrong with human personality:

1. Too much constancy.

2. Too much inconstancy.

Auditors do these two things: they "resist change, even when it is sensible, and they obsessively introduce change when it is not required. Constancy, without understanding, without reason, is simply a characteristic of MEST." So is change. One should understand why one is being constant before being constant. One should also understand what he is undertaking before he introduces alteration.

Unlike life, oddly enough, auditing does not necessarily bring about its own track and its own mass, because it is short track and it is singularly deprived of duress. It is not something to worry about, unless done in a knuckleheaded fashion which puts a person beyond help. That would be a crime. You could audit someone badly enough -- it would probably take auditing him on the wrong goal -- to kill him, perhaps. But it would take some doing.

In prepchecking we had a problem. There is a problem of alteration and a problem of too great a constancy. One of the problems is that an inconstancy of approach by the auditor causes more trouble than an unusual solution heals. Buttons can be wonderful in the right circumstances, but if the auditor is inventing them, intuiting what is needed, they can improve the PC's case, but they lower his confidence, because he can't predict what the auditor will say next. The PC keeps coming out of session with his attention on the auditor. This violates the definition of in-sessionness. If you have a constancy that works: the four mid-ruds, that takes a lot of edge off the case. There could be more, but what you are trying to do with model session is to make the PC auditable, and to cause him to continue to be auditable. The virtue of model session lies, not in its processing value, but in its predictability value, and in the fact that it "takes the edge off the things most likely to distract the PC."

Hidden in any case is a basic purpose, a prime postulate and earlier prime postulates. It is amazing that we even have processes like model session and prepchecking that do something for the case over the top of those goals. It is incredible that these processes make the PC feel better. All the auditor wants them to do is to smooth out the needle so that he can find the PC's goal. The conflict of goals is the senior aberration on the case. Any alteration of a goal adds mass to it and the bank. It is amazing that you can handle handle case phenomena with other processes, assists, etc. But you can't solve the case permanently without recourse to goals.

It is difficult and sometimes impossible to help someone who has overts against that which is trying to help him. You have to set the PC up by getting them off. Don't get spoiled by having good luck with one PC. Most require set-up.

The other problem is metering. You can ruin an E-meter's effectiveness on a gradient by not quite really cleaning ruds as you hit them, by neglecting instant reads. An inexperienced auditor who overlooks the tiny reads that occur on ruds questions can easily and shortly get the PC into a barely readable meter, which only reads on the greatest of greats. The auditor misses withholds from there on out. That is the problem: ending cycle too soon on ruds because of missing reads.

The other problem is being too careful and cleaning ruds that are already clean. Model session, run strictly by the book, is still not a muzzled session. The auditor still must maintain 2WC with the PC and can make sure the PC is content the rud is clean. Too many auditors withdraw from the session, leaving model session to do the job and the PC wondering whether we are alive at all.

An advantage of repetitive rudiments is that only one skill is needed for repetitive ruds and repetitive prepchecking. One of the problems is teaching a number of technologies or procedures. It is better to have one done superlatively than ten done indifferently. Repetitive ruds and repetitive prepchecking tend to get the PC talking to you cheerfully and happily, blowing things and feeling better. If they don't, you are probably doing something unusual with them.

6207C10 SHSpec-169 Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking (Part II)

A repetitive process is one that is run over and over, with the PC answering and the auditor acknowledging. It is run to a precise flat point. When used with ruds and prepchecking, you run it to a clean needle and no further. Beginning ruds would always he done repetitive. Early in auditing, you would also do middle and end rudiments repetitively. It is kind of a prepcheck in disguise. Thereafter, you would run middle and end ruds as fast ruds. You would normally run the random rudiment (missed withhold) as a fast rudiment, not as a repetitive rudiment. You may have to fish around for it. Be very sure you get it answered.

The repetitive rud approach was first used in sec checking, where it was quite successful. Prepchecking using the withhold system -- running chains -- was too hard to teach auditors. Also, this system is hard to use with a poorly reading, ARC breaky PC. It is not as successful as repetitive prepchecking. The average auditor gets more done with repetitive prepchecking, and the PC gets into session better with this method. Don't use more rudiments than you find in model session, though

you can make them understandable, e.g. to a child. If you seem to need more rudiments, you still have the solution: the ARC breaky PC comes to pieces on O/W.

So O/W is added to model session. It can be used when the PC is so involved in some upset that he can't pay any attention to the rest of the session. His attention is so fixated that any change of his attention will lead to ARC breaks and upsets. The other time O/W is used is when a PC is seriously ill -- too ill to be audited. This situation is handled with general O/W as the first rudiment.

General O/W goes into model session right after start of session. The commands are "What have you done to another / withheld from another?" It is not run against the meter; it is run against the PC. It can get his TA moving. Some pcs with a highly automatic bank, with everything grouped and all in motion, will give you a multiple picture reaction when you ask them one question. The PC goes all over the time track. This is not very common, but when you run into it, it is hard to control the PC, and they can't run well on anything -- except O/W. The PC who complains of no auditing result is likely to have an automatic bank. You will find this out if you ask what is happening when you give the PC a command. However, these pcs will respond to O/W and get excellent TA.

So if you notice that you had gotten good TA on O/W, just move it into the body of the session. Otherwise, run it until the PC feels much better and then do the ruds. If you notice that you had gotten TA on O/W when you never had much on Anything else, resume the O/W. You can't really run the TA out of it because of the breadth of the question.

If the PC comes into session ARC broken, all that would happen if you asked, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" would be screams and snarls, letting the PC commit overts against the auditor. You don't ask, "What have you done to me?", etc., because you may be allergic on his terminal line. Besides, this would be putting the PC's attention on the auditor. But you can run general O/W. If the PC seems to be withholding things and having a hard time, you can use missed withhold as a random rudiment (That's what "random" means: "can be used at any time".), checked against the meter.

So you can use O/W and the PC will eventually settle down and look calmer. Then go into your ruds. If one of the questions may have read when you checked it, and you are not sure, don't pretend. Give the PC the R-factor that the read is equivocal and recheck. Ideally, your metering should be so good that you use the TA to control the needle so that it is sitting exactly at "set" exactly at the end of your question, not still bouncing back from somewhere else. Never try to read a needle on a fast rise; always distrust fast rises. A goal doesn't have enough impulse to read down against a fast rise. It will show up as a tiny slow, if you see it read at all. The needle that is flying around has inertia, and a slight read can get missed. So be suspicious and don't hesitate to call a read "equivocal" and recheck. Be sure it is clean before you call it clean, or the PC will know that he is getting by the meter and will read less and less on the meter. You will then have to go back over all your earlier zero questions and see that one gave a tiny read. Don't miss it this time! Clean them all up, and you will build the case back to reading well.

The only time, in rudiments, that you ask a PC to amplify or reneat his answer is when you didn't understand it. If you fake an understanding, you are disturbing the knowingness button. This button is the most serious one you can push in a case. Don't fail to understand the PC while acting as though you do. The onus of understanding and of making something understood is on the auditor. TR-4 is not a Q and A; you are asking for a comprehension so that an as-isness can take place.

You Ask a rudiment question until the PC has no more answers, without checking the meter. If you get a read on checking the question, you use it to guide the PC, who doesn't know what it was, into seeing what was still there. After getting the PC's answer, you then leave the meter until the PC says, "No" again, because he will now give you all the locks. When it is clean, ask, "Do you agree that was clean?" and TR-4 whatever he says. Don't go back to the rudiment if he says he doesn't agree.

The exact same procedure is used for repetitive prepchecking. It depends on the mechanism of cycling on the track to pick up the basic. Pcs will stay in session quite cheerily with this. It takes longer than using the withhold system, but it is much easier and more certain. As long as you clean all the reads you get, the PC will be cheerful and easy to audit. If you miss a few, the PC will become nattery and hard to audit by virtue of not reading well.

If you make the opposite mistake of asking the question again after it was clean, Hell hath no ARC breaks like the one you have thereby set up. This is because a thetan is closest to nothing and you have given him a nothingness withhold [a missed withhold of nothing]. That is very upsetting to a thetan because:

1. There is nothing there, so he can't spot it or as-is it.

2. He is closest to a nothing himself, so he feels as if he himself has been missed. "You didn't buy 'nothing', so 'nothing' is unacknowledged. So therefore he is unacknowledged." So don't try to clean a read that is not there.

This system of repetitive rudiments and prepchecking has a liability: it pulls the PC thoroughly into session and builds up fantastic ARC between the auditor and the PC. Then, if the auditor speaks his mind inopportunely or goes on automatic, the ARC break will be magnitudinous, just because of the degree to which the PC is in session.

This system was invented because, due to the fact that pcs were not well in session, auditors were having trouble getting pcs to read on the meter. Auditor TR-1 also contributed to the problem. Commonly, and in a social context, a meter is inoperative. The PC has to be in session to some degree for the meter to react at all. Social conversation won't activate a meter. The better ARC you have with the PC, the better the meter reads. Meters are not like lie detectors. A lie detector reads because of terror; an E-meter reads on ARC. The PC knows that it doesn't matter what overt he gets off. You are not going to turn him in. If you miss reads, they operate as missed withholds and the PC ceases to read well. The repetitive system gets the PC talking about his case before you read the meter, so it will work where nothing else does.

6207C12 SHSpec-174 Meter Reading

Scientific research follows certain laws, and we have been rigorous in following those laws in scientology. When you can get a research problem down to one variable: Voila! You are there! During the last couple of months, having observed that auditors weren't uniformly getting unvarying results, LRH took every variable out of technology that he could, stripping it down and testing it, to the point where we now have model session and repetitive prepchecking. The meter, once developed, had to be refined, and it was. Yet pcs were still wobbly at times.

So last night, LRH watched three auditors to see what they were doing and found the one variable: the meter read. It works out this way. All you have to do to louse up a session is:

1. Clean one thing that is clean.

or

2. Miss cleaning something that reacts. There is little to choose as to which is the most serious.

A person has a certain knowingness, no matter how occluded and packed in he is. [The thetan always knows.] There is a instinct, as intuitiveness. He knows. You can't fool a PC. An auditor who tries is misguided. A PC knows when a question is hot, even if he doesn't know the answer. He also knows when a question is cold. He has a something-nothing sensitivity. He requires help to know what is there, or to get a high degree of certainty that there is nothing there. His intuitive feelingness is not articulate and there is a need to transfer it over into an analytical knowingness.

When you invalidate the knowingness of a thetan, you will get trouble. The thetan can put up with this, but he doesn't have to like it. He doesn't like it, even though he is used to it and has put up with a got of it and been overwhelmed by it. He has used it as a pitch on others and to overwhelm others.

A PC's ARC breaks with his auditor are much more serious than his ARC breaks with others. You have heightened the PC's intuitive feelingness by putting him in session. Now if you tell him a rud is out when it is in or in when he knows it is out, he has a long way to fall from his heightened in-session awareness and elevated tone level. It is a severe shock, and he gets an ARC break. He is now out of agreement with the auditor to the degree that he was formerly in agreement. "If you've got an agreement that's built as high as the Empire State building, the first scrap of disagreement will appear

as high as [that]." The PC will feel awful. He is finally on the road to truth after all the trillenia, and here is a falsity. It is very upsetting. Cleaning a clean is the mistake that is most mysterious, because the PC can't find what is wrong, because it is nothing.

You can flub once on TR's and still have the session going OK, but if you leave one flubbed read, your session will go to pot. If you are accustomed to auditing with sloppy metering, you have a completely different idea of what auditing is like. The things that are supposed to be in a session aren't there, and auditing is basically a protest, not letting the auditor get too close. Auditing is as fast as a PC is in session, since the more he is in session, the more easily he blows things.

A PC is there to be audited and is very persistent, as a thetan. A thetan can he squashed and overwhelmed. Yet he never stops trying. This is very noticeable in handling children. A thetan will keep reaching, using disabilities to do so if all else fails.

If you set up a perfect session and then and a wild wrongness at some point, you catch the PC off-balance and he goes into action reactively. He is powerless to stop himself from acting. It is as if you had the bank all stretched out like a rubber band and someone suddenly let go of one end. He is in a mess; he gets overwhelmed and starts dramatizing whatever is handy -- namely, one of thousands of instances where he is still trying. He will take such an incident and use it against the auditor. This can get rather subtle. The PC can convince the auditor that he has obtained results, but then let someone else see that he hasn't made any progress. He does this in such a way that the auditor will find out about it.

It is good to know that meter reading is all that is wrong. Auditors have learned TR's, model session, and repetitive prepchecking fine. And we have taken havingness out of beginning ruds to eliminate that source of difficulty, when we found that havingness takes the PC's attention off the bank and extroverts him, which isn't good for putting the PC in session. It is better to use O/W to get his havingness up. This also puts his attention on the bank. Your problems with pcs are the same old things: communication, control, keeping the PC's attention on what he is doing, getting your question answered, etc. You have mastered these things, then sometimes had them deteriorate, at which point you have been persuaded into unusual solutions, Q and A, doing something else, getting anxious, etc. The PC is out of session. It's baffling. What happens to cause this out-of-sessionness? You missed a meter read.

This wrongness may be missed by all the instructors and supervisors, who see all the wrongnesses that follow from it and correct them, to no result. Lots of other wrongnesses may get located, but they aren't really what wrecks the session. The ultimate session wrecker is the mis-read meter. This ARC breaks the PC all to Hell. He will start reading on ARC breaks, not reading because of ARC breaks, etc., and you wind up with a dog's breakfast. This results from the calling of reads that aren't there and missing the ones that are there: the missed withholds and the missed withholds of nothing.

If this goes on for many sessions, the PC goes on a self-audit, because he doesn't trust the meter. The PC can't have an auditor because he can't have the meter, so he audits himself. He gets anxious. He keeps his own rudiments in, like a gopher sitting at the edge of his hole, ready to duck. The PC is running the session on himself purely because of bad meter calls.

So metering, above all, must be perfect. There is no tolerance whatever in it. You must not miss a single read. Meter reading must be perfect, or you become a dangerous auditor. A dangerous auditor is one who might miss a read -- just one -- in a session. If a read is equivocal, say so and check again.

6207C12 SHSpec-175 Meter Training

Auditors make mistakes reading meters. While the basic reason for this is in their banks, poor metering can be countered educationally. The first requirement for accurate reading of a meter is good eyesight. The first thing we find wrong is that the auditor can't see. It may he necessary for him to wear glasses, unpopular though that is amongst scientologists. When a case assessment form on a new PC, we should take something with extremely small print, like a railway timetable or the stock market report in the newspaper and hold it as far from the PC's face as a meter would be and have him read it. If he can read it, make a note on the assessment form that his eyesight is good -- with glasses, if that is true. If he can't read it, put down, "eyesight poor." This will make D's of P and D's of T aware that his metering may be suspect when he starts to audit. Check eyesight again when doing

practical sections on auditing courses. Since a person's eyesight changes with auditing, recheck the eyesight if, as an auditor, he gets crammed for a GAE. Let's assume that all auditors who goof have something wrong with metering.

How wide is present time? This is the next area to look into. One could have an awareness of present time as much as ten minutes wide. LRH has this, at least for movie and TV plots. A clear can tell, fifty to a hundred feet before an intersection, whether there is anything coming; he may find himself "seeing" the truck coming around the corner before it does. He is not looking around corners. He may think that it is a new "linear" perception, but it is not. It's just that PT has gotten a bit wider than the instant that most people perceive. He has a wider fringe of knowingness. A really sharp athlete also has a wider PT. For instance, Sam Snead can look from the point of driving the ball to the point where it lands and know where it lands as he hits it. Great athletes control both ends of a broadened PT, so you get a hole-in-one, a perfectly placed serve, etc. They are always exterior, and the axioms seem very obvious to them. They don't think of their present time as continued motion. Motion doesn't happen randomly in their PT. They think of it as continued control. When they are doing something, they are controlling all the motion in that present time, because they are in that present time and they have the width of that present time to decide. It is as if at the end of two seconds they could undecide what they decided at the beginning of the two seconds, so they have tremendous judgment. They know which decision is right, because they saw it happen. They can perceive both motion and stillness as a total is-ness.

Then there's the guy whose PT is one thousandth of a second wide. He is in continuous anxiety and regret. It is always all wrong. That is a crazy man's present time. He doesn't even know if the bed will continue to sit on the floor. You only get the idea of continuance by perceiving across a span of time, not by comparing different times. The less PT a person has, the more trouble he has with the perception of motion and stillness. So you can run, "Look around here and tell me something you are absolutely certain will be here in one second," and keep increasing the time-span. You could drill the person's perception into a broadening of PT. You could also run, "Look around here and find something that's having an effect on an effect," or "Look around this room and find something that's having an effect on something else." The latter will occasionally turn on a very widened PT. Such processes are really drills rather than processes. An auditor needs to have a broader PT than most if he is to be able to spot a speeded rise, for instance. Reading a meter is spotting motion, no-motion, and change of rate of motion, when it exists.

This is beyond perception. It is a matter of consecutive awareness. There are three moments that must be perceived to find out if a needle is still:

1. The moment before. (It wasn't moving.)

2. The moment it is still. (It isn't moving.)

3. The moment after. (It will not move.)

You need comparison. You are not just looking at one moment. A moving needle requires only two observations, two moments of awareness. Thus it is easier to read than a still needle. For instance, a sitting pheasant is harder to see than a moving pheasant, not because motion attracts the eye or some such reason, but because motion requires only two observations to perceive, while stillness requires three. "Motion takes part of the responsibility for directing attention, whereas stillness takes no responsibility for directing attention."

In perceiving motion, all you have to do is to observe that something was in place A and is now in place E. How narrowly can Places A and B be spaced and still have perceptible motion between them? One tenth of the width of the tip of the needle apart.

The next question is, "What section of the present time you are in do you require to perceive an action or an inaction?" This opens the door to the solution of this problem. Broadening PT is best done by clearing, but it wouldn't work to insist that auditors must be clear before they can clear someone. Actually, clear raw meat, with no comprehension or reality on what has happened is enormously inferior to someone who has the data and goes clear. Training gives a subjective reality on what it is like to wrestle with the problems of clearing someone; trained individuals have a capability to understand people, while clear raw meat is likely to be very impatient with people. A raw clear will also ask the damndest questions. He is very oddball and unpredictable. This guy has been launched

into the atmosphere and expected to fly without knowing that he is in a plane. It is better to go clear with the data. You get more comprehending people that way.

Because it takes more time to see a stillness, an individual has less tolerance for it. Hence a person is impatient with observing stillnesses. His "continuance" has to be too great. Stillnesses absorb time. They give a sense of foreverness. Something that moves does not have to have such a continuance.

However, the period of time required to perceive motion or stillness can be shortened until the person can observe, in the tiniest, narrowest PT, three moments (stillness) or two moments (motion) of time. You do this by practice and drill. If a person's span of PT is a twentieth of a second long, he would need to be able to perceive an instant of time that is no longer than a sixtieth of a second, in order to be able to observe three moments in time in his PT, and therefore to be able to perceive that the needle is still. He "must be able to perceive an is-ness that is only a sixtieth of a second long."

The amount of PT someone can observe can be tested with a camera. You could set the lens wide open and vary exposure time.

The less PT span they can observe, the smaller the diameter of lens that they will be able to perceive at a given speed.

A suitable target would be to get to where we can perceive an is-ness in a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second. People can be drilled to get up to this speed, without broadening their PT.

You could do it gradiently by flashing, say, a slide of a chair for one second, over and over, until the students can actually tell you all about the chair. Then cut it down to half a second, a quarter of a second, etc., until you reach a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second. The student will gradiently improve until he can get everything in the slide in a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second. "The name for the viewing device is "a variable speed tachistoscope". The Navy used this system during world War II for an aircraft identification drill. It is now being used to teach reading and to improve reading speed.

Even without these devices, you can learn to read a meter.

This is necessary, and now we know that it will he done. The result of the training should be an auditor who can tell that a still needle is present, given only a twentieth to a sixtieth of a second's observation time. The old saw about the eye having a "shutter speed" of about a twenty-fifth of a second is a stupid lie. There is a thetan in back of the eye "who has a width of PT and who tends to fixate on what he considers an observable moment."

6207C17 SHSpec-170 E-Meter Reads and ARC Breaks

Meter reading has been exposed as the one point that must be done perfectly. There is a TR-4 phenomenon connected with the meter. The meter, read wrong at all, operates to throw TR-4 out in the session. The PC has an answer which the meter hasn't acknowledged, as far as the PC can tell, so he gets mad -- at the meter, really, but, not knowing what to get mad at, he misassigns the blame and his anger to something else. The PC has had a withhold missed. Or the auditor cleans a clean; he calls a read where there isn't one, and the meter starts reacting on the PC's ARC break.

Incidentally, the wording of listing lines has been amended. [See p. 259 for original wording.] On "Want/not want", the wording has to use the exact warding of the goal, [e.g. "to catch cats", not "the goal to catch cats"] , and on "Oppose/not oppose", it has to be the participial form [e.g. "catching cats']. Precise English is very junior in importance to wording it as given by the PC.

In the metering errors mentioned above, only one thing is occurring. You are violating an old, overlooked law that you mustn't acknowledge a lie or accept a lie as truth. What is this about? It is about prime postulate. [See the discussion of the first four postulates on pp. 14-15, above.] 3GA demonstrates the similarity of construction between a reactive bank and a universe. A universe is formed by a prime postulate which then, alter-ised, makes matter, energy, space. and time. The PC has a basic purpose or goal, indistinguishable from a prime postulate. Therefore prime postulate, or the PC's basic goal or purpose, is the basic building block of the reactive bank. The prime-prime postulate would be the basic-basic of the goal or purpose on which all else would be stuck. [Cf.

Expanded Dianetics.] You won't get it on the first try. You can't just date it on the meter and have it blow, because it has occurred earlier and has gotten mingled in with later occurrences. So don't worry about it. Just take what you get on a goals list.

The keynote of the reactive bank, with all its masses, spaces, and everything else in it, is alter-is , which suppresses down into a not-is. This forms the MEST that is contained in the bank. The same mechanism exactly applies to the formation of the physical universe. Thus the field of the mind is parallel to that of the physical universe. But the mind came first and thus formed the universe. It is fantastic for a being to discover this, because this discovery is in violation of [the principle behind the formation of] matter, space, etc. This discovery reverses the downward spiral. What starts the downward spiral and makes it denser is acceptance of alter-is as fact. "This is something every thetan knows, 'way down deep, he must not do and what every thetan that ever got in trouble has done." A thetan gets nervous when he starts to suspect that he has been accepting alter-is as fact. If he accepts too many alter is-es as fact, he goes into an overwhelm. He is overwhelmed by lies.

The priests of Muggy Muggy (a god made out of mud) can make lots of converts using this principle. If everyone protests Muggy Muggy (the lie) enough, and if the priests can collect to themselves enough motivators, in other words, if they can can get the people to commit enough overts against Muggy Muggy, Muggy Muggy overwhelms the people. This is how you get zealots, fanatics and atheists. They all form a chaotic mess, resulting from fighting an alter-is of the facts. Religious mechanisms have   been the most powerful source of alter-isness of mind and forms. They get protested against most strongly, and thetans get overwhelmed by them most easily. The biggest alter-is you could make is the mis-assignment of source of creation, or alter-is of thought. These exist in the seventh and eighth dynamics. The most fruitful source of lies and commotion is anything that has to do with creation. A false assignment of the source of creation produces randomity all out of proportion to the Act of making the false assignment. This act is, in itself, the father of all chaos. Being Almost on the truth makes it very bad. The most powerful protests follow the most extreme alter-isnesses. Hence the violence of religious wars.

If you mis-assign the source of any part of a cycle of action, in fact, you will get a grossly disproportionate upset. Try going to a museum during an exhibition of Rembrandt and pointing out all the "Picassos". People will argue with you and get very misemotional, etc. Any chaos in the universe will be found to exist by reason of a misassignment of who created it. For instance, George Washington is thought to be one of the sources of of the U.S. government, yet the fact that he actually tore up the minutes of the constitutional convention is virtually unknown. This is what is wrong with the U.S. There is a lot of missing data concerning its source. We don't know what the basic purpose of the founding fathers was.

"Basic purpose, alter-ised, creates mass [and] a degeneration of tone." People who think LRH has alter-ised scientology and dianetics don't realize that we are operating on a backwards track, cutting into the most fundamental fundamental we can cut into, regardless of the forward progress of time. We are swimming against the time-stream. Suddenly, on isolation of importances, we are back in the early fifties, with basic purpose and prime postulate. This is all Book One stuff [See p. 270, above.] We've gone down some blind alleys, like 3DXX. If you do a 3DXX line or a pre-hav line, you are listing wrong things, which just adds more alter-is to the bank. 3DXX was the ridge that LRH found before prime purpose. 3DXX was alter-ising the PC's goal.

We have gone forward on the time track and, at the same time, we have run the fundamentals back. Now we are at a fundamental that runs out everything that we have put on the time track. Unless you follow some such pattern as this pattern of scientology research, you can't backtrack the complexity of structure of a mind or a universe to a simplicity sufficient to do something about it. That's what we have done, and we find, to our great surprise, that what is wrong with the PC is his prime postulate, his goal. That's unexpected. That's weird. A complete whizzer. George Washington is not what is right with the U.S.; he is what is wrong with the U.S. Similarly, a PC's goal is what is wrong with the PC.

"If the individual is no longer able to adequately do something, it's probably his goal.... it'll be the one thing that kinda makes you sigh and that you retreat from." A goal itself isn't really what is wrong with the person. It is really the alter-is of his goal, departures from his goal line, his inabilities to commit this goal to action -- that is what gives him his bank. If he never altered his goal, he would probably he all right. The PC's goal "was a self-postulated truth" that "never got acknowledged, but all around him lies got acknowledged, and this baffled him."

That's really all the thetan is protesting. "Truth never gets acknowledged and lies always get acknowledged." That's the basis of a thetan's misemotions. All thetans operate on these same buttons. So when you make it clear, in session, that you are not acknowledging or taking up a truth, the PC gets upset. That's cleaning a clean read. When you say he has something he hasn't got, he gets upset. He also gets upset when you say he hasn't got something that he has got. Cleaning a clean or missing a read is an alter-is and an acknowledgment of a lie. Nothing upsets a PC or a thetan more than this. So misreading the meter is a betrayal that strikes at the heart of his thetanesque soul. He will try, from then on, to get the truth of the matter across to you. You don't have a PC anymore. You have a crusader for truth, armed and mounted.

We mustn't have more alter-is than we've already dot, because that is how we got in this mess in the first place. An ARC break is an abandonment of truth and an acknowledgment of lies. In a session, you are running extreme truth and the PC knows it. He can feel it. Every time you misread a meter, you have entered a lie into the session. This is the thetan's favorite bogey-man. You have just hit on the issue of the whole construction and destruction of universes and of his bank, and he doesn't like it being that way. You have made the session agree with all the slave tricks that have ever been pulled on him, when he thought you were his friend getting him untrapped. So put in a lie (misread the meter), and all Hell breaks loose. That's why it is essential to read a meter correctly, every time. It is do-able, so don't worry about not being able to learn how.

6207C17 SHSpec-171 Anatomy of ARC Breaks

TR-1 is [based on] the desire to get a response from the PC. If you don't want to know, TR-1 will be out.

If you misread the meter, the PC will ARC break, but he won't assign cause rightly. He will give you some reason for the ARC break, which, in itself, might be true, i.e. a real outness, but the actual cause is earlier. Even if he says that it is that you missed a read, it's an earlier missed read that did the damage. There is always that much alter-is in the PC's protest. If you touch a PC's bank, you put him into a state of alter-is. Because he is in a state of alter-is already, he will frequently do something other than what you have told him to do. If you let him get away with it, he will become unauditable. Therefore, never ask a "Yes" response-type question without asking what it was. This way you spot the alter-is. The PC thinks he is doing what you said. but you mustn't acknowledge a lie by letting him get Away with this.

The degree that PCs alter-is monitors the degree to which they protest alter-is or acknowledgment of alter-is. Telling someone to do something without having control of him is asking for trouble. You should go into this by gradients, since you are asking for trouble if you try to control him at a distance before he is up to it. Don't acknowledge an improperly done command. It is fatal to Q and A with the PC's alter-is. The PC acts as though it will please him for you to acknowledge his. alter-is, but it doesn't.

A PC who starts giving the auditor orders has ceased to accept the auditor as the Auditor, because the auditor acknowledged some alter-is awhile earlier. Note that this ARC break or attempt to control the session occurs some time after the missed withhold resulting from some alter-is. Both involuntary and meter-read missed withholds result from wrong acknowledgment. I would not Q and A with the PC's order. I would ask, "When did you first think I didn't hear you?" or "What happened earlier in the session?" The ARC break could appear up to an hour and a half after the missed withhold that caused it. So don't expect, when asking for the missed withhold, that it just happened.

Here is just what occurs. ARC makes up understanding. If you fail to understand what the PC said, ARC breaks down. This is bad TR-4. At this point, willingness to talk to the auditor drops out, and so does interest in his own case, because the PC feels that he doesn't understand as much about his case as he thought he did. The greater one's understanding, the easier it is to blow things. The auditor must understand and the PC must understand, for the PC to blow anything. As-isness depends on understandingness. Alteration always pursues failure to understand. Not-isness accompanies the notion of incomprehensibility. That is what happens with the insane. [They are not-ised because they are incomprehensible.] The deepest lie is pretending to understand the alter-is. All people have to do to make some advance is to come off their high horse and admit the lack of understanding and not pretend to understand. When one snarls about a PC, just recall the first time one didn't understand the PC.

Understanding is in the area of knowing and not-knowing. [See pp. 14-15, above, for a discussion of the first four postulates.] That is a vary high-echelon pair of postulates. They come right after Native State, so they are rather esoteric buttons for a lot of people and can lay an egg. But a severed communication line, with the missed withholds involved, is very comprehensible. Hence the idea of a missed withhold communicates well. Its mechanics are easy to handle.

One kind of missed withhold is a communication intended and not received. This is unacknowledged truth, the inadvertent withhold. That one makes the PC scream like a Banshee, since it is right on the button of the creation of his mind and the universe. For instance, if the PC can't get, "It's hot in here," acknowledged, he will try to make it stick if he possibly can, even manifesting it physiologically. The other kind of missed withhold is a failure to find out something wrong. The PC has put through a lie, which you have acknowledged. Either way, the session blows up. For instance, the PC says, "I have never had anything to do with women in my whole life," Gin answer to a question about women]. This is a very low reality, probably due to an original low affinity. So you don't give an acknowledgment; you don't buy that. You check the question on the meter.

You cannot create an ARC break by establishing truth, only by refusing truth and accepting lies. It is never wise or kind to permit someone to depart from truth in order to spare their feelings. The E-meter isn't a lie-detector; it is a truth-verifier. The auditor uses it to establish the truth. If he can establish the truth of the situation and acknowledge it, he will never have an ARC break. This requires that an auditor not be shy about establishing the truth, even if the PC is protesting and blushing. The only way you will come out a friend of the PC is by establishing truth. The idea that social lies are necessary is one of the mechanisms for making more bank. Actually, if you told only the truth for twenty-four hours, you would do very well. You would have real friends. But it requires a strong man to enter into this, because there may be repercussions. The first part may be rough, but eventually it has its reward. The way down is stepping back from the truth. If an auditor goes into session with social mores and kindness in play, the session will go to pot.

You can build a whole universe out of bad auditing, because of alter-is. That is why your metering has to be one hundred percent accurate and your TR-4 has to include understanding the PC. A PC will forgive a lot of fumbling if it is clear that the auditor's intention is to establish truth. It is better to be a knucklehead than to know it all. You can even act stupid as a way of making sure you understand. An auditor must establish truth.

6207C19 SHSpec-172 The E-Meter

The E-meter was devised as an aid to help an auditor observe a PC. It certainly beats fingers on pulses! The first Mathison meter wasn't built as a modified wheatstone bridge. Until E-meters were developed, people thought such galvanometers were reading sweat, not thought, because the earlier galvanometers were so insensitive. Engineers and electronics men in scientology have not always recognized the possibility of a meter that directly reads electric thought-impulses, not the physical results of these thought-impulses. Home-made E-meters built by people who do know something about psychogalvanometers, often have a built-in lag which is meant to "protect the movement". The needle is damped down, so reads are late, you read "sweat", etc. Hence no instant reads.

The first Mathison meter wouldn't read on a large percentage of people, so LRH got Mathison to expand it. By the end of 1952, we had a pretty good meter. The very first meter had tiny electrodes -- little metal bars -- and didn't give mental reads. LRH and Jim Elliot got the idea of using soup cans, which did result in being able to get reads.

The E-meter can detect whether a PC is auditable. It is a coincidence that it just happens that when you can read a PC on a meter, that PC is in good shape. When a person's needle is in a constant agitated rockslam, e.g. with a real manic-depressive or schitzophrenic psychotic, no metered process works on them anyway. CCH's are all you can use. Fortunately, they are available. If you can read the meter on him, he can be audited on a think process, e.g. prepchecking.

The meter ran us into a complete cul-de-sac. We had had knowledge of the whole track before, but the meter made it clear how many engrams there were. This made dianetics look wrong. As long as you audited only this lifetime, you could make someone look very good, but it was obviously impossible to run out every engram on the whole track, because the number is infinite.

LRH, in the past, had refused to let PCs be subjected to experimental processes because they might get their heads blown off. Sometimes he used himself as a guinea pig for that reason.

The board of the first Dianetic Foundation started to resign when LRH started looking at whole track. They discovered at that point that Hubbard could get mad! His attitude was that no one was going to say what could or could not be researched. They decided that he must not be clear!

At that time, which was the time of early research with the E-meter and A History of Man (1952), LRH and MSH went down to the library and started looking up words. They came up with "scio" and "-ology". This seemed to express what we wanted: moving out of the field of the mind into the field of knowing. The mind is only a vessel of knowledge, so a new approach was required. Exteriorization started coming up. LRH and MSH went to Phoenix. One night, Evans Farber showed up And wouldn't go away. LRH finally asked him what he wanted and found that he had discovered the process, "Try not to be three feet back of your head," as an exteriorization process.

That was practically the end of the E-meter, because you can't read a thetan who is out of his head. LRH tried to develop a Theta-meter. The trouble was that it detected the auditor as well as the thetan who was the PC because it didn't require one to be exterior to read on it. It was very simple, electronically. It used a "magic eye" type detector.

In about 1955 or 1956, E-meters went out of use. They revived after the Clearing ACC [Probably in 5802C07 19ACC-15 "Help -- How to get Started" and 5802C13 19ACC19 "Other processes -- the Help Button". Other tape titles from this ACC may be more relevant, but I don't have them.] in the U.S., when LRH assessed people with the meter. Don Breeding, Joe Wallace, Pinkham and others were working on meters, and one of them designed a transistorized E-meter in 1957. It was found to be very useful in clearing people. It was used with a five-way help bracket to clear fifteen or twenty out of seventy people, as long as LRH did the assessment. We know now that the people who went clear were those who had a beingness goal and chose the terminal of that beingness goal to run on the five-way help. They made a first dynamic keyed-out clear. That is, you could clear anyone with help whose terminal was also his goal. The trick of assessment was to find the Rock, which would sometimes coincide with the wording of a goal.

This got meters back in, when it became clear that you wouldn't clear anyone without a meter. This was horrible, because LRH had never been able to teach an auditor to use one. Not that he had tried very hard. The Step Six phenomenon that was run into not long afterwards was the result of running someone on a button that wasn't on his goal line, not from creativeness beefing up the bank, per se. If his goal was run out or desensitized, you could then run any creative process with no bad effect. Otherwise, the button of alteration of creativeness can get activated, which is the bank-creator. [See pp. 285-287, above.] When a bank starts to go solid, that's no fun.

The difficulties of auditors finding a correct Rock loomed enormously. We now had two factors that were missing:

1. We needed technology that would unwind any accidental out of this package of clearing, so there would be no unknown data.

2. We needed to get to the point where an auditor could interpret the data we did find.

The first British meters were copies of American meters. Fowler and Allen built them, at first, with no idea of what they were building. One day LRH sat Allen down and ran a responsibility process on him on whatever he was looking at, put him on the meter, located his dead war-companion that he felt he had overts on, and found that he was looking at a window, surrounded by blackness. He ran responsibility for this scene and got more and more room in the picture. Suddenly, he got the whole sequence, with full kinesthesia, all sensations, and no more stuck picture. LRH explained bits and pieces about the E-meter to Fowler and Allen. They went on to build the Mark II, III, and eventually the Mark IV, with an improved circuit. They also worked on an OT meter.

The job of the meter is still what it always was: to detect what the PC has in the reactive bank. It is incidental that the meter detects ruds, problems, or what the PC is thinking or doing, or whatever. What we need most is to know what he has in the bank, so that the bank can be assessed. The E-meter has been designed and must be designed to detect the PC's prime postulate. Otherwise you won't clear anyone. If a meter won't detect a prime postulate in an individual. it is useless, even if it could be

used to get ruds in. A good meter must be very sensitive, yet not pick up everything that the PC is doing physically.

But this has not been the main liability of meters. The liability has always been auditor reading. Now that this has been singled out as the weakest point in auditing, it can get fixed. Also, more is known now about meter reads and auditor ability. All the auditor is missing on is certainty on whether the needle read or is clean. Trouble with knowing when it read is solved by not looking until you say the last syllable and by drilling on when the needle is or isn't reading.

So all auditors must learn to read an E-meter, or they simply cannot audit. You have to be able to detect the thing in the mind that is keeping the PC from being clear. You ve got to learn to read meters. A good, safe auditor can read a meter; an unsafe one cannot.

6207C26 SHSpec-179 Prepchecking

[Some of the data in this lecture is found also in HCOB 30Ju162 "A Smooth HGC 25 Hour Intensive". See also page 254, above, for history of prepchecking.]

"I've just found a way to use middle rudiments and make them double in brass and get the job done much better, in prepchecking." Suppress, suggest, careful of, invalidate, and fail to reveal are powerful prepcheck buttons. They should be used in the above order. Used in this order, you have the mid-ruds as a complete prepcheck. The middle rudiments were carefully sorted out of a great number of buttons that could be used. You could add another fifteen or twenty buttons. The Chart of Attitudes [See Handbook for Preclears] has a lot of them. Ruds are buttons that consist of just those things that can keep one of the other buttons from reading and which, if present, can keep a goal or item from reading. They are pretty powerful:

SUPPRESS: If you got suppress off the case, nearly everything would blow. If suppress is alive, you don't get a read on the remainder of the buttons, so run suppress before adding another series of anything.

SUGGEST: This button could be and sometimes has to be translated as "Is-ness". That is evaluation, per the Auditor's Code (No. 1). It says that something is. It is a powerful button, because you say something is, it will now read, even though it wasn't reading before. You say something reads which doesn't, and the PC can jam on it, and it will now read. It will at least read on disagreement. "Suggest needn't be used in mid-ruds, since auditors don't do it much. Save it for prepchecks."

INVALIDATE: If a goal or item is invalidated, it will read, even when it is not the goal or item. Get the inval off and it will no longer read. Suppress on top of inval keeps the inval from showing up. That is why suppress goes first as a button.

FAIL TO REVEAL: This button is off the line. It gives you the dirty needle, a minute rockslam.

CAREFUL OF: This is another suppress, with an added characteristic: After the person has been having something a little off-beat done for a little while, he can hang up in the thing, if he becomes too careful of something or other. He can also make an item read by a reverse suppression, by carefully not suppressing it, i.e. by making sure it reads.

The order of the buttons would be:

Suppress

Suggest

Careful of

Invalidate

Fail to reveal.

This is an optimum arrangement. That puts the most important button last, as far as session foul-ups are concerned. This also gives you two cracks at suppression.

If these buttons are so strong, they must have some value. They make great prepcheck zero questions, as LRH found more or less by accident, while cleaning up a PC who had been feeling poorly.

The procedure for the Problems Intensive is as follows [See also p. 134 above and HCOB 9Nov61 "The Problems Intensive -- Use of the Prior Confusion", as well as the current HCOB of 30Jul62].

1. Sort out the chief self-determined change the PC has made, using assessment by elimination or greatest read. For purposes of assessment, each change should be expressed in a few words plus a date.

2. Get the confusion that preceded the change and date it. Keep the PC to the just prior confusion. This should be anywhere from five minutes to two weeks earlier. Don't let the PC go "way back on the track.

3. Go a month earlier, in case he didn't remember the overt that started the confusion.

4. Prepcheck "Since (the above date)...." When you use the above procedure, PCs are very willing to tell you things they have suppressed. Somatics come off also. Don't also check mid-ruds on the period you are prepchecking!

You might think that you wouldn't reach basic on any chain by using the above method of prepchecking, but since you are taking up the buttons in this sequence and they seem like such innocent buttons, they clear away a lot of track without your having to worry about fundamentals and basic. Omitting the withhold system left us with no way to get to basic. It appears that, with this system, you don't have to bother. You could start in all over again, if the PC had given It a shallow pass on the first time through, and pick up deeper fundamentals. However, the hazard in doing so is that you might be cleaning a clean. Also, be very sure not to leave a question unflat. That is very important, since in so doing you could give him missed withholds, and he could blow or create a big storm and feel terrible.

For a fifty-hour intensive, you could also do a prepcheck "In this lifetime...."

This system gets the PC's withholds easily and voluntarily. Just be sure to follow the rules. And don't be an idiot: make sure the PC understands the question! To audit a small child, you might have to reword it to get it to communicate. On any PC, you want to be sure to communicate. Know what you are trying to communicate. If you find the PC unable to answer or with very few answers, don't blame it on the PC's caginess or unwillingness. You have to more the communication so it does bite. If you do that, the prepcheck will unstack the bank in its natural sequence, which is always desirable in sec checking and prepchecking. It is a very repetitive action.

There is another way to use repetitive prepchecking:

1. Sort out by assessment the person's self-determined decisions. Get the most charged, old-time Problems Intensive style. Make sure it is self-determined.

2. Date the problem.

3. Date the confusion prior to the decision found in (1). The PC will slide away from the prior confusion if You don't keep him looking for it. Don't let him find one five years before. It is a just-prior confusion.

4. Date the beginning of the prior confusion and go a month earlier.

5. Prepcheck it "Since (date found in (4)...."

A PC tends to see himself as a pawn on the board of life. The liability of taking an other-determined chain is that you will get into a chain of engrams. This system doesn't handle engrams, so watch it! It is ok, however, to get sometimes coming off. On dating the prior confusion if you let the date he a

few years earlier, you will Miss it. The prior confusion is the period when he was creating the problem for which the decision is a solution. The sequence for this this mechanism is:

1. The PC commits overts all over the place and has withholds missed on him like mad.

2. This causes a problem for him.

3. He makes a decision to solve the problem. This is the self-determined change.

All this is part of an effort to make prepchecking beefier and more effective and far-reaching. You might feel shy of doing a prepcheck if you weren't pretty sure of getting a good result. Somatics and conditions like post-partum depression will blow, without your having to run engrams and getting the PC stuck in the incident. The success you will have will depend on the excellence of your meter reading, how thoroughly the PC is in session, and how well you clean up each question. Prepchecking is a relatively permissive system that gradiently lets the PC get himself into confrontable soup. It doesn't overwhump the PC, but it must be metered right.

6208C09 SHSpec-182 Clearing

What are you, as an auditor, trying to do? You are trying to clear people! You should recognize that all processes are subordinate to this end. To be clearable, a person has to be auditable. If someone can't talk, listen, or respond, he is unauditable. You aren't concerned with states of ["insanity"], as defined by kraepelin. This is a subject that is subordinate to scientology. We have used the words "sanity" and "insanity" for PR purposes, but actually we have nothing to do with either. There is not a person on earth who is sane. They are all batty, Or they wouldn't be here! Someone who is sane is someone who resolves problems for the greatest good of the greatest number of dynamics. That is sane action and a definition of sanity. Very few people apply that rule.

People fall into a gradient scale of auditability. That is what you should study, if you are concerned with states of Man. A person who isn't clear won't resolve things for the greatest good of the greatest number of dynamics. Even a first goal clear won't, ordinarily. There is no processing short of clearing that is worth long, arduous hours, now that we have 3GA. So we become interested in auditability. The trick at the moment is to clear someone while he is clearing someone else. The struggle for LRH is not to clear people. It is to get people to clear people. People in the ruds and havingness group are there, not because they are unauditable, but because they are not able to audit well enough to receive auditing.

A person, to be unauditable, has to be pretty bad off. His auditability is determined by how many overts he is secretly committing while being audited. The lowest level of auditability is the person who can be cleaned up, who will keep his snoot clean long enough for you to clean up his needle. Below that level is the PC who will never tell you, who won't cooperate or be frank with you. At this point auditing ceases to the degree that the auditor can't get the PC to communicate. It isn't that the meter won't read, though that would also debar auditing.

Almost anybody, if not auditable, is "preparable". He is still auditable on CCH's and thus he can be "prepared" for auditing. This would also apply to someone who is bleeding to death or in a coma. The unauditable case will get a new body, sooner or later, so you can get him later, if the technology is still there. The only case that can't be reached is the one that isn't there and will never hear of scientology.

Don't spend more time than necessary to get the goals. Any case that can be forced into a groove can be audited. The case that breaks your heart, though, is the one that appears auditable, but is not really preparable. We don't have the tools to handle such a case at present. The auditability of people depends in large measure on the sphere of influence of the scientologist. The sphere of action that will do the world the most good is that of auditable cases. They may be nutty, amnesic, spin-bin cases, but if they are auditable, they can be straightened out. Some people have a nutty idea and know it is nutty. Others don't know. The one who has some hope, who knows he can get better, can be audited. The one who knows no one can be helped and that it is all someone else's fault, etc., may be a lot harder to Audit. The bugginess of their ideas makes no difference. A person's goal could make him sound batty, but they could still be audited.

There is nothing wrong with somebody, except that he has upped and got himself a basic purpose for reasons that are unknown to him. Then, when his basic purpose is disobeyed or blocked off, you get a bank developed. At this point, a lot of other purposes he doesn't want get hooked on to the first, and he follows those, and he doesn't know who he is, and he gets a body, etc., etc. It is incredible that a clearing process to unsnarl all this was developed. Previous efforts at clearing peeled the guy away from the GPM, but it was still there. So no matter how good the PC felt, the chance was there that it could key in again.

The PC's goal is a random, chance factor for instance in running repetitive processes, e.g. help processes, communication processes, etc. The goal could be "never to communicate to anyone" or "never to help anyone". The index of how much good it will do to find and clear the PC's goal is the amount of case gain you can get on a person who has had a wrong goal found. If you sit down with him on a meter and handle that goal with the "to be a tiger" drill [Reference: HCOB 29Nov62 "Routines 2-i2, 3-21, and 3GAXX -- Tiger Drill for Nulling by Mid-Ruds". See Fig. 10.], clean it until all sensation and pain have gone gone off it, you will see more case gain than you have seen for some time. What is happening is that finding the wrong goal did a key-in of what was there anyway. It could have keyed in at any time. Now you clean it up and it has no further effect on him.

This could lead to a wild Problems Intensive:

1. Have the PC write a list of all the problems that he has had this lifetime.

2. Ask him, "What decision would have solved the first, second, third problem, etc., etc.?" Don't date them. They are really goals.

3. Dust them off lightly with the tiger drill. It is a little chunk of doing a goals list, and the PC will get phenomenal relief. Not that you would necessarily do this on someone. It is workable because of the value of a decision. The bank is a basic decision, or purpose, which has on top of it a concatenation of purposes. So every time he makes a decision, he adds a look.

It is simpler, though, to just do 3GA in the first place. And this is also faster and more to the point. If you can clear somebody, there is no reason to do anything else.

What this means for this planet is quite amazing. Three-quarters of Asia became civilized just because of a hope that this could be done.

THE TIGER DRILL

Small tiger uses: Suppress
Big tiger uses small tiger buttons.

Invalidated   Plus: Nearly found out
Suggested
Protest
Fail to reveal
Anxious about
Mistake
Careful

Procedure:

A) If the goal reads, check inval, etc., until null; then checksuppress repetitively to null.

Recheck goal.

B) If the goal doesn't read, check suppress.

Patter:

A: To be a tiger.

C: Null.

A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?

C: Read.

A: That reads. What was it? ... Thank you.

On this goal has anything been suppressed?

C: Null.

A: To be a tiger.

C: Read.

A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?

C: Null.

A: On this goal has anything been suggested?

C: Read.

A: That reads. what was it? ... Thank you.

On this goal has anything been suggested?

C: Null.

A: To be a tiger.

C: Null.

A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?

C: Null.

A: To be a tiger.

C: Null.

A: Thank you. That is out.

****

A: To be a tiger.

C: Read.

A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?

C: Null.

A: On this goal has anything been suggested?

C: Null.

A: On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?

C: Null.

A: On this goal has any mistake been made?

C: Null.

A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?

C: Null.

A: To be a tiger.

C: Read.

A: To be a tiger.

C: Read.

A: To be a tiger.

C: Read. This goal is now ready to be checked out.

Once upon a time there was a thetan, and he couldn't go forwards or backwards. He had to stay there and he mustn't stay there. The result was that he was overwhelmed. He got further orders to evacuate, then to advance, then to stay there. Then he caught the barrage. His own artillery shelled him. He decided then to evacuate, but couldn't carry out the orders. He is there now, in a highly charged agitation, rockslamming.

A rock slam is a "can't go, can't stay, can't come, can't leave, mustn't be". It is a highly charged agitation. Originally, while addressing goals on the twentieth ACC, this was such a strong phenomenon that Ron used it in assessing to go down the chain to find the Rock, hence the name.

A dirty needle is a tiny, persistent rock slam. LRH has been spending the past week or so studying rock slams in depth. He happened to get a criminal on the meter, one with known overts against him. He saw a rock slam turn on and off on this one fact. This was very interesting. Of course the criminal was trapped too. In this case, however, it wasn't a goals phenomenon.

LRH found that you can clean a rock slam off a missed withhold on someone and end up with a dirty needle. This is because the PC's attention is on the large overt -- the rock slam -- not on the auditor. It takes superb TR-1 to get past the no-read that results from the PC's elsewhereness. This was the first evidence that a rock slam and a dirty needle are signs of overts. Until the overt is handled, the needle won't register.

The mechanics of a "failed to reveal" is the still point following a confusion. You should audit the confusion. You could only get a stuck picture to move by asking, "What about that picture could you take responsibility for?" This works because responsibility takes care of the overt. Stills do not exist without prior confusions, except in the case of goals postulates. For this reason, you can also unstick a stuck picture by spotting the prior confusion and the overt the person did. The person usually settled the confusion with an overt.

A culture will get stuck and fixed following a good confusion, too. A PC will get a chronic somatic following an overt, or more likely, a series of overts that involve motion. These overts were a way of settling a confusion.

Politics is an aberration caused by the collective overts of the citizenry. You can forecast the next governmental form by looking at the overts the citizens are committing, because the government will try to bake those overts legal, thus lessening the overt. For instance, a criminal has come to the conclusion that property belongs to nobody. He has to come to this conclusion. Before the 1917 Russian Revolution, the crime rate was very high. So the Russian government legalized the idea that property belongs to nobody. Weekness, or omitted participation, would be the prior overt in a socialized state, because in such a state, weakness is legal and rewarded. In politics, there is only opinion and aberration, no wisdom.

In research, what usually happens is that LRH falls over something for awhile he bumps into it until a way to use it occurs. Auditors have learned to go to "failed to reveal" when a dirty needle shows up. Failed to reveal is subsequent to an overt. There is little to gain by asking for overts, though. It is too strong. But the "failed to reveal" skims the top.

Tiger drill is effective until you run into a persistent rock slam or dirty needle. O/W has been put in to remedy this. It works as long as you get your question answered. When it doesn't work, it is because the PC is doing something else with the answers. If he is technically answering but not giving overts, keep clearing the commands. The PC may be trying to solve a problem with the auditing question.

LRH found that he could turn on a rock slam at will in anyone on a goals chain. 3GA as it exists is totally workable and will do the job. The only problem is doing it faster. We have already cleared a first-goal clear who had a wild rock slam. Goals got picked off the top of the GPM to the point where the rock slam showed up. This guy has gotten caught in the front lines with a bunch of overts, and he is sitting in a ridge that has enough confusion and enough overts behind it to make him unable to move anyplace. So there he is.

It would be faster to find the first goal if you could just bypass the first three goals of the GPM and only have four or five to deal with. That is the proposed speed-up. We have run people to an F/N on a goal and found that they had a rock slam underlying the F/N. If you overlist for fifteen or twenty minutes beyond the F/N, you get a rock slam, as the PC goes on down the goals chain.

The track is laid out in cycles, made up of series of lives or types of lives associated and allied, highly variable in their time element. It is a prime postulate, a new goal, that starts a cycle. This is not a solution, but a new game. The PC goes along with this. Eventually, the steam goes out of it and the thetan finds himself with no interest and no ability to get into trouble. He goes out the bottom, then perks up a bit and goes off with a new basic postulate. Any further postulate is a solution to problems caused by the first one. That is a cycle. Those are pieces of GPM, with an interrelationship. If you can get the earliest you can find cleaned up, the later ones blow easily, since the thetan had less power to make them. For this reason, it is worthwhile to get as early a goal as you can find that still reads and has some reality for the PC, and which he can still run.

If a goal will rocket read, you can list it. After you have tiger drilled it clean, if it rocket reads, you can list it through to F/N, then find another, etc., etc., as you go further back. It would be easy to find later goals, but useful to find earlier ones.

A thetan never gets so messed up that he fails to leave a flag out on his points of aberration. In early work, it was noticed that the key engram of the PC's current life leaves out a tag. The tag is an innocent-seeming and seemingly meaningless picture that the PC is frequently aware of. For instance, it may be a picture of Grandfather's rocking chair. When you explore this, you find the key engram. Similarly, the key goal has a rock slam left on it. One way of finding out what subject it is on is by nulling several hundred goals, culling the rock slams, writing them down, And seeing what the subject matter is. Test "overts on ..." and see the rock slam turn on. The rock slam may wear out on some of these subjects. Those are the locks. The real goal will have a rock slam that won't weer out. The charge manifested by the rock slam can be imparted to associated subjects that won't hold up and that will confuse you. Any branch of the tree looks like the trunk. Eventually you will find the trunk.

You can use the rock slam to find the goals channel by assessing the eight dynamics to find one that has a rock slam or a dirty needle. If there is no dirty needle at first, you can cause one by having the PC think of overts against each dynamic and picking out the dirtiest needle. You have to be clever to ask these questions without causing missed withholds. Get the PC to tell you a few overts on the dynamic that reads dirtiest. Ask him what would represent that dynamic, and get a list of items. Assess by elimination, looking for a rock slam or the hottest item. It is ok if, at this point, you don't get a rock slam. Take that item and get the PC to list, "What goal might you have that would be an overt against (e.g., the government?" Write down any pain or sensation on the list. Keep listing as long as there is needle action. When the needle smooths out, the PC's goal is on the list, if you are lucky. If you are unlucky, you will get nothing but pain, sensation, and a stuck needle. If so, start with a new dynamic assessment. If you are getting cognitions, that is a good sign.

On some PC's, this could be the only way to run goals. On most, it would be a shortcut.

6208C14 SHSpec-185 World Clearing

The subject of this lecture is forwarding scientology on a world-wide clearing basis. The activity of world-wide clearing is now understood, but there will have to be an agreed-upon and workable plan to deliver the goods.

HPA/HCA is presently a neglected sphere. Prepchecking is not an adequate tool to turn people loose with, by itself. We also have the very effective form of auditing with great therapeutic value that is goals listing, not necessarily goals finding. If someone is upset, just get them to write a goals list with some astronomical number of goals on it. Preserve it carefully for later use. This sort of goals assistance will shortly be part of HPA/HCA training, along with prepchecking. If the PC could also list items for goals, he would shortly be in shape to learn to find goals. Alternatively, a St. Hill graduate in an organization could find the goals of everyone around, once they had been set up by the HPA/HCA. Item listing takes a long time. There could be 2500 per list. So a policy letter has gone out forbidding St. Hill graduates from doing anything except to find goals (HCOPL 13Aug62 "Clearing"). That way the org can do clearing. The staff could co-audit on getting goals and items listed, and the St. Hill staff staff auditor could find the goals. This would get staffs cleared.

Now, on to world clearing! Say you have fifty people, paying a certain amount per week. They all want to be clear. Form them into co-audits, three nights a week or whatever. Get goals listed. Get items listed. St. Hill graduates would find the goal and put the person back into co-audit. Within a year, they would all be clear. Second goals could be found next. Have them study the practical actions and get to look like auditors, co-auditing under good supervision. The fee charged should be more than adequate to support the center, or whatever.

What damage could this do? The instructor would have to make sure that no withholds got missed that could cause PCs to blow. You will have to do some training at first. At the same time, get the goals lists made so that some progress is evident from the start. You could take the person's auditing skill count for points towards their getting their goal found.

You might think that this would cut people off from getting trained. Not so at all. People will decide to go get trained while waiting to have their goal found. At the end of the year, you will have fifty first-goal clears. The only limiting factor on the expansion of clearing by this system is the number who can go through St. Hill, and that number can be increased. There are lots of old-time scientologists around the world. LRH is now getting their names so that he can write them and send them to the nearest franchise holder. This will give semi-trained assistants, people who will join in the co-audit, etc.

A finite auditing period -- four to five hours of auditing and several hours of training per day -- are required to accomplish this program.

That is the basic world-clearing activity. Central organizations have always existed for training and dissemination of information, with auditing of PCs mostly for demonstration purposes. Now, when PCs come in, they can be handled with co-audit and/or preparatory actions. The trouble in any central org or any co-audit will be to keep up the quality of auditing and not to let it get slipshod. That is always a fight, because green auditors can think up more interesting ways to do things and have more problems! You can find what portion of a central org the public is impinging on most, because that will be the most scrambled and mucked-up and off-line. The main danger with a small staff is that the public will shove the time-scheduling out. You have to be mean on that point, because the area the public is most messed up on is time. Time is the single source of aberration. There would be no aberration, were it not for time. keeping time controlled for the group, with regard to course hours, etc., will actually result in your giving wins. Don't let a guy sneak in late. Greet him loudly. This results in less aberration and enturbulation in the group. Let them know you think scheduling is important and other factors will fall into place. This is a method of controlling people who are otherwise unruly. LRH would never let himself be pushed into auditing more than five to five and a half hours per day.

You also have to save time by having administrative people to handle the phone, mail, etc. The people on the co-audit will string out in time, depending on how much bank is in the way of their understanding. The bank is composed of no time at all, so they get into its timelessness and have no time to do anything. People have different periods of time that it takes them to register the same recognition. They have different reaction times. They have different rates on different subjects and on

different dynamics, etc. These rates are determined by where the goal sits. That gets in the way of your meter reading. Some people are aberrated on the subject of meters and can't see the read on the needle, though they may read books, etc., well.

A very sane person has fantastic quantities of time. LRH once flabbergasted someone by outlining a program for this part of the universe that extended 5000 years into the future. "I've seen a billion years planned out, down to the smallest detail."

If there were no time, there would be no motion, no havingness, no matter, etc. The more bank a person has, the less time he has for the longest period. A rock can sit there without any recognition at all for a few trillenia. Speed of recognition depends on how much time a person has. PT varies from a thousandth of a second to a more normal value of a second or two. Expanded to ten minutes, this would be frightening. The number of mistakes a person makes is [inversely] proportional to the amount of PT they have. The saner and the freer a person is, the more PT he has. The guy whose PT is a thousandth of a second never foresees the difficulty of doing anything and does the most impulsive and stupid things you ever heard of. Foresight is not really brightness, but width of PT. Nothing beats looking your way out of things.

If you think being able to foretell the future a thousand years ahead with accuracy would be boring, how come you can only get excitement by being stupid?

Anyway, this gives you a fast index on PCs, co-audits, etc. This index is the amount of time it takes him to register, to find out that something is there. The length of time it takes him to absorb auditing information is the length of time it takes him to be reliable. If you pair up co-audit teams on the basis of their recognition periods, they will stay happy. It will seem reasonable to both of them. Methods could easily be developed to measure recognition period.

How much should you teach your co-auditors? LRH would demand perfection. In any co-audit, the amount of gain is to some degree proportional to the amount of responsibility the instructor is taking for those people. It is not very dependent on what process you are running. You have problems of comparable magnitude, PTP process, responsibility processing. Use some processes that avoid O/W. Your best bet, though, is to put them onto listing goals and items, so they had better be started out on prepchecks and prepchecking. If you have to keep them busy, give them something to study: listing, for example. Utilize the available time in the most productive possible way.

It is not very tenable to single-hand a project like this. It is harder on you than you would think, since you lack a datum of comparable magnitude.

The communication channel falls off to the degree that an individual feels that he is outside the organization. This makes the development of city offices, rather than franchises, a good idea. [A city office is similar to a franchise, but it is under the administrative direction of the central scientology organization, via an HCO Area Secretary. It is set up by the HCO Continental Sec. The intention is that it will ultimately grow up into a Central Organization. See OEC Volume VII, pp. 154, 158, 162-163, 165.] There is a necessity to make everything neat. Since it will blow up anyway, it might as well be done neatly, so that it can be put together again after it falls apart when expansion hits. When increased comm hits a network of comm lines, it is not surprising if the seams leak. So you have to be skilled in putting the line back again, not in trying to hold it.

Any central organization putting together a clearing co-audit should do it perfectly. then put it all back together again when it blows up. You hold the fort with time, good discipline, etc., and you realize that world clearing is done on the basis of somehow making it, not as a juggernaut rolling down the highway. There hasn't been a road. You follow policy as far as you can, and then you make it work from then on. Just don't scant technology. Don't fail to deliver the goods and make clears.

6208C21 SHSpec-188 Basics of Auditing

Auditors keep asking LRH for rules and more rules. Then they goof in session and ask for more. It is strange that fundamentals usually come at high levels of training. Here is what an auditor should be able to do: He should be able to get another being to be interested in his own case and willing to talk to him. Rules, tricks, rudiments, and various other types of upset-preventers are all contributive to getting this to occur. The E-meter is only contributive insofar as it applies to rudiments. It is vital for

assessing. In rudiments, you are trying to do with rules and the meter something that you cannot do yourself. This won't work. Some auditors have only to sit down in the chair to have the PC ARC break. This is more true now than ever.

The difficulties the auditor encounters are his own difficulties, and the mechanics he uses force the PC into session with an auditor who doesn't want the PC in session or who doesn't understand that the PC should be in session or why the PC should be in session. The mechanics of rudiments and rules have made auditing so powerful that the PC is put into a state where he is interested in his case and wants to talk to the auditor. But the auditor thinks he is supposed to do something else and drives the PC out of session again. So the PC ARC breaks. The auditor looks like an auditor and the rules trick the PC into session. Then the PC finds that the auditor doesn't want to hear what he is saying. The auditor is auditing by some set of rules. In fact, there is no auditor, but the technology has created a PC. This drives the PC around the bend. The PC doesn't know what is wrong, but he feels that something is wrong.

We have been blaming meter reading, missing reads. This is just another technical rule. Someone who understood the basics of auditing and used them could miss reads and clean cleans and still have a PC happily in session. But someone who cleans cleans and misses reads must be auditing, not by basics, but by rules that force a PC into session. If there is no auditor but only rules and a meter, the rules may be right and the meter wrong. There is nothing else holding the PC in session, so he gets upset. If the auditor is not there and he misses something, it is curtains. So it is very necessary to know what the basics of auditing are.

The remedy for the above situation is that people are going to learn to prepcheck and to put ruds in without meters and to do this accurately. This will make auditors. They can do it because they will learn the basics of auditing.

Why does auditing exist at all? There are two articles in Certainty magazine (1958) that take apart what psychoanalysis did wrong. Anyone that went into session in analysis did so accidentally. Basically, the analysand never had an auditor. He was also never brought back to PT at the end of session.

The basics of auditing include the mechanics of blowing something -- the reason why auditing works (Axiom 51). One underlying thread is the principle that after a session, a PC should feel better. Even an awful goals assessment session that missed the goal should end up with the PC feeling better. Secondly, the auditor must get off the PC's withholds.

The earliest part of auditing is the roughest part, since all the missed withholds of life are still sitting there unrelieved. It takes a far better auditor to handle such a case than to handle someone who has come up the line a ways. Scientologists are not really harder to audit than raw meat, especially raw meat that hasn't ever reached for anything. You would be surprised, though, at who can go into session and who can be audited. Once, in Detroit, the cops seized some tapes. Fourteen cops listened to them, and twelve resigned from the force!

An auditor should be able to handle the PC's problems and to get a clean needle so that the PC can be assessed and made to feel better. An auditor should audit to get things done in a session, not just to audit. Auditing consists of getting something done by a series of little accomplishments, not by going through the motions.

You should be able to get a PC into session without a meter, rules, or anything. Some people have a gift for this. An auditor should be able to let the PC blow something by talking to him. You would be surprised how rare this is. You should also be able to get done what the PC wants done, without Q and A. People have trouble differentiating between TR-4 and Q and A. An auditor must be able to make this distinction. He must handle the session and do things the PC wants done without Q and A. You have to work at it, to get in trouble with this. Q and A is simple:

1. Not accepting the PC's answer; questioning the PC's answer. Auditing isn't done by rules but by understanding. People who Q and A don't want the PC to talk to them. They use a remark, a comment, or a request for more information to prevent the PC from just saying something and blowing the charge. Or the auditor doesn't acknowledge. This is a defensive mechanism.

2. Doing something every time the PC says something. An auditor who always does what the PC says will drive the PC crazy. An auditor who audits strictly by rules and not by understanding will

never do anything a PC says, no matter how reasonable or sensible it is, which also drives the PC crazy. There are two things that PCs do:

1. They ask auditors to do things such that if the auditor doesn't do them, the session will go around the bend.

2. They originate. Auditors who are having a hard time with PCs never differentiate between these two situations. They don't evaluate importances. They try to follow all the rules instead of helping the PC. You don't take up the process that the PC wants run or the goal which the PC asserts but which doesn't check out. On the other hand, you don't ignore it when the PC says, "This room is so hot that I am melting!" Open the damn window!

There is no substitute for understanding and a feeling of humanness. Obnose!

Why does auditing work? It bothers someone to be the only one who knows something. He feels better when someone else can see it too. He doesn't like to have only his attention on something. It bothers him to have to keep it from other people. When he puts something out and lets someone else see it, and the person says that he has seen it, and nothing else happens, Axiom 10 hasn't fired. The catastrophic effect he expected hasn't been produced.

Auditing of withholds blows the PC's certainty of consequences. He gets off a gross overt that he knew would kill him if anyone else ever found out about it, and there is no consequence. The only thing that happened was ventilation. Having gotten off the withhold, the PC finds himself with his attention freed up from that subject. Before, it was stuck on keeping it withheld. So he drops it like a hot potato. Without going into the mechanics of as-ising, we can say this: If the horrible consequences that the PC expected, on getting off a withhold, don't materialize, his previously fixed attention is freed up.

Auditors have interesting methods of preventing PCs from blowing things. They use the meter. They do something every time the PC originates. If the auditor always does something or asks another question about it, the PC isn't allowed to blow anything. Auditing works because the PC blows things. If he isn't allowed to blow things, he will blow up. The point is to audit the PC, not to go through a drill.

Auditors should be able to clean up a dirty needle. They should be able to prepcheck, simply using PC indicators to establish cleanness of the question. But don't try to assess goals without one. If rules get in your way, you probably don't understand the rules. The reason for this emphasis is that 3GA requires a superb auditor, if it is to be done rapidly.

6209C18 SHSpec-189 Directing PC's Attention

"Instead of reaching for an argument, reach for an E-meter." To straighten out arguments, put the person or persons on a meter. Pull missed withholds on a nattery person. Just sit him or her down as though no natter had occurred and ask, "What have we failed to find out about you? What have I failed to find out about you? In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?", etc.

When you use an E-meter, get something done. You can do a great deal with it, so use it to get somewhere. The rules of auditing are to keep you from doing ineffective things. Men have been talking to men for thousands of years, and the general result of these discussions has been nil. How can we use talking in auditing to get something to happen? The rules by which you audit are the rules of an effective path to an accomplishment of reaching someone, bettering someone, reaching an agreement, and improving existence. But it is a highly circumscribed path. There have been almost numberless efforts in the past to cure people or make them better. Almost all schools of healing have involved talking or listening. There is an effort to reach. Axiom 10 applies throughout.

We can now make this same talk effective. Auditing has to do with the comm formula. This is the most fundamental fundamental of scientology. When someone says something and someone acknowledges it, if the statement is true and the acknowledgment is received, mental charge can blow, de-intensify, eraser be eradicated. It is on this fact alone that auditing works. It isn't what is said. It is Axiom 10. The cycle of auditing follows this pattern:

1. The auditor's question or command directs the PC's attention to a certain area of bank, causing a momentary restim.

2. The PC, perceiving the area of bank that has been restimulated, responds by verbalizing.

3. When he is acknowledged and receives the acknowledgment, he knows that he has responded.

4. That area of the bank blows.

Most auditing rules exist to maintain the purity of the auditing cycle. The tech exists to determine what should be restimulated, in what sequence. If you have done the auditing cycle right and you know what buttons should be hit and what responses should be given, then you only need add repetitive question and response and the proper sequence of questions, each followed by the same cycle, to obtain the state of release, clear, theta clear, or OT. That formula is the only reason anyone gets out. There can be numberless departures from the auditing cycle. Other activities, like selling and teaching, have their own cycles, which are different from the auditing cycle. If the auditor has spent lifetimes being a salesman, he may use the wrong sort of comm cycle and end up selling the PC an engram. Or you may get someone who thinks forgiveness of sins makes people better. This person won't use the proper auditing comm cycle. He will do something else.

Auditing is basically a cycle of command that operates as an attention-director, eliciting a response from the PC and getting the PC to as-is the restimulated area. The PC knows he has done so when he receives an acknowledgment from the auditor that it has occurred. That cycle, all by itself, is sufficiently powerful to get gains, no matter what words or process is used. The mere fact of directed attention and the acknowledgment that the PC has directed his attention -- that fact by itself is therapeutic. There need be no significance in the command.

The repetitive action adds duplication to the formula. This increases the effectiveness of the communication. The person will become aware of the existence of another being; he will become aware of mass and of whether his attention is easy or hard to shift. His awareness will increase and his attention will become freer. In essence, those are your CCH's. It is the non-significance of directed attention. The CCH's present different ways of directing the PC's attention with minimal significance. Your worst-off PC does well on these, because he discovers that there is matter, energy, space, time, and another being in the universe. This can be a great shock to him. How does the great criminal live with himself? By knowing that he is the only one, that there is no one else in the universe.

You can't tell someone in that condition to think of the significance of this or that, because the significance would never arrive. He can't duplicate it. He can duplicate the fairly non-significant action of simply directed attention. This is a new idea in the communication cycle: a communication without significance, beyond the significance of what the PC's attention is directed to. [Linguistic analysts refer to the "performance" aspect of language, apart from the mere significance of the words.] Many an activity has directed attention, but has not done so duplicatively. That is one of the secrets of scientology processing, and why it works. This was not discovered before scientology because earlier practitioners couldn't duplicate.

You could run a duplicative process on one object, but two is better because it makes space and adds duplication. You need to have two things to use. You need two to make space. We live in a two-pole universe. You can't make space with just one spot. You also need two things to have duplication. This applies to Op Pro by Dup. The two points, book and bottle, give you space. "I don't care how you run [Op Pro by Dup]. Run it."

"You could direct attention repetitively, in a duplicative fashion [or] in almost any fashion, and achieve a renewed awareness on the part of another being [of] yourself and ... the world around him.... There's no further significance than that," and that is the whole result of the process. This increased awareness improves I.Q., alertness, etc.

Wherever you have a communication line set up, you have some kind of response system on this line, and it will go through some kind of cycle. Knowing that different cycles of action exist, you will see that the auditing comm cycle is unique, and you will realize that the question or command directs the PC's attention by pulling his bank up around his ears. The auditing comm cycle operates independent of the intention of the PC. It is more responsive to the practitioner than it is to the PC. "Any outsider has more control over the person's reactive bank than the person himself. It's on that fact that auditing

is based.... The common denominator of the reactive bank is other-determinism." So auditing requires an auditor separate from the PC to be very effective. And when the auditor isn't following through the cycle of action of auditing, then nobody else will adjust the bank for the PC. An auditor who won't help the PC out by adjusting the bank for him is leaving him in the soup. The auditor must control the PC's attention, if the PC is to be able to as-is anything in the bank. Otherwise the PC obeys the bank, and auditing is not occurring.

There are no good PC's and bad PC's. There are only good and bad auditors. The good ones know and keep in the cycle of auditing. If the auditing cycle isn't followed, auditing doesn't occur. A PC whose attention cannot be controlled, cannot be directed into areas of significance that reactively don't want any attention directed there. Say the PC has a goal, "Never to look." If you can't control the PC's attention, you will never find it, because the bank has more authority over the PC than the auditor does. All goals lists contain goals of this character. If you look over the goals list of a PC whose goal is being easily found, you will find an absence of those goals that command the PC's attention to go the other way. You will find no "Never to look" or "To be silent". These goals cause trouble until they are located. The PC whose attention can be directed by the auditor, on the other hand, will have a great many of these.

There are no good or bad PCs, only auditors who do or don't use the auditing comm cycle and get it executed. Sometimes an auditor has to work harder than at other times, that's all. You should look over your auditing with the question, "Is the PC's attention being directed by me, and can I count upon the fact that it is?" If you do this, you will learn a lot about your auditing and what is going on with that PC, and the relationship between your auditing and what is going on with the PC.

6209C18 SHSpec-190 3GA: Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam

The rock Slam is so-called, because it is achieved when the auditor is approaching what we once called "The Rock". There is something earlier than the Rock: a goal. If it were called a "goal slam" you would have it. It is producing a lot of random needle motion because of currents being set up amongst the items and identities that the person has assumed or fought in the process of executing the goal. The individual has no way to go towards or away from the goal. He is in a state of agitation. It is a thetan convulsion. In the absence of a slamming needle, you may well see convulsions of the body, when the convulsion gets to a great degree of solidity. This is surmise, with some evidence behind it. That is called an epileptic fit. If it went beyond that, to enter the physical universe around the person, you would get other effects. First the physical universe gets enturbulated; auditors drop commands; people have accidents. Further on, you could get poltergeist phenomena. You get enMEST in any case. What this is, is obsessive and random motion, or a postulate that is in a state of producing obsessive and random impulses when restimulated. One may well get one's goal restimulated in the course of life.

So the rock slam is the goal track. The PC's interest follows the track of the goal and therefore also the slam. The PC is being reached as a case when he is rockslamming. Don't ARC break a PC while he is rockslamming! You won't get away with things that you could get away with when he wasn't rockslamming, so your auditing had better be smooth. The case will hang up if you bungle it during that time. The PC's interest is very much on his case and the distraction is severe if you yank his attention out of session. He goes from Tone 30 to minus 8.0 with no curve, and it is hard to clean that up.

Dynamic assessment is an intense activity, and it should be so regarded by the auditor, since, as the PC goes down the track, he is unknowingly running into all the items that you will later list. You will find his detested person, which will make him very happy. You will take a lot of edges off the case. You will find the dynamic that slams, and this means a great deal to him. Now we find the item, and here is something that is enormously significant to him. It explains all sorts of things. Then you find the goal, beside which all else pales.

This gives the PC gradient gains, which is an improvement over ordinary 3GA. A nervousness can build up while you are tiger-drilling the 850 goal list. The tension that built up when we were assessing by elimination was enough to break the PC's and the auditor's heart. The PC was so nervy and ARC breaky, he was almost impossible to audit.

If you tiger drill a list, the goals, but not the Goal, are being erased as you go along, and the PC feels better and better. But this is still not good enough or fast enough. There is such a terrific attention line here that any little wiggle is super-upsetting.

Doing dynamic assessment by rock slam eliminates most of the liabilities. It goes into the goal line, not direct for the goal, and it goes by a gradient of interest, with the PC an active participant, making gains every few hours.

Also, a successful dynamic assessment by rock slam makes the PC feel great. The auditor doesn't really care about this, because the end product is getting the goal. The auditor can get distracted by the spectacular successes that he is getting, but anything other than going for the goal is a waste of time. If you are going to get to be a Class IV auditor, you have to do it fast. To clear earth, you have to be able to find a PC's goal in a week. This is something LRH can do, so you have to learn to be that effective. This is an upgrade. LRH wants Class IV's to handle a group co-auditing to clear, per the program for world clearing.

That is the only way to get it done as fast as it needs to be done. This would produce fifty clears in one year. When the technology is trimmed a bit more, you should be able to get it done in twelve and a half hours. But to do this, you have to be pretty slick as an auditor. There is a point of diminishing returns, where it is done so fast that it is unreal to the PC.

As a PC's listing continues, his interest in the goal ebbs and fades. It is brought back by tiger-drilling. It takes one minute, on the average, to clean up a goal by tiger drilling. At 460 down the list of 850, that's 450 minutes or seven and a half hours, plus rudiments, to get to the goal. That is not bad, and that was the place where the second goal was found on one PC. But the first goal is rockier to find. Many PCs will never find one without a dynamic assessment by rock slam.

So we are looking for a positive and efficient method of finding goals on all PCs in a fairly predictable amount of time. Some ACC's found PCs running for six weeks without finding a goal. This was very disappointing.

Dynamic assessment by rock slam has the luck factor of whether the list you are assessing is complete. If no item assesses out unmistakably, the list was incomplete. There is no other reason. We know that if we can get a dynamic that rockslams when the PC considers committing overts against it, we can then list what represents that dynamic on a dwindling rock slam. We can assess that list to get an item. The goal will be an overt against that item, in one shade of meaning or another, as given on the list.

The tough point is the entrance point: trying to find the first slam. There is a new caper: "the most detested person". This is experimental at present. "Who or what have you detested?" could get it, but you may or may not get an item, or what looks like an item. A short cut is to say, "What do you wish was not part of existence?" Oil him up by getting a list. Then ask, "What isn't part of existence?" This will serve you as an item, if it will develop a rock slam. You assess it by "Consider overts against _____ ." You will find that the common denominator of all dynamics and items is that the person will not admit that they are part of existence. They are things from which the PC has individuated.

So when you get the slamming item, you might build it back to a dynamic, when all else fails, by asking, "What part of existence does _____ belong to?" This could give a rock slam when the list is assessed. Then you could list, "What part of existence does a _____ represent?" This could give the dwindling slam.

The normal way is to ask, "What opinionated person have you detested?" Assess the list with "Think of doing bad things to _____ ." Get down to an elimination by rock slam. Get one person (often the first on the list). List, "What part of existence does _____ represent?" This gives a list of dynamics on which there will be rock slams. Assess with, "Think of doing bad things to _____ ." If you are lucky you will get an unmistakable rock slam on one dynamic. Then the list of the item will be a dwindling slam, down to a dirty needle. Assess that with, "Think of doing bad things to _____ ." One will fire well, and now we have the PC's goals line on that item. You list with, "What goal might you have that would be an overt against _____ ?" That will go also by dwindling rock slam. Then list line six. In a high percentage, the goal will be number 1, 2, 3, or 4 on that list. Just tiger drill each goal.

There is an action that must precede any dynamic assessment by rock slam. The PC must first list 850 goals and find and list every goal ever listed on the PC and tiger drill the whole list. First, however, you tiger drill the tiger drill buttons, e.g. "On the word 'suppress' has anything been suppressed?" etc., down to flatness or cognition. This is a must on anyone who has been audited much. You should also be sure to get the PC to tell you the consequences of your clearing him. It could be so horrendous that the PC will never give you his goal.

Work the suppress and the careful buttons hard. "Careful" is especially likely to turn on a rock slam, when the rock slam is off. The command you use to tiger drill early goals is, "In auditing on the goal _____ , has anything been suppressed?", etc. Thus a goal that has been buried will begin to read again. You can also use, "Since (date goal was found), on (goal), has anything been _____ ?" Don't ever discard old goals. The case can be stalled from that point forward.

6209C20 SHSpec-191 Listing Lines

[The original four lines used in 3GA listing from goals: want, not want, oppose, and not oppose, are augmented by the addition of a Create, Curious about, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit scale attached to each one, making twenty combinations, then each of these reduplicated in an "effect" form, making forty listing lines in all. A PC was allowed to list only four items before going on to the next list. This process was carried to the E.P. of F/N at clear read for each goal found. Having a large number of lines served the dual purpose of making the auditing question as clear and precise as possible and keeping the PC fluid on the lines. Before doing this listing, you have to tiger drill the goal until it reads. Much more detail is given in this tape, particularly concerning gain and sensation and their significance in listing goals.]

What happens if you overlist is the following sequence:

1. The line flows in a direction where it isn't reaching anything and it is trying to come back. That is the comm lag.

2. He feels that you are getting him to reach too far, and it is indescribable. At this point, he is fishing for the right item.

3. If he goes on from there, the backflow starts to hit. He no more than announces something than he invalidates it. All these manifestations are just bank manifestations.

One problem that arises in self-listing these lines is that pain and sensation will appear on the wrong lines. This occurs because, in order to give himself the command, the PC has to go into other valences and give the command to another valence. This louses up where the pain and sensation belong. He goes into the "oppose to list the "want" and vice versa. So he gets the sensation and pain in the wrong places.

Just before the PC goes clear, his TA won't necessarily be near clear read. The last two or three days of listing are the tough ones. The PC rollercoasters a bit. He gets very worried just before the needle goes free. He is afraid he will have no game if he gives up the goal. You have to persuade him through this to the "There is nothing there" point, where he is free to make some new games. Early on in clearing, somatics tend to be dull and persistent. In the middle of listing, they fade in and out. By the end, they flash on and off. That is a symptom of winding up. The somatics may make the PC resist the end of clearing because he doesn't want them. Beware also the PC feeling wonderful when he is not yet clear. This is the manic phase. He will drop. He will also tell you that "It is blown," many times before he is clear. But when he is really clear, the needle is free and will stay free until you find the next goal. He may start looking right away. Listing can be done by HCA's [Class II auditors. See HCOPL 21May62 "Training -- Classes of Auditors".], if they are well-supervised.

6209C20 SHSpec-192 Geriatrics

Gerontology never solved geriatrics, but we have. You should understand that one of Man's longest searches has been a search for longevity. Geriatrics is the study of living longer. LRH's research at Oak Knoll naval hospital suggested that the mind could change the body more than the body and physical substances could change the mind. "You can always get function -- or thought -- to monitor

structure, but you can't always get structure to monitor thought." Medicos got this messed up because it is usually so obvious when structure monitors thought. If you cut a guy's leg off, you generally, but not always, see his thought change. But if you don't get rid of the psychic traumas, you won't change someone's structure or function. Change the psychic condition and the structure can change. These conclusions are very valuable in the field of geriatrics.

Metchnikoff studied geriatrics as he felt the years creep up. He found that, theoretically, sour milk could extend life indefinitely, but he died before age seventy. It is odd that there is all this interest in geriatrics, given that a thetan is indestructible. This is actually interest in preserving the body, which, as it ages, irritates the thetan by restricting his activity.

A PC doing well generally looks younger. One that is doing poorly looks older. In the process of doing a dynamic assessment on goals [See previous tape] , you will see rapid change when you get the dynamic and the item and the goal. As a PC gets listed on the goal, he or she looks younger. If things go sour, the PC looks older. We don't know the theoretical age limit for a body, so we don't know how long a clear should live. It should be longer than "normal" anyway. If you clear somebody around age thirty, you will probably add thirty to forty years to his life. If he goes clear at seventy or eighty, you might add only five or six years. Probably, the older they are, the less you could add to the life-span.

The field of geriatrics has the problem of researchers dying out without leaving records and dying out before the length of time it takes to produce results, so the researchers are always getting challenged. Age is normally determinable by the condition of certain body parts, functions, and cellular structures. If you were to examine someone physiologically, then clear him, then re-examine him, you would find that the person was physiologically younger. This pre-determines that they will live longer.

People get interested in scientology when you tell them about its geriatric aspects. You would think that insurance companies would be interested in the idea of changing someone's life-expectancy, but they are not. They are only interested in figures, which are based on expectancy of claim payments, all figured out by averages, etc. Since the risk is spread out amongst many individuals, they don't care about making individuals live longer. They could even be against it, since it could cost them money.

So you can get a reverse philosophy on this point. Socialist states and insurance companies realize that if we weren't kicking off regularly, things would be in a terrible state. But most people would be far more interested in living longer than they would be interested even in being healthy, since being healthy would cost them a service facsimile. People wish they could live longer, even if they don't believe it is possible.

Just doing a problems intensive would increase a person's life expectancy. Most people are fighting living longer, even if they say they want to.

LRH's experiments with horticulture, using tomato plants, produced some tomatoes that were kept in constant temperature and humidity and which were not injured in any way. They grew to sixteen feet, grew enormous numbers of tomatoes, and lived longer. LRH found that the life span and resistance to blight of a tomato plant is directly related to the amount of punishment -- the amount of clipping, handling, topping, pruning, etc. People thought he was interested in horticulture, but he wasn't. He was interested in geriatrics and longevity. A plant that is abused will become ill and will die sooner. Abuse determines:

1. Longevity

2. Susceptibility to illness. If you can delete abuse, e.g. by running engrams, you pick up the characteristics of not having been abused in the first place, i.e. health and longevity. This would apply equally well to human bodies. Dianetics also pointed to this conclusion. [See Science of Survival, Book II, p. 23.] In humans, if you delete -- audit out -- abuse, or the consideration that one has been abused, you effect the same change in longevity as not having been abused would have made.

So in disseminating scientology, you can talk about longevity and preventing illness. On a planet that is very fixated on bodies, these are good avenues of approach. Dianetics corresponds to deleting abuse from a person's life, which is equivalent to avoiding abuse in the tomato plants. Depression gives rise to symptoms just like an illness. You can, as a dissemination approach, use "Maybe you are

not sick. Maybe you are just depressed." You use that instead of "suppressed". The person will get very interested. Then give him a problems intensive. His "sickness" will frequently disappear. You don't tell the person that you will cure anything. You are only interested in removing the suppressions of life.

We have to have a bridge from raw meat to clearing, and the bridge has to have reality in it. The person must be brought to a reality on the mind and life. Say you are running a clinic, giving problems intensives, using repetitive prepchecking. People will come out at the other end looking and feeling younger and no longer sick. This is an area that we have just neglected, with our emphasis on clearing.

In Book III of DMSMH, it says that if you can parallel what the mind is doing, you can reach the mind and do something for it. This is a trick to parallel what a raw meat's mind is doing. He is thinking, "How sick (or well) am I? How young (or old) am I?" So "How are you?" means "How sick are you today?" A common hidden standard is "Do I look, feel, or appear younger?" If most people are fixated on the body (and they are), you can use this fact to get in comm with them. In effect, you are getting a guy in session, according to the definition of "in session", before you officially get him in session.

Age is normally hooked onto the body by the thetan himself, using engrams and secondaries. The limitation on what thought can do for structure is only the thetan's consideration.

The reason you have trouble defining scientology to people is that there is no datum of comparable magnitude in this universe. So they always put up a datum of incomparable magnitude and hang you right away in a suppression and a disagreement. "Oh, it's like Christian Science." "No," you say. Right there you are hung with a suppression of him. It puts you into a disagreement. Never let him choose the datum of comparable magnitude to scientology. Give him one -- his ruin, himself, what he owns, his family, his sick mother or wife, his health, etc. This is what is really of comparable magnitude to scientology for him.

6209C25 SHSpec-193 Current Trends

The main difficulty we are having right now is not clearing people, 2500 years after it was proposed ss a possibility. Clearing is not something you achieve because of faith or right belief or any such trap. Our only interest in discipline is in getting the job done. We do need a certain number of safeguards to see that it is done right, since doing it wrong not only doesn't get it done, but also gives the subject a bad reputation. People need to realize that clearing is a precise activity, not something done casually by the untrained.

LRH knows we are successful when we get attacked by squirrels and when we get counterfeited. "Concept therapy" is one such counterfeit, picked up in 1952 or so. The chief movers in that appeared at the clearing congress, unfortunately. The ethics of clearing are the effectiveness of clearing. He who hasn't been trained cannot do it and should not try, since he can bungle it. You can have an unfortunate win when you have a flukey lucky break. We want technology that works on everybody. Dynamic assessments [See pp. 305-308, above.] have this broad applicability. It becomes unethical to clear somebody non-standardly in order to keep the rules in use. "You clear somebody according to the rules and take advantage of every lucky break," as long as you realize that it will probably never recur. But don't go looking for the break and drop the rules. Broad clearing technology must be preserved as it is and safeguarded.

Confusion occurs when an action that should have occurred did not. All of a sudden extraordinary solutions are being required. Whenever an extraordinary solution is demanded of you, in auditing, it is only because the usual has not been followed. "The unusual [is] demanded of you because the usual has not been done." When you see a demand for an extraordinary solution, you should:

1. Fix whatever is wrong with the PC.

2. Get the auditor straightened out. That is vital, or the errors will just continue.

3. Find out who dropped the ball in training the goofy auditor and everyone along the line who certified him, and get them to handle. If you only handle the immediate situation and never handle the source of the confusion, that confusion and worse will continue to occur.

When it seems that the situation is totally out of your control, remember that "you can always turn a force around and make it serve you." This principle is used in judo. Tennis players also do this. This is a trick that is particularly adapted to this universe. So when you hear that AMA certified "auditors" are going to clear the U.S. Army Air Force, set yourself up as a small civil defense rescue unit; publicize what is happening. Be very prepared to scream. Set up this civil defense unit "to take care of the emergency". This may give the would-be malefactor second thoughts, if you make it very clear to him that you are prepared to handle the disaster.

We are walking into an emergency situation. The demand is going to produce an enormously confused area. In fact, it has already started to, for LRH, the same as it did in 1950. It will all come out all right as long as we hold to the standard and keep the show on the road and don't tolerate any bad clearing. It won't come out right if we all say, "Well, my job is just to audit." Japan has just blossomed as a new area of interest. It is a vital, energetic country that will need translated material, etc. A nation that is whipped in war will go from the force band into thought. The thetan never gives up, so conquest is still their purpose. No political philosophy will handle that situation. They already have some communistic ideas, along with an emphasis on individuation and independence. Buddhism was the first civilizing influence in Japan. Suddenly now there is an embrace of scientology, coming from the west with a total impact.

6210C03 SHTVD-15A Prepchecking a Goal Part I

[First part of this demo is occupied with LRH pulling a withhold. Then he prepchecks the item "a murderer"]

6210C03 SHTVD-15B Prepchecking a Goal Part II

[Continuation of the above. LRH prepchecks the goal "to know". Good TR's, good example of absence of Q and A.]

6210C04 SHSpec-198 Modern Security Checking

We have had dissensions and upsets over the last twelve years. Things now are more even and more easily handled, but we still have occasional upsets. There was an HCOB on a new style of sec check we have [HCOB 12Sep62 "Security Check Again". This involves looking for rock slams with commands with the wording, "Consider committing overts against _____ ."] This HCOB points the way to a resolved case and to peace and quiet, while we get cases cleared. For a long time, we have tried to find out what made some people nervous, obsessed, and prone to revolt and cutting their own throats. We have wondered if there was some international group that was closely opposed to the advance of scientology. The answer is, "No." Communism has some goals which would make you nervous if you knew about them, such as the goal to take away everything of yours. This leads to a total games condition. Socialism is also nutty. It rewards people for not working. It says, "If you are working real hard, you should share with people who won't help you." Another antipathetic philosophy is that of the South American division into ricos and pobres. Capitalism has one small group owning everything. Democracy goes like this: "Take a ... bunch of uninformed people and take the mean of their opinion and say that [it is] valid and therefore disregard it, and then do things and tell them it's their fault.... It's the perfect mechanism to prevent revolt. No better one has ever been invented. It's a self-perpetuating machine that is pure idiocy." You are given a choice of voting between two goons you wouldn't let clean your chicken coop and then if everything goes wrong, it is your fault.

"All government is merely a substitute for the disabilities... of the individuals in the population." In an absence of understanding of the human mind, you inevitably have government, and you have as much government as you have crime, until the whole government is crime. There is nothing a government does that has not been done privately at one time. This includes fire departments, police, etc. Police forces [that are a part of government] have nothing in common with public safety. The more government you have, the less liberty you will have because government is a non-producer. The laws that the government passes against crime apply to you, who are in theory honest hired men. Next thing you know, you haven't even got yourself anymore.

But there is no international group that faces and opposes Dianetics and Scientology, except to the degree that aberration opposes sanity. A medium-good auditor gets chewed up from time to time. An excellent auditor never gets chewed up. The only enemy of Man is his aberration. You just need to audit, that's all. If people attack you, it is because you are not auditing them. What they want is relief from their own misery and agony, and you are giving them no auditing. Once you have embarked on this sort of thing, you are in for it if you don't carry through with it. In the past, when we have not executed our commitments, we have been in trouble. You have to make some kind of arrangement whereby auditing can occur.

A PC who has a screaming ARC break can be smoothed out just by auditing him smoothly and well, though, true enough, he has missed withholds for you to clean up. PC's ARC break over no auditing. Auditing can also be conducted so as to amount to no auditing of any kind. Making auditing occur and making it possible is an even stronger action than pulling missed withholds, although that is necessary too. Auditing is pure magic.

The pretense of auditing without auditing is pure poison. It is dangerous to be almost an auditor, going through the motions of auditing without really listening to the PC, etc. A PC will put up with a relatively poor auditor, but not with a pretended auditor. All the things you are having trouble with are resolvable with auditing. Therefore you must not fall short as an auditor. In Last night's TVD, it turned out that the PC had set up the room in such a way that the meter wasn't secure. It bounced around and had to be fixed. When it was fixed, the PC's needle cleaned up.

The above truth applies regardless of the dynamic you are addressing. You can't counterfeit the intention to audit. If you have that, you will win. If you don't, you won't. Even if the PC doesn't perceive the intention, you should handle the situation by auditing. Put in the hope factor and the R-factor and audit.

What causes the apparent revolt against dianetics and scientology, when it occurs? It is a particular sort of missed withhold: a missed dynamic, item, or goal. It doesn't much matter what it is. The person is a thetan who is basically good. An appeal directly to the thetan bypasses all the garbage and secures his cooperation, if you truly intend to audit him. All the crimes, wars, and insanity in the world are not caused by the individual himself. They are caused by the misapprehensions of that individual. The greatest misapprehensions of all are his considerations of the dynamic and item, as a result of his carelessly postulated goal.

We are dealing here with human behavior. If an individual exists and can be reached, anything wrong he does thereafter is the result of his not being reached or audited. Here is what makes him tough to reach:

1. His goal.

2. His item, which is his pet antipathy.

3. His dynamic, in which he has included all the badness of existence. "He's fighting against shadows which are quite real to him." A person's goal may commit scientology to the status of being -- in his consideration -- his oppterm, whether it makes any sense or not to you, the scientologist. You can't predict this just from knowing the goal. It involves the PC's interpretation of the goal and his track experience. You match up to his oppterms, in his universe.

A rockslamming case is one who would get a rock slam on, "Consider committing overts against:.

1. Scientology.

2. Ron.

3. The organization.

4. Me. (The auditor)" If you get a rock slam on any of those four commands, the person considers you an enemy. He is not unauditable, but the meter behaves oddly. It is rockslammers who have made things unpeaceful for the last twelve years, not governments, psychiatrists, or some international organization. These people make up not more than twenty percent of an organization.

[If psychiatrists or psychologists had come up with results like ours], they would have published our case histories, with graphs and all. Nevertheless, they would undoubtedly rock slam, because they have a basic disagreement with what we are doing. The psychologist has agreed that Man is an animal, a meat robot. There is an earlier fundamental that makes this a lie. "Psychology" means "study of the psyche". If you talk to a psychologist, don't get into a discussion about whether Man is an animal. Talk about the derivation of "psychology", their fundamental name. You will thereby blow off their disagreement with us and clear up something that was definitely antipathetic to themselves.

The individual existed before the goal. The goal is less fundamental than the individual. It is only the antipathetic goal that gives you trouble. [Cf. Expanded dianetics: evil purposes.] Don't reward the rebel. Put him on the meter and check the four commands given above. If someone rockslams on one of those, don't hire him or enrol him on a co-audit. You could enrol him on a sub-co-audit, hang the rock slam around his neck, and he won't cause any trouble because you have as-ised the fact that he is a rockslammer. Rockslammers will dramatize in a 1.1 manner if you don't get them audited. You get an emergency telephone call, and they write down the message for you. Then, as they leave the room, their coat brushes it off into the wastebasket. You don't see it, but later on they can prove that they wrote it down for you. They will also agree with you about doing all the silly things you mention, and they will dissuade you somehow from doing all the right things.

Knowing these principles, you can understand human behavior much better. In an organization, a clearing co-audit, a marriage, or any other group, you have a sure-fire way of testing for the person who has to be straightened out. It is the person who rockslams when the group or person is mentioned in "Consider committing overts against _____ ." It is not one bad act that makes a rock slam. It takes a long accumulation of overts. The thing that a person rockslams on may be so suppressed that it has to be thoroughly tiger drilled [See p. 295a] before it rockslams. Find and handle rockslammers. Neither snuff them nor let them foul up the non-rockslammers.

We are in the weird situation that if we lose, everybody loses, while if we win, everybody wins. So it is an overt act for an auditor not to pick up and pay attention to a rockslammer, because if he omits to do this, he is letting the person lose and making it possible for everybody to lose. The rockslammer will only win if you do something. Only finding a goal will make a rockslammer go straight.

6210C09 SHSpec-200 Future Org Trends

If scientology organizations did nothing cohesive and had no central control, but only had people doing processing, and if, combined with this situation, there were other people with a vested interest in making slaves, we could get thrown on the dung heap and scientology could end up being practiced with electric shock by governments. On the other side, we could have a completely different picture: a well-unified scientology with sufficient international esteem and force to overcome any attempt to use it wrongly.

Buddhism, for lack of a plan, ended up being an enslaver of people. Some thought needs to be given to scientology's future to make sure that scientology doesn't end up like Buddhism. In Buddhism, nirvana became like a GPM. Look at a picture of nirvana sometime. It looks like someone surrounded with valences -- a GPM. Lamaism, with more ghosts and devils, became like another GPM. Zen Buddhism was based on the idea that if you are hit, you know. Much of it is a dramatization of Axiom 10. The Indian rope trick is mass hypnotism. The East never had a technology that did anybody any good. They knew a few answers, but they all wound up in the soup.

So this is the first time on this planet and maybe in this universe, when sentient beings could better themselves without worsening someone else. We are looking at tremendous force, not as in bullets, but force of knowingness: theta force. In this universe, one is used to seeing good people being squashed. It starts to look like goodness is weak, not a force, and that evil is strong. That is this universe's lesson, but it is not true. The reverse is true, even though this universe would like us to believe otherwise and seems to provide numerous "proofs" to the contrary.

If you block a theta comm line and tap it, you can suck a certain power off it that is residual in it. But it will explode in very short order.

The way an organization gets in bad shape is by individuation. An org commits overts against other orgs and gets into a games condition with them, then starts considering itself strange and different. Then it can't communicate anymore or function anymore.

This cycle is an interesting phenomenon which one can see every day. Overts are followed by the still after the confusion -- the withhold. The quiet moment on the battlefield is the one that sticks. So the stable datum is likely to be whatever someone thought after the fight was over. This is not necessarily what holds it still at all. One dramatizes the withhold. It is not the overt but the withhold that is the source of action. For instance, Bill shoots Joe and doesn't tell the police. He fires; Joe falls; Bill feels remorse and says, "I mustn't tell the police," and that, not the shooting, is what he dramatizes. As time goes on, he is no longer sure what he mustn't tell. To get rid of the source of pronouncement of his guilt, he commits more overts [-- against the police]. His "I mustn't tell the police" equates to individuation from the police. He also mustn't be Joe, the victim. That is another individuation. He might be able to tell you the withhold, "I mustn't tell the police," but he will probably not be able to spot or as-is the [prior overt], since it is at the level of action.

Committing an overt results in an individuation. The more separate we are, the less we can communicate and the less we can understand. If you want a laugh, get someone to "explain" something to you in an area that he has overts on. Using symbolic logic, where instead of numbers you are using meanings, all mathematics can be derived from ARC. In the absence of ARC -- i.e. when there are many overts -- there is no understanding or knowledge. Overts lower A, which lowers the other two: R and C. Someone who is totally stupid in an area has overts in that area. In the absence of ARC, there can [by definition] be no knowledge.

You can always apply these mechanics backwards. You can make someone feel that he has done something if he has a withhold about it. If we tell someone that we will burn him in the electric chair, he will dream up a crime to fit the punishment, even if he continues to protest his innocence. [Cf. the Jews in German concentration camps, who felt they must have somehow betrayed their Fatherland.] Also, if you tell someone not to touch something enough times, he will start to believe that it is dangerous, whether it is or not. This is because you have told him not to communicate with it, and the definition of dangerousness is "not to be communicated with".

Logic is two-poled. There are two sides to an equation. The mind also operates on a two-poled basis. Thus, when describing scientology to someone, if you keep on saying that it isn't like this, that, or another thing, he will get the idea that it simply isn't. You have to dream up something scientology is just like, so there will be a datum of comparable magnitude. You will find that the more ARC he has towards the thing you compare scientology with, the better he will understand scientology. So the best strategy is to compare scientology to himself, his highest ARC terminal. This will intrigue him, at least. "You want things better, right? So does scientology. You probably have a lot of basic wisdom about life, some buried, but really there. You have observed things. Scientology ia like you. You like to be free. Scientology wants that." You would be surprised how effective even so crude an argument could be with people. It doesn't even matter if his understanding of scientology is correct or not. He will get some A, R, and C.

In the absence of any ARC, you have no observation and no knowledge of the object or thing. Something you feel something about, have a tiny reality on, and have communicated slightly to the vicinity of -- that thing would be something that you would understand only slightly, but you would know it existed. There is an understanding that goes along with each step of the tone scale, up to total ARC, which is total understanding. This leads up to being part of everything, which is the booby trap of nirvana. The reverse of individuation is enforced association. One can obsessively become something.

There is a cycle here. Overts first lead to individuation, then goes on through the cycle to obsessive identification with the thing overted against. [For more detail on this cycle, see pp. 242-242a, above.] PC's associate themselves with their own oppterms, in varying degrees. This phenomenon occurs throughout existence. "What you resist you become," is here more accurately stated as, "That against which you have overts, you become." One becomes more and more individual and individuated up to a limit, at which point, the harder one tries to individuate, the more one becomes a sort of fake version of that against which one has overts. This shows up in dynamic assessment [See pp. 305-308.] and clearly shows up with the item. This is how the person rockslams.

If an organization overts against another one, it becomes more and more individuated, until it becomes a lower-level beingness. A thetan will run a whole cycle this way. That is why you get the "dead thetan" at 2.0. He is obsessively being what he was once part of.

We must keep the above mechanism of individuation in mind and look at the organizational plan that says that one scientologist is a field auditor and another is a staff member. This plan gives us a source of inadvertent withholds. If we are planning anything broad in the way of organizations, we have to eliminate any incipient individuation, or we will get a fake scientology. Scientology must be a single org in which the members freely participate. [Yet] scientology orgs must never individuate from scientology. They must never be allowed unhandled overts, or scientology will crash like every other attempt to help Man. The HCO 10% tends to further individuation, since it makes "HCO" different from the org.

Philosophers say that every organization's ethic is strongest at its inception, but actually, there ia no reason why its ethic shouldn't get much higher. To accomplish this, you must set it up such that organizations are not made different from each other, in order to avoid the incipient inadvertent withhold which would lead to no true scientology being in existence.

[Here, LRH goes into describing at some length an ideal scene for lower level scientology organizations.]

Looking further ahead, when you have cleared everyone, the scientology centers will be political centers and scientology will be the government. L. Ron Hubbard   Type = 3 iDate=9/10/62 Volnum=1 Issue=201 Rev=0 rDate=0/0/0 Addition=0 aDate=0/0/0 aRev=0 arDate=0/0/0 SHSpec - 201 Instructor's Bugbear   6210C09 SHSpec-201 Instructor's Bugbear

An auditor clears as fast as he is bright and as he delivers good quality auditing, and he clears as slowly as he flubs. If all is not going well, look to what is wrong with the auditor, not the PC. There is nothing wrong with PCs. Some PCs require more cleverness on the part of the auditor than others. Apparently, the individuality of life was all attained by goals. That doesn't mean people are individuals because of goals. It means that they are odd individuals because of goals. A goal is a symptom of individuation. So each person acts differently in processing. But there is no goal too difficult to be found. If you can discover a goal, "never to be discovered", why, you have a damned good technology.

Auditing quality is not "associated with sternness or... immovability or ... with being able to repeat the auditing command or [the idea that] "the auditor must always be right". An instructor watching half a dozen auditors may think that he needs a half a dozen new rules to overcome these students' peculiar difficulties. Actually, a11 he needs is "a tremendous ability to detect variation from the standard rule." This variation is sometimes so clever and well hidden that one never spots it. An auditor can leave the session on the forward track by leaving the PC at time point A and progressing to point G as fast as possible. The auditor is actually leaving the session, by way of the future time track instead of the door. The auditor is running the session process and the PC is still stuck in the first rud that the auditor couldn't confront and therefore didn't handle. In an effort to avoid facing the confusion in a session, the auditor unwittingly refuses to set up a session. He ignores and evades some part of the session that he has had trouble with. Now the PC is trying to get into session, while the auditor tries to run [from] the session.

The PCs who give you the most trouble are the ones who do the least. They don't explode at you. They don't walk out. They are just never in session and auditing never bites. They make no forward progress. The "good" PC is produced by an auditor who never gets the PC into session enough to ARC break them. Everything is all sort of shallow, dusted off but not investigated, etc. There was no communication and no understanding present. The auditor was trying to avoid ARC breaks, so there was no ARC at the outset and the whole session was an ARC break.

Standard auditing is the cycle of "asking the auditing question of that PC who is sitting in that chair, getting a response or answer from that PC, which is then understood by the auditor and is acknowledged by the auditor in such a way that the PC knows he ... did properly answer." When this is interfered with, weirdnesses creep in. It is a terribly simple cycle, and "terribly simple people -- such as myself -- don't seem to have too much trouble with it. More brilliant people figure their way through... and arrive at some kind of a mutated answer to it that produces a no-auditing situation, and how they manage to do this is the subject of an instructor." This is the instructor's nightmare. The

instructor must observe the departure from the simple comm cycle and get the auditor to see what he is doing. The instructor has to point out to students their errors "in such a way that they realize that they are not doing what they should be doing."

Where do all these oddball considerations come from, apart from goals, which is a source that we already know about? Man can rise above his aberrations anyway. He doesn't have to dramatize his aberrations to the full. It is not good enough to say that his goal and his item oppose his being a good auditor, even though he will perhaps never be fully expert until these are out of the way. There is another element, however. The auditor has a fixed idea left over from some group or philosophy or activity, about what is supposed to happen or what he is supposed to do to make something happen when he audits. For instance, he may have been part of a society which supposed that there was no reason why you couldn't decide to be anything you wanted to be and immediately become it. According to this view, all men were evil because they couldn't do this. That's rather a familiar one on the track. This is a weird way of making nothing out of thetans. An auditor with this kind of background operates on the basis that the PC is weak because he doesn't just make up his mind to go clear and do it.

Another oddball consideration is, "Why should you ask anybody a question? They already know and they know you know ...." Wait a minute! Those are the people who think that everybody knows all about them, to whom every minute is a missed withhold. This is the consideration, "Well, that is obvious to me, so it should be obvious to him."

Then there is the consideration that the auditor has to control the session and that that means, "never let the PC originate" or "Never confess that you didn't understand the answer" or "Never check anything the PC tells you is out (like a rud)."

So this auditor is doing a basic not-is of auditing the whole time he is auditing. And it will be found that he has never examined his fixed idea. With this auditor, the instructor must:

1. Find the fixed idea.

2. Get the auditor to look at it.

A person can get the impression of knowing from an impact, so if you have committed a fantastic number of overts against a thing, you conceive that you know something about it, but it's an inverted knowingness. It's the total cycle of individuation," and the PC returns on the reverse curve of inversion, back to the center of impact. [See pp. 242-242a for a more detailed description of this cycle.] At this point he "knows" that he knows. But -- ask him, say a psychiatrist, what he knows, and he can't tell you anything that he knows. If you kept it up, things would get very interesting, because you would "de-individuate him out of an obsessed interiorization into whatever he's doing." You would be reversing the cycle until he again knows he doesn't know.

When you "try to teach [such an individual] something to know, ... that room has already been rented. It has occupants. You can't, because he already knows,"at the level of impact and obsessive interiorization. So you have to reverse that cycle and convince him that there is something he doesn't know. This is the guy who greets everything you tell him with, "Yes, I know." So you say to him, "Everybody hates you," and you will get, "Yes I know.... 0h. Now wait a minute! ... Well, I knew if I knocked long enough, somebody would open that door! Hello!!"

If you press such an auditor long and well enough as an instructor, he will eventually cognite either that he "knows or that he doesn't know, and a new piece of certainty will be added to his auditing." Don't leave these fixed ideas uninspected by the auditor. Just ask him to inspect his own considerations about why he is doing, must do, or should do what he is doing wrong. Take his cockeyed, memorized answers, acknowledge, and then give the question again. Break down his machinery, and he will finally see some screwy alter-is that he has added into what he really should be doing. Ask him, "What puzzles you in a session?", and you will get an item of alter-is and confusion. It is usually something he has added which wasn't taught.

"All additives occur in the absence of understanding or the presence of misunderstanding." Idiocy equals all additives and no understanding. "Understanding is the reason for no additives.... Misunderstanding is the reason for ... additives." Know this!

Misunderstandings get picked up on meters as disagreement, a no-comprehension of. Education by disagreement is a fascinating approach. Hence, while word clearing on a meter, you don't ask, on spotting a read, "What didn't you understand there?" You ask for the symptom of the lack of understanding: "What is the disagreement there?"

In life, with respect to knowledge, "disagreement occurs after the misunderstanding." Get the auditor to spot his disagreements, and you will find his misunderstoods. If you get him to give you "twelve things in that bulletin you agree with," you will inevitably get the twelve things they disagree with.

"A person cannot do what he does not understand." Increase a person's understanding (ARC) of what he is doing, and he will do it better. An auditor is not evil. There is something he misunderstands or doesn't understand about "the function of the auditor or the cycle of auditing action.... You can't understand psychiatrists ... because you don't realize that they haven't any goals. [They] aren't doing anything that you would think they should be doing."

A goofing auditor can get really wild in his computations. You have to spot it and get him to spot it. For instance, you could get a computation like this:

1. I'm trying to straighten out this PC's mind.

2. Therefore I have to correct the things that they think.

3. The only way to correct anything is to change it.

4. So to change the PC, I have to correct him.

5. So I have to tell the PC something different every time he says something. "If you do not understand what is going on in a session, you won't be able to handle that session. At the bottom of all error is misunderstanding." You restore understanding of something by deleting the disagreement with it. Then you can study it and do things with it, etc.

6210C30 SHSpec-204 Pre-hav Scales And Lists

[LRH comments on Z unit progress. (See HCOPL 8Dec62 "Training -- Saint Hill Special Briefing Course -- Summary of Subjects by Units"). The SHSBC at that time had a new streamlined form, consisting of V, W, X, Y, and Z units, with Z being the most advanced unit. The material of the Z unit consisted of additional clearing data, the form of the course, and scientology plans. Auditing requirements were goal found on self and goal found on PC. This would give a Class IV certificate if all check sheets complete, a Class III cert if Y unit complete and above auditing requirement completed, a Class II cert if Y unit auditing requirements met (R2-12 (See page 339, below), CCH's, Assists, and Prepchecking) and only X unit checksheets complete. Also some general comments on rigorous training. See also HCOB 13Oct62 "Processes".]

Any former data on the subject of assessing scales was prior to the experience of nulling goals. We have learned that items can disappear from a list without being out or appear on a list without being in. All nulling of lists is therefore to be done as follows: We have a scale or list from some source and we have a lot of words, verbs, terminals, or whatever. Old style assessment by elimination is superseded by a new style that is much faster then tiger drilling the items. It is done by reading each item in turn. The ones that produce a disturbance of the needle, not necessarily an instant read at this point, are in. The time to judge whether it is a proper read is when it is still in at the end. Keep the questionable ones in until you have eliminated most.

Having assessed each line, mark the ones that read, no matter how they read, in. This means that they disturbed the needle. When the PC is in a rock slam area, the PC is all over the place. The read can be early, late, etc. For instance, a read could appear latent because the rising portion of a rock slam could obscure the first part of the read. If the PC is out of session, you may get prior reads. But goals almost always instant read. In assessing a scale, the time to get picky about reads is when you have an item still in and it is one of the few remaining. Now you get nice about it. Rocket reads are consistent; rook slams are not. The item with the slam has far more authority than the auditor. The to may sit there, cogniting silently, having forgotten the auditor altogether.

On a dynamic assessment, as you go down the list, pay attention to the PC's somatics on the different levels. You would be foolish to go headlong down the items list and pay no attention to the somatics that the PC is getting. You may find the PC's valence at one of these levels. He is likely to hit an item which is where he has been for millenia, and if you don't watch what you are doing, you will go on, leaving him there.

Standard assessment by elimination is not likely to work, except with a really good auditor who maintained real two way comm with the PC, no inval or eval, no out ruds, etc. Items on the rock slam chain must be right. Therefore, the procedure must be revised. The revised version is easy to do, especially if you can see the meter read. It does require precise meter reading. The PC must know what you are doing and what you are trying to find, or the whole list can be a protest. Be sure you can read the list before you try to assess it, so that you can give the items right. If the PC is a rockslammer on scientology and you give an item wrong, the item could rockslam. At the very least, it can make the PC protest. A wrong or irrelevant item on a list, read back to the PC, is being asserted by the auditor and protested by the PC. Therefore, it will read. The PC may get caught up in an oppterm and may get protest reads from that.

Another phenomenon is everything on the list reacing. That is by-passing the item. All the items can stop reading, too. Either one of these two phenomena indicates that the mid-ruds of the session, not the list, are out. One item in every now and then is what looks right. If the mid-ruds are out, the PC is handling the out-rud on down the list and everything can read on that out-rud. When this happens, the auditor's voice, reading anything, creates a greater effect on the PC and the item has a greater effect on the meter. The PC is vulnerable as in Bridge, because a partial win becomes a missed withhold. So the auditor's voice, no matter what he says, will produce a reaction. The PC really has a missed withhold, whichever rud is out. If this phenomenon is increased further, nothing will read.

However, if you put session mid-ruds in too often, the PC will be driven out of session by cleaning cleans. If you assess for awhile without noticing that nothing was reading, when you see the column of X's the next time through, call these items again, to be sure.

This system is to prevent reads from being wiped out by out-mid-ruds and to let you select the right item by tiger drilling [See p. 295a for tiger drill procedure]. It is best to err on the side of having too many items left in to be tiger drilled. You should leave, say, five items in. Mid-ruds may not be out enough to screw up the session, but they may be out enough to screw up a particular item. So the procedure is:

1. Assess by elimination to a few (between three and eight) items,

   keeping mid-ruds in.

2. Start tiger drilling, using a six-button tiger drill, unless the PC is protesty, in which case you can make it seven by adding "protest".

After tiger drilling, you are looking for a slam. If an item stays in with a mere dirty needle, circle it, but don't necessarily buy it. Buy the biggest read. You should get a bigger read on the right item and a smaller read on the wrong item, after tiger drilling. You don't necessarily do this with a big polish operation, because you don't have the same need to be precise as with a goal. Just tiger drill it enough to make sure.

This should not take more than three minutes. Don't pay any attention to pain and sensation while you are doing this. Just dust them off. If you can't make up your mind, tiger drill them harder.

6211C01 SHSpec-206 The Missed Missed Withhold

[LRH enumerates the many bulletins that have come out on missed withholds, starting in February, 1962. In spite of all this, the subject has not been duplicated by students. People keep picking up withholds, instead of missed withholds.]

All ARC breaks stem from missed withholds. "I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to be brave, squint up your eyes, and plunge." Get the missed withhold.

A missed withhold is a withhold that people nearly found out about but didn't. You want to find out what people almost found out. A withhold is something a PC did and isn't talking about. It is not missed unless someone nearly found out about it. The missed withhold has nothing to do with what the PC did or is doing. It's not the PC's action. It is the other person's action and the PC's wonder about it. It often shows up as a recurring withhold, one which the PC keeps giving you. The charge keeps coming up because of the restimulation, as yet unlocated, of someone possibly finding out. "A missed withhold has nothing to do with the PC. it is another person's action and the PC's wonder about it.... Forget that it is even a withhold.... You are looking for exact moments in the ... lifetime of this PC when somebody almost found out and he's never been sure since whether they did or they didn't. We don't care what they almost found out. We only care that they almost found out something. 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." The PC is stuck in the unknownness of the uncertainty as to whether someone else knew. This blows when the PC spots it. A missed withhold is an overt and a withhold plus a mystery. The magnitude of the overt has nothing to do with its evaporation. The degree of mystery is what holds it in place. If you want to know what is sticking a thetan to something, look for the mystery sandwich. Even overts themselves wind up in the mystery of whether you should have done it. This causes withholding of further action. All things boil down to right conduct.

So when you ask the PC for missed withholds, be alert for whether the PC is giving you withholds or missed withholds. The number of withholds a person has on the whole track is undoubtedly staggering. You don't need to get them all to clear somebody. The whole anatomy of a game is O/W. You gather energies by the mechanism of O/W which result in solid-mass terminals, making a game possible, etc. In spite of all that, you don't have time enough to run nut all the PC's overts, even for one lifetime. General O/W does have its uses. It is useful for getting the PC into session and smoothing things out, but it is generally too lengthy. So to see a case go, "Sproing!", Ask the PC for "nearly-found-outs". "When I tell you to pick up a PC's missed withhold, I want you to pick up another persons action, not the PC's. And it is best characterized as 'nearly found out'.... You are running the almost-discovered track."

"You'll never see anybody quite so upset as somebody who has been just barely missed. Look at a pedestrian who was not hit," or a bear that is biting at a bullet [that just missed him], or an exam that you failed by one or two points. "It's the nearness of the miss" that counts. It is a mis-estimation of effort or thought. A thetan's main attention is on estimation of thought, effort, and look. He wants to know how much look is a look. His certainties are all based on proper estimation of thought, effort, look, etc. When an error is made here, it is upsetting. How much knowledge is knowingness? That is an estimation. How much emotion does it take to be emotional? Enough to create the desired effect. What is a proper symbol? Etc. You can estimate everything except how much mystery constitutes a mystery, because that is a mystery! You are now into the no-estimation band, and it is all mysterious. The not-knowingness of it is upsetting. Not-knowingness that is probably known is especially painful, because of the multiple not-know flows involved. Take a not-knowingness and play with it both ways: They knew, but they didn't or couldn't have known. You know they knew, but you know they didn't know. The four-way flows of a missed withhold are painful to a thetan. This is the stuff of which insanity is made. Insanity in the effort band of the know to mystery scale is "can't reach/must reach". Insanity in the mystery band is a "did/didn't; must/mustn't know". That is what a missed withhold is and what it is doing to the PC. "It's just pure mystery mucilage, ... and the thetan will stick right to it."

Getting just the overt and withhold off, when there is an added mystery of a missed withhold, doesn't produce an as-isness of the section of track where the PC is stuck, because "the PC is not stuck with the overt [or] the withhold. The PC is stuck with the 'almost found out', so of course nothing as-ises [if you only get the O/W's] and you get a recurring withhold." You could get remarkable results running, "Get the idea of people nearly finding out about you." You could run this on three flows. This process would free up track that the PC had never seen before, but which had been right in front of his nose.

So when pulling missed withholds, it is not what the PC did which is of interest. When pulling withholds, "get the name, rank and serial number of the person who missed it. [I] couldn't care less what was missed. I don't want the PC's action. I want the PC's guess about the other guy." Get who the PC thinks might know, etc., etc. If you have gotten off his overts on something and he still feels a bit weird about it, you are apt to think that he must have more overts, so you keep after him for more. This will send him around the bend, since you are essentially cleaning a clean. You have to find:

1. Who nearly discovered the overt.

2. When.

3. How often. This is what is needed to complete the cycle that was started when the overt was almost discovered. Just as far as time is concerned, it is a mystery sandwich. The thetan is wondering whether a certain punitive track is going to happen. It doesn't, so that time doesn't exist. The result in the creation of mocked-up track that never actually appears on the track and therefore hangs up in time. Not dropping the other shoe is like producing a missed withhold.

So you don't ask, "What have we failed to find out about you?" ask, "What have we nearly found out about you and when did we nearly find it out?" The first gets withholds; the second gets missed withholds. The worst type of missed withhold is where the PC is asking himself, "Which one of my crimes did he (maybe) discover?"

6211C01 SHSpec-207 The Road to Truth

It is very difficult to go around remembering all the time. You get stuck!

Pontius Pilate asked, "What is truth?" Truth is a very near ultimate in its most severe interpretation. Lots of people have stated what truth is without realizing that they are putting an absolute where there is actually a maybe. Truth is a relative commodity. The best approach to truth is contained in the mathematics used in connecting telephone switchboards. They don't select out subscribers with arithmetical truth. Arithmetic is a theoretical truth. It is only theoretical because there is no commodity connected with it. It is a truth of symbols. Errors only turn up when people say the symbols mean something in reality. "Two apples minus two apples equals no apples," is a magician's trick. A no-apple is a relative thing. There is still something of an apple. You can say, "Well, there are no apples on the table after you take two apples off." That is true, as long as you accept time as a truth, which is adventurous! The statement is only true for one particular time and place, yet it passes as a truth. It is a truth, but a relative one. No thetan since apples came into existence has utterly as-ised an apple. So "Two apples minus two apples equals no apples," is only relative, unless it presupposes some kind of magic. We have become used to accepting such things as true. The abstract 2-2=0 is true, but it is true only because we have set it up that way.

The person who adventures out on the road to truth adventures with great desperateness. It is an adventurous step. A philosopher who seeks to discover and teach truth is taking his life in his hands, as well as the lives of many others. Therein lies his responsibility. It is adventurous because it is the only track you have to go the whole way on. There is no short stop on the way to truth. You have to walk to the end of the road. Otherwise, all manner of difficulties and upsets will beset you. There is no such thing as a relative philosophical truth that is safe, if it doesn't approach the actual composition of the subject matter it addresses. If you address the subject of the physical universe through the physical sciences, you will find weird things in your path. The savants of these sciences use the phrase, "exact science" with great impudence, considering the complete difference between what is given as truth in two different fields, like chemistry and physics. There is an article in The Encyclopedia Britannica at the turn of the century that wisely said that people wouldn't find out much about time and space until they studied in the field of the mind and got the conceptual basis that preceded time and space. Physics has gotten the world in trouble by building weapons that can be used by men who aren't sane.

There are workable truths. which gives the "exact sciences" a bloated notion of themselves, because they deal in workable truths. In the field of the study of Man, people try to use, as a workable truth, the notion that no one can do anything about Man because he is merely an animal. This idea started as a revolt against religion's control of men's faith. Psychology is a study that is peculiarly religious and was so until 1879, when Wundt theorized that Man has no soul. Up to that point, psychology had been a religious study, looking at the will, reason, etc. Somebody moved in on it in the spirit of revolt. Just as the advances of the "exact sciences" have, here and there down the track, blown up religion, so the "exact sciences" have now entrenched themselves in a total falsehood concerning the mind. At the same time, they have developed an unworkable psychology to back up the "exact science" of blowing up the planet. That gives you some of the liabilities of embarking on the road to truth and not going towards truth.

Gautama Siddhartha discovered how to exteriorize without discovering the laws governing it or how to let someone else exteriorize at will. How many hundred million people did he condemn to slavery by not walking all the way down that road? Because half-truths have been used and misused ever since. Knowing this, it takes a brave man to go in that direction. He knows that the traps and upsets of existence are composed of half-truths and that all efforts to enlighten can be employed to enslave and entrap, by the fact of two-way flow. Aesop's Fables originally had no morals. They were just amusing stories.

This is pertinent to what you are doing, because in the microcosm of a single person, you have the macrocosm of the universe. The universe proceeds from basic postulates. You can go on from these basic postulates to spot the goals of gold and lead and the methods of livelihood of quartz and schist. They aren't alive, but they follow a behavior pattern. All flies wash their faces in the same way. It is wonderful, the way some postulates stick! Moss or Man, you are looking at the same cumulative structure, based on some intentions and dedications. You could reanalyze the world of chemistry or physics on the basis of postulates and intentions. One of the booby traps of studying science is the sort of statement typified by, "Nobody knows what electricity is." This is in fact just a remark, not even a postulate! But everyone takes it as a truth, so they go into agreement with it and therefore are debarred from discovering more truth. People have been telling other people for a long time that they can't find out about truth. The idea of the unknowable has some use, but only to let people see that you don't have to know all about something before you start to find out about it. Emmanuel Kant used the concept of the unknowable differently. He said that the unknowable would never be known by anybody. Well, how did he find out about it? Even by philosophic examination, it is preposterous. If you can't experience it at all, how can you know it exists to be not-known?

There are some roads that are agreed to be closed. For instance, there is an idea that it is bad to know about the human mind. ["Some things it is better not to know...."] If you are alive, you know something about the human mind. What is really dangerous is to find out nothing more about it. In the last few days, the cobalt-60 was close to spreading across the steppes of Russia and [the plains of] the U.S. Because of what? Because it is so dangerous to begin to know anything about the human mind. People recognize that it is dangerous, to some degree, but they recognize what is really dangerous. If you know of the existence of something, it is dangerous not to know all about it. People concede that they don't know anything at all about it. That is an idiotic premise. In the field of the mind, they are already aware of the existence of figure, think, calculate in other beings, so they are already started on the road to knowledge of the human mind. It is very dangerous to go no further. So the search for truth isn't the province of a few. Everyone has started to know something about it. But not to know more about it than they do will cause them to die. That doesn't even seem startling, it is so accepted.

If a group decides to go all the way on the road to truth, the more they know, the less dangerous it is. What is really dangerous is to suppose that people think, and to know nothing more about it than that. It is also very dangerous to be spotted as one who is walking towards truth, unless you go the whole way. It is booby trapped. Everyone is very suspicious of anything being known, because people who have jumped up and said something was known have often lied. If they pretended to know more then others, they have committed overts. If they found some partial truth and never got any further, but instead spread bric-a-brac in all directions as The True Wisdom, they have committed the overt of consigning perhaps billions of people to slavery. So there is no substitute for walking the track. LRH has never doubted that he would bring off this study, though he has often wondered whether or not the time factor would upset things. We needed a few clear years.

If you have a reputation for knowing, you enter into a mechanism called the missed withhold. If you seem to have the gift of knowing about the mind, people think you know the truth, and to them, the only truth that exists is themselves: a first dynamic truth. This includes their own aberrations, their ideas about rightness of conduct, etc. So you run into missed withholds. A scientist wants to get away from right and wrong because he is blind to the possibility that there could be an exact right conduct. The idea of right conduct has been a particular concern of eastern philosophers. It has been ignored in the west. All considerations of behavior and the O/W mechanism are primarily based on ideas of right and wrong conduct. In back of the O/W mechanism is the idea that right conduct can exist. This is the saving grace of any race of beings. Survival is the monitoring factor of rightness of conduct. The behaviorist would try to tell you that right conduct is a first dynamic matter, that it is not survival, but self-preservation. This misses the boat. A person commits overts, not because of self-preservation, but because of survival. That is his rightness of conduct. The difference is that, in fact, one acts out of more than one dynamic. Right conduct is always a group activity, not an individual

one. No matter how much a person speaks of integrity to himself, his ideas of his own rightness are based on the concepts of the group to which he belongs. So we get third dynamic aberration of right conduct as underlying all O/W and missed withholds. The only thing senior to O/W is the pure mechanics of existence, as given in the early Axioms. Those early Axioms are very close to absolute truth. [A thought: Absolutes are unattainable because the only absolute is a static and that is nothing, hence it is unattainable, because it cannot be had.]

The aberrations a person engages in are his efforts to discover right conduct, with the handicap that mores change from group to group and lifetime to lifetime. So there is no road to truth on the subject of right conduct. If you realize that a thetan's aberrated condition results from:

1. A search for right conduct;

2. An effort to adhere to codes of right conduct;

3. The breaking of codes of right conduct, then you are walking the road to truth. Moral statements are the entrance of arbitraries into conduct, not truths. This fact is unknown to legislators, who always try to say that their laws are true. But in making the laws, they no longer even consult the customs of the people, but instead try to reverse the social order. However, laws which don't evolve from the customs of the people:

1. Operate as a total tyranny.

2. Are totally unenforceable. Prohibition was a good example of this fact.

This concerns you, because you are in the business of determining truth from right conduct or "now-I'm-supposed-to's". People think that right conduct is truth; they think they have some data, when they don't. Your period of peril is past. There was a time when -- taking you as a unit of truth -- there was a question whether or not your state of understanding of yourself [could be] materially improved by study and processing. However, it is now clear that if anyone will sit still and if the auditor does the right processing, this will occur. We started out with everyone stupid as Hell on the subject, including LRH, originally. Now we have gotten to the point where someone can know all about where he has been, what he has done, and where the Axioms look to him like clearly-stated obvious things.

We are essentially in the business of individuals. Don't forget that. No matter what you are trying to do or handle, whether it is a world government, or whatever it is, you will never, in your whole history, handle more than sn individual. If you fail to handle an individual, then you will have to set up all sorts of groups and laws to do it. The raison d'etre of most earth organizations is the fact that they could not handle an individual. This brought about their construction, not their demise. This isn't true of all third dynamics, only the aberrated ones here on earth. This is actually an inverted third dynamic. They couldn't handle the first dynamic, so they developed an organization not to have to do it. Despite that scientology is the one activity on this planet that doesn't follow this rule, there still tends to be an organization that gets pulled in and grows up around LRH. At times this organization fails to deliver service, due to shortage of time or material or personnel. But on the whole, we are handling the individual. Russia shoots individuals and loves the masses. This is aberrated.

You can handle the individual if everything you do is individually tailored to serve his needs, so he is not overlooked. Whenever you fail to handle an individual, you set up an upset. So you will set up an organization, laws, and all sorts of O/W to do it. We are probably the only organization today going in the direction of a clear third dynamic. We use O/W only to park an individual until we can handle him.

"There is no truth in the mass of things [and] no truth in moral codes. Truth isn't to be found there, only agreements." There is no truth apart from the individual. If there is any truth, you are it. If there is any truth to be known, you will know it. When someone almost caves in because you have confronted him and made him wonder what you do know, i.e. when you have missed a withhold on him, your only mistake is not to reach him as truth. You are at that moment confronting the road to truth, and you have got to travel it, because you have already started to. There will be many a PC that you will start to process, many a person that you will tell about scientology, of whom you will say, "Why did I get up this morning?!!" If someone says, "I heard that Ron doesn't believe in God," the wrong thing to do is to unload, jump off the road. You handle it. All your disasters anyplace will stem from the instant you backed off, turned around, did something else, and set up an organization to

handle this jerk. You will only fail when you don't try, because if you make some stab at it, he won't go away. You will be surprised to find that you will pick him up somewhere down the track. Many times you will think you have failed when you haven't. The only mistake is to try to go backwards on the road to truth. That is dangerous. If you fail to stand up to someone who is mad at you because of his missed withholds or to the guy in the PE course who says, "It can't be true because Ron doesn't believe in God," that is when you fail: catastrophes occur; people get mad at you. You cave in. But that can be changed or handled. If you fail to handle an individual, you end up setting up an org to handle masses, but not individuals. Individuals only stand up [and yap] in order to be handled.

There is truth to be found, and there is a road to truth. You have that in you, and every time you look at a human being, you see it in him. Rut you don't find truth in the mass of things and in moral codes. Since you understand what [human nature] is about, the more you know and understand it, the less these factors [like having to handle a banky individual] will trouble you. But every little fellow has started on the road to truth. His only stupidity is not to keep going. We are almost there. The main road and the thorns are behind us. We only retreat from our position to the degree that we don't realize that you can't start a case, you can't embark on clearing a planet or an individual and do it diffidently, without to some degree seeing it through to a final conclusion. Your only disasters will stem from failure to follow that road all the way through.

6211C13 SHSpec-210 The Difficult Case

A Problems Intensive [See p. 292] is apparently capable of producing a Book One MEST clear, if it is done right. It has done so on a couple of PCs. If this is not happening elsewhere than at St. Hill, it may be that people elsewhere don't know what a free needle is. Peoples' TA's have been gotten to clear read with no mention of F/N. So pay some attention to this. It could be that it was happening without being reported.

The aspect of a case depends on the way the case is handled, generally. How the case is handled has a great deal to do with how rough the case looks. Say case A and case B are similarly tough cases. If case A gets a lot of usual actions, a good hope factor, a good R-factor, and case B gets unusualness and wrong actions, case A will run easily and case B will run rough and break anybody's heart.

Psychiatric classification, behavior in life, etc. have no bearing on how hard or easy the case will be to handle. The same goes for scientology classification schemes. We make our own tough cases: the Black V, theetie-weetie, etc. It doesn't matter. The length of time to handle the case doesn't compare to the state of the case. All cases are hard, actually. Some are made more difficult by preconceptions and classifications that don't really apply. The technology has by-passed the difficulties. The case that you will have trouble with is always a spook and a surprise to you. It is not the psychiatric disaster case. The tough ones are the ones who look sane and able and lie like Hell, because they don't do the commands. They get upset if you keep at them to see if they did the command. That just makes them feel accused, and they get harder to audit.

You can spot this kind of case by observing that, after a short period of modern auditing, the case hasn't recovered. This case either:

1. Hasn't done your commands,   or

2. You haven't audited the case. This case interrupts the auditing cycle.

The most extreme example of this kind of case is the individual who can't communicate at all, or the case that can't hear or that has no command of the language that you are using. But that is simple. You recognize the out-of-communication state that he is in and know that you would get nowhere with a subjective process like straightwire.

But you miss the case who ostensibly speaks and understands English but never answers the question or executes the commands. There is actually a gradient of this which, at its top level, includes every case. Sooner or later, any case won't do the command. The "spook" is the one who never does the command and always does something else. What is happening is that he is on a circuit. He is being a wired set of valences. The PC is out there somewhere and has nothing to do with the auditing at all.

Don't let your PC sit there in a sort of comfortable, relaxed puzzle. Find out what is going on, but don't chop up the PC. Auditors sometimes sense that the PC isn't executing the command, and they start harassing the PC, chopping him up, because they know something is wrong. They don't feel in good 2WC with the PC. So you move in and get insistent with the PC. Then the TA moves even less. This case is the last one in the world to admit that he is not doing the command. He could even get TA. Say he is running the command through an electronic incident, because he knows that if it changes, he is better.

How do you handle this case? You watch the TA while you are running the PC's right havingness process, or you can run another process that has something to do with the physical universe, like Op Pro by Dup, SCS, or CCH's. If you get good TA with that, flatten that. The reason you don't notice the TA is that the PC is off the meter. But if the PC gets a lot of TA in the rudiments and little in the body of the session, you know at once that the PC never does the auditing command. It is self-evident that this is the true state of affairs if you run the PT environment, e.g. with, "Look at the _____ ," and the TA moves, while a Problems Intensive gives zilch TA. Here you will see that the PC can get TA.

Such people have a short span into the past. Reality on what went on in the world ceases five minutes to five days ago, or so. In the body of the session, you are trying to send him out of PT. If all PCs were like this tough case, we would clear people with ruds, since TA action gives a direct index of case change. "If you don't get as much TA action in the body of the session as you do in running the rudiments, please realize" that the process is not running. "TA motion mirrors directly and immediately the amount of change which is being secured. [It is a] direct index of how much bank is changing or shifting." So you handle the difficult case by giving ruds and havingness sessions.

A case with good reality on the bank wouldn't get good TA on ruds. TA on havingness or any CCH or contact process means that the PC is becoming aware of the walls of the room. "What wall?", indeed! His concept of mass is being shifted by confronting his environment. It is not bank mass that is giving TA. It is the mass of the walls of the room. The PC is in no shape to be audited, because where is he going to be audited from? Furthermore, he doesn't have the stability of PT to audit against. So any attempt on your part to get him to address the track throws him into confusion. He can't answer the auditing question because he has no point of reference. Cases are audited against the reference point of PT. Oddly enough, the memory of eight million years ago totally depends on knowing it was sight million years from a specific time, e.g. PT. A guy who is stuck in an electronic incident of three million years ago will get TA when you get him to look at his immediate vicinity. Otherwise, hs will run a Problems Intensive from a point three million years ago, which is an unstable point. So you are running a confusion against an instability. But two confusions never made a stability. "A case that is wildly out of PT seldom answers the auditing command or executes it, and auditing depends exclusively on getting the... command executed." The auditing cycle must occur every time the auditor opens his mouth. On "Recall a time you communicated," if the time he commed is up the track from where he is stuck, he can't recall it, because it hasn't happened yet. So he has to do something else. So, for instance, he mocks up a psychoanalyst against the auditor. Or he holds the two back corners of the room. He does these things because he doesn't want to wasts the auditor's time.

TA action on ruds and on the body of the session is the only reliable indication of this type of case. In this situation, it becomes important to prepare a case. Don't try to plow the ground with a Cadillac. It is the wrong vehicle. If the PC isn't doing the command, don't harass him. Do objective processes. When the motion goes out of the TA, do the body of the session with subjective processes.

The gradient scale of toughness of cases is proportional to the amount of TA they get on PT or near-PT processes, ruds and havingness. To get good reality on this point, take a PC who has been having an awful time with 3GAXX and run some PTP's or some such, and watch the TA fly. [First mentioned in tape 6210C23 SHSpec-202A "3GAXX". Also mentioned in tape 6210C23 A "3GAXX Following the Rock Slam" and 6210C25 SHSpec-209 "3GAXX Secondary Pre-hav Scale". These tapes are confidential. The process lists and handles some types of implants. It unburdens the case and locates goals. See also pp. 332-335, below, and HCOB's 8Nov62 (Listing Pack II) and 11Nov62 "3GAXX: Straightening Up 3GAXX Cases" for more on 3GAXX running.] The PC must be there before you audit him. The auditing cycle requires the presence of the PC. So give him lots of ruds and havingness and a Problems Intensive on a close-to-PT problem he can confront.

This type of PC will get sensation on a list, all right, because he would get sensation from two days ago, it is that unreal. He has sensation because he is in the middle of a confusion with no referral point, no PT. How do you expect him to be anywhere but in a confusion? That's what sensation basically is: the PC in a confusion. Give him PT. Then you can run him.

6211C13 SHSpec-211 Entrance to Cases

[LRH starts by referring to a recent bulletin: HCOB 11Nov62 "3GAXX -- Straightening Up 3GAXX Cases".]

The subject of entrance to cases is becoming broad and encyclopedic. There is a new routine: R3-21. [See also p. 356, below.] The original 3GA was highly workable, but insufficiently delineated, Routine 3-21 is 3GA plus all the improvements, like tiger drilling. It would probably work on any case that was well-prepared, but we can't count on a case being well-prepared. Preparation would be done with CCH's and prepchecks. There have been frailties in the preparation of cases that have made it necessary to develop things that weren't really vital.

We rediscover havingness every six months, it seems. It has been six months since the last time. No matter how tricky your auditing question is, if the PC isn't there, it won't reach him or alter his case. No unusual solution will get to him either. So, when faced with the unusual, do the usual, the very ordinary.

The tricky developmental work has had uses and has brought us forward. On a well-prepared case, tiger drilling the 850-goal list is easy. The PC doesn't protest all the time. The PC who is not well-prepared isn't doing the commands and has a dirty needle. He never completes the auditing cycle. The reads you get while tiger drilling aren't coming from the po confronting anything. They are coming from some automaticity.

Even if the case is well-prepared, you could still have difficulty doing R3-21. The goal could be absent from the list, or on the list but so unreal to the PC that it would never answer up if confronted. So you need a process that overcomes the PC's enturbulated PT environment, etc. This process is 3GAXX. 3GAXX is designed to totally grab the PC's attention and interest and to keep it where the rock slam is. It will always be true that a rock slam will produce interest. It is sort of a forced in-sessionness. Interest follows a rock slam. You are overwhelming the so-called "natural defenses of the mind". You use the rock slam channel, find the goal, find the pairs of items all along the channel by their rock slams. You can pretty well overwhump almost anything in the PC if you can get on the trail of a rock slam. You will be asked to do miracles -- to audit in noisy environments, on poorly-prepared cases. For that you need very powerful processes. 3GAXX is what you need. It is designed to capture the PC's interest so much that he can only tell you what is in front of his face.

There are three bank elements that are handled in 3GAXX:

1. The rock slam channel.

2. The goals channel.

3. A set of pairs that lead from the dimmest beginnings of the GPM up to the tiniest pair in PT. The route between these pairs is travelled from PT back to the beginning. The procedure is to

1. Find the goal. and then

2. Find items that have built up by the existence of this goal. This is a path marked by rock slams. 3GAXX has rules, such as the rule that the PC's interest follows the rock slam. Since this is true, the PC has no choice but to be in session.

Suppose the PC is protesting mid-ruds whenever you get off the rock slam channel. This would be because he is only in session as long as you are on the rock slam channel, where he can't help being interested. It could also be because he has been beaten with mid-ruds to a point where he can't stand them. When you are getting his pre-hav level items (by listing "W/W would (pre-hav level)?"), the answers come ripping off his circuits. When havingness is low, circuits key in. Someone who is in indifferent contact with PT has his circuits keyed in. Circuits are GPM items or their cousins, aunts,

or uncles. 3GAXX deals out the circuits that the PC would normally be using anyhow, so he has no choice but to give them to you, and thus you do get an auditing cycle.

You start out with a dynamic assessment. [See pp. 305-308 for the general procedure.] Use these questions:

1. "What isn't part of existence?"

2. "Who or what have you detested?"

3. "Who or what would you prefer not to associate with?" In listing and nulling these, follow the rock slam. [Note: These commands might be the precursors of later PTS rundown tech. LRH recognizes the enturbulative effect of environmental factors on auditing, though as yet there appears to be no official form of ethics handling. There seems to be an attempt to handle all of it through tech.]

So you are doing 3GAXX and now you call his attention to PT to get mid-ruds in -- and you have a God-awful time. Nothing quite cleans up. If you have goofed and invalidated one of his items, you will really be in the soup, since he is allergic to PT, which is where he would have to be to clean it up. So a process as beefy as 3GAXX must be done with expertise, particularly when used on a PC who is not well set up for it. You have no leeway for error when you have overwhelmed the natural defenses of the mind. That is why untrained auditors shouldn't try to run these high-powered processes. With R3-21, you can find the PC's goal, whether he is ready to find it or not, by entering the case with Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam.

An additional method of entering the case is Roll Your Own Pre-hav. [See HCOB 7Nov62 "Roll Your Own Pre-hav".] The pre-hav scale, to be exact, must be given by the PC in his own words. So find the pre-hav level and ask the represent question. Get a list and find the item, which will be his perfect individual pre-hav level. This procedure gets rid of the necessity for huge long assessments, and you will probably wind up with a rock slam this way. You will list, "Who or what would do that?", and get a terminal or oppterm -- it doesn't matter which. The assessment can be done simply by calling each level, assessing by elimination down to a few items, tiger drilling those items to one and saying, "Consider committing overts against _____ ." This should turn on the slam.

So you get the item, which is "the protagonist or antagonist in the game which pursues from the fellow having had a goal in the first place." They are like a pair of dumbbells. There is also another pair of dumbbells: the not-pair, pinned to the positive items electronically, e.g.-

W/W would smoke?

W/W would not smoke?

W/W would oppose smoking?

W/W would oppose not smoking?

You can, however, safely ignore the negative items. You could find the item, get the oppose, represent, oppose that, represent that, etc., etc. You are not trying to clear somebody this way, although you could, theoretically, by going back item by item down the rock slam channel. It would be hard, though, lacking the goal. It is easier to go down aways, pick up the goal, and then list it. Unburden the goal. Then find it and work with it.

If you kept discharging the case and at the same time disorienting the case, you would get further and further from finding the goal. You would really just be enturbulating the case, say, if you kept giving the PC items that didn't slam. He would keep getting fuzzier and more confused. This could occur when you went by "detested person", etc. [See p. 333. See also p. 243, above.] There is a pair there, which you have ignored if you go on to the dynamic assessment and the represent, etc. So your rule is to make a pair. When you get an item that rockslams, you oppose it. If it is still hot, you represent it. This isn't all that smooth, when the PC is not clear. The items can be out of order. You have to pick your way through it. The test by which you go is, "What is still slamming?" It will slam if you run, "Get the idea of committing overts against [it]."/withholding from [it]." If it still slams, it hasn't been opposed, even if you think you got the oppterm.

The GPM straightens out only because you have gotten the PC to recognize the matter, energy, space, and time that the item consists of. It has been recognized and placed where it should be placed. The PC has seen what it is opposed by and has gotten sensible about it. This goes back to the earliest laws of the mind that LRH formulated; namely, that things are composed of:

1. Identities.

2. Similarities. and

3. Differences.

[This is from Dianetics: The Original Thesis and DMSMH.]" "A GPM is in a state of total identification when you [first] greet it.... Every ... item is every other ... item. When you list, you are bringing about a similarity from an identity.... By causing [the PC] to find the item they [the other items] were all pinned to in the first place, differentiation takes place, and the thing starts blowing apart." Just calmly finding that the PC is a rockslammer and telling him, will make him significantly saner right there. "He was mad at the whole environment. Now he knows what he's mad at specifically [e.g. scientology, Ron, etc.]. Now if we find, "Who or what was mad at (whatever he was slamming on: scientology, or whatever)?", we would have a pair [that] would tend to blow [because] a slam is the meter manifestation of a games condition. It's the unsuccessful effort to withdraw from the thing he must attack."

It takes two items, minimally, to make a package. "One stick won't burn. It takes two to make a fight." Every package has at least two items and really four, including the "not" pair, i.e. you also have to find out what wasn't against scientology and what scientology isn't. A rockslammer is only bad off before he has been detected. When he finds out what his target really is: scientology, and then finds out what would attack that target, he will feel better. He will start to shed that valence, and he can be someone else. But the more rock slam you leave behind you, by leaving items, the more the rock slam will diminish. The PC's attention is on those by-passed items, and he can't confront the items ahead of him. Since he only slams on things that can become real to him, the slam fades out. So you had better get all the things that he can confront. If you have available parts of his line plot with unopposed items, you can free up more of his attention by filling in those blanks.

So here's why you are doing 3GAXX. You are releasing sufficient attention from fancied opposition in the environment so the PC is not distracted and going back-track from the ruffled point of the environment. As you go on, he will get less and less confused and more and more able to find his goal. Eventually, you find the goal, after you have a hatful of items by a variety of methods. You could take a goal like "to dance on eggs" that fired only three times, but which rocket reads once in awhile. You can do a represent list on that goal to get a similar goal and pull apart goals. You can list for the goal that a given item would have. [Cf. expanded dianetics "wants handled" rundown.]

But unless all this improves the PC's presence, alertness, and available attention, you would do better to just give him a Problems Intensive and CCH's.

6211C15 SHSpec-212 Terminals

There is an item on the bulletin board about Nixon. We really clobbered him! "I hit him because he hit Mary Sue. [He was] using the U.S. secret service as sort of a private Gestapo ... all over Washington," which didn't seem right.

You will notice that after country A has defeated country B, customs of country B will show up in A. Almost anyone will take on the color of his oppterm. This is horrible but true! People tend to think of themselves as the cowboy in the white hat and the oppterm as the cowboy in the black hat. However, the only real to tell whether you are dealing with a terminal or an oppterm is whether it turns on pain or sensation. Pain shows that it is a terminal; sensation shows that it is an oppterm. Some people get tangled up because they consider themselves to be the guys in the black hat. If you get a terminal on the oppterm side or vice versa, the consequence is great confusion. Such an item, a combination terminal, turns on pain and sensation. This is a deteriorated package. Mark it in the center of the line plot. It's legitimate. It is a new terminal that has attributes of both terminal and oppterm, a sort of end of the road, a combination terminal which is a lock on both the terminal chain and the oppterm chain.

In national life, you get succeeding generations of politicians performing as combination terminals. The U.S. defeats Germany. Then, somewhere up the track, there is a tendency towards Democratic Fascism in the U.S. It is OK for a democracy to exist, as long as we can also operate a gestapo. "It's that sort of thing that I tend to keep an eye on."

You may not realize it, but you are all members of a secret society: You have been for a very long time. It is the SPG. You can enlist anyone. There are no dues. Only performance is required. It is the Society for the Prevention of Government! It is interesting that Man hasn't yet realized that government is the cause of his wars. A "pure" government attacks an S.P. government, thus producing a combination terminal. The "pure" government henceforth isn't so pure. Keep this up, and you will get what we have, in the way of a government. LRH recently received an invitation to be part of a group that is supposed to figure out what should be done with governments and Man and atom bombs. All the group is doing is meeting, in the hope that someone will come up with a solution. All they are doing is to get people in communication. They haven't approached governments!

The reason why government occupies so much of people's attention is that governments have spokesmen and salesmen, while individuals do not. [Democracy is highly publicized, but in a democracy] everything is the people's fault, so the head of the government has no responsibility. But the people have no real choice. This is a real mess. With salesmen, you get more and more government. Individuals become less and less. The end of this process is totalitarianism.

The only reason you collide with government is that you are selling the idea of the individual. You see that bettering things by handling the individual is a workable system, so you push it. This puts you up against the government, because it is for the government. This makes you a revolutionary in a totalitarian world, whether you intend to revolt or not.

The perfect reply to a communist is to tell him that you are an anarchist. That is the one thing that he cannot handle. He is claiming that communism wants to do away with the state, and you force him to say that government is necessary. Thus you turn him into a conservative. Anarchy has always been rampant in countries just before the communists took over. Anarchy is the one thing that the communist fears. He has so many overts on anarchists that they have almost become sacred to him. Similarly, the U.S. government is becoming more and more communistic, e.g. with its tax laws. Things won't get straightened out in the political arena. They will just get more and more confused. You can predict the politics of the future by looking at the opposing sides and combining the least desirable characteristics of both. Combination terminals in politics occur because the least admired characteristics tend to persist. "That Which is least admired tends to persist." We are going to get the worst of Russia and the U.S. combined into a super state, unless we stop it.

This is also the fate of any individual. Livingness alone will not lead to a new, highly desirable state, because the above mechanism will occur. In the course of handling cases, you will get a look at the eventual fate of any individual you process, in the absence of further processing. Suppose you could locate the chief terminal and the chief oppterm in an individual, without in any way relieving them. You could take the least desirable characteristics of both and get the combination terminal the person would become in a few generations. Those terminals and oppterms that are near the top will produce a new pair. But first, they will produce a new single terminal: the new combination terminal. As the GPM flies off, you will see that this had been taking place. The freedom that is there to be freed is fantastic, because all cases are in a very deteriorated state.

When we first discovered the tremendous power that the basic postulate of an individual could exert over him, in the course of creating the sections of the GPM, we tended to see it as something brand new, despite the fact that it is mentioned in the definition of the first dynamic in Dianetics: The Original Thesis.["I. The dynamic of self consists of the dynamic thrust to survive as an individual, to obtain pleasure as an individual, and to avoid pain. It covers the general field of food, clothing and shelter, personal ambition, and general individual purpose." p. 31. See also Advanced Procedures and Axioms, p. 42 and p. 270, above.]

A thetan does various basic things, following the laws governing theta as formulated in the Axioms. However, he also splinters off and postulates some portion or specialization of them. He tries to go forward with this specialization as an individual purpose and, trying to effect this purpose, moves on with a lot of accumulated mass and things like terminals, oppterms, combination terminals, items, upsets, etc. Thus the thetan builds up a section of the GPM. Then he postulates something else and

builds up another section of the: GPM. That dwindles out. It gets blown up thoroughly, and the thetan gets sort of out of it. He forgets it utterly. Then he makes up a new individual purpose.

Actually, all these purposes are in controversion to the basic laws of this universe, theta, and the purposes of thetans. And if there is any reason why it builds up mass, it is that it is an alter-is of the Axioms. The thetan is an individual, already in a games condition with his fellows and the universe. Then he decides to be even more individual and makes a basic postulate. It is this basic postulate that we are dragging up as a goal. This postulate is counter to the agreements on the structure of the universe, as contained in the Axioms, so the thetan is now individuated out to the degree that he has pitted himself against the whole lot.

What we are finding out, as we find items, turn on somatics, and clear the individual, is that he hasn't gotten away with it. There is the GPM, and it is killing him. He can't even execute his individual purpose or goal, because it fights his own more basic agreements, postulates, etc. He has called himself a liar by violating these agreements, e.g. the Axioms, and thus he has departed into super-individuality.

As the individual goes forth, postulating a new goal, he is flying in the teeth of all his former agreements. So now he gets to a point where he explodes out of the bank. Then he postulates a new individuation, a new basic purpose. He lives this one out. When he finally gets out of it, he adds it to the old stuff that he has accumulated. Each new purpose gets messed up faster and faster. He finds more and more things he can't do and that he can no longer confront. Eventually, he won't even explode out of the mass anymore. One day he says, "Row come it's all black?" And he won't get out of the GPM again.

This is Hell: an oblivion of total pain and sensation. "What's 'Hell'? In religions, they'll have some metaphorical method of trying to communicate, [but] if they were talking about a Hell, this is Hell.... They recognize there is something waiting for them in the future and they try to shorten it up ... and say it's the next life and this time you'll die and you'll go to it. Well, that's just enthusiasm!"

The only alternative to this grisly picture is scientology, but people have been "saved" before, too many times on the track, e.g. by the auto-da-fe of the Inquisition. That's why they are decidedly reluctant to be "saved" by scientology. Someone who gets mad at scientology and refuses further processing is a fool. He isn't aware of his future of total pain and sensation, which is Hell. But thetans have a long history of being sold pie-in-the-sky, so they are likely to be skeptical about what scientology has to offer. Someone who has been sold on heaven and hasn't found it, and who knows that Hell is possible, begins to regard the idea of freedom with some doubt. He has been "straightened out" before, and has been cheated. This area of betrayal comes up in the course of clearing someone. The offer of help restimulates this area, and the PC will fight help all the way, until he gets reality on what is happening. The kindest way to handle him is to give him a fast reality on the fact that you mean business. Do something for him subjectively, so that he will realize that he is on some kind of a real road to truth.

The PC whose trust level is shot alter-ises commands, doesn't answer, etc. The auditor can feel uncomfortable about this. The healing sciences haven't helped, with their general ineffectiveness in most things. No wonder the PC's trust level is so low! This is the main thing that gets in the way of dissemination.

The individual has fought the physical universe and the laws of the physical universe after agreeing to them. He now alter-ises them. Since those laws concern matter, energy, space, and time, he starts accumulating MEST. That is what puts MEST in his bank. Then he makes an individual purpose that has nothing to do with these other purposes. He tries to go up against these other purposes with this individual purpose. That causes a lot of mass to accumulate. Then he does this again, and again, etc.

All this is true, but this activity must have been based on a very low level of confidence and trust anyway. To have gone to all this trouble, with all the individuation, etc., the thetan must have had a very low level of trust and confidence. He must have thought that what was going on was detrimental, or he wouldn't have taken all this trouble to individuate from it. Most PCs are mad at the physical Universe, to some degree.

Now here is something I've never told you before, but it follows from the sixty-four lectures of the 1952 Philadelphia Lectures. The physical universe will stay there for the individual until the individual

gets back to the first individuating goal that he made, after agreeing to the Axioms. At this point, you would think that the PC would hit total OT, but he won't. He still has to handle the Axioms. You will now have to back up through the Axioms. The PC, at this point in processing, would start telling you about the Axioms even if he had never heard of them. They are getting ready to blow.

The individual's agreement to the Axioms, his contribution to the Axioms to that degree, is in all probability his first basic trust. You may have to go back to the Axioms and run them. Sooner or later the PC will collide with them, going backward.

[The purposes that you will run into at first] are all purposes that are individuations from the basic purpose. You have to go a long way back to pick up more than the first dynamic. Even today, the fellow is generally on an inversion of the first. You will find that there are seven dynamics that will invert on you. You must reverse the inversion process before the PC gets to a straight first dynamic. He then has to go quite a ways before he gets a sight of the other dynamics. That is what you are tackling.

In every PC, there is a deteriorated trust in everything, not only in his fellow man, but also in organizations, group activities, and any effort to do something for him. He starts to get nervous when you start to do anything for him because he knows that that has always been dangerous for him. You are reversing his experiential track, so he is going back into areas that he thinks are dangerous, and, thinking these areas are dangerous, he is nervous. This applies to every PC. What is important is your skill as an auditor: the smoothness of your model session, the positiveness of what you are doing, the fact that you can produce a result in the PC in which he has a reality. These things make him realize that you are going in the direction of freedom. The PC may be so downscale that when he sees that he is going towards freedom, he can't have it because it looks too good, and you get into another wriggle-wraggle.

You can add to the above phenomenon the idea that if you existed and if you freed Man and did things for the physical universe, then this person couldn't execute the first goal you will run into in processing him. (This "Goal One" is not the first goal that the PC made. It is the first one you find.) With this addition, you've got a rockslammer. His distrust is not built just on goal one. It goes earlier and is built on the quicksand that everybody is made of. To handle him, you have to find the oppterm to what he is rockslamming on. Then it tends to blow up. His "whole viewpoint on the subject of scientology will shift." [See HCOB 23Nov62 "Urgent -- Routine 2-12, Opening Procedure by Rockslam, An HPA/RCA Skill". This bulletin gives R2-12 procedure. At this point, R2-12 is also known as "3GAXX for Rock Slammers". Evidently it is a form of 3GAXX that can be done by a lower than class IV auditor. Many other bulletins and tapes on R2-12 follow.]

A soon as your auditing is less than perfect, you rekindle or permit to remain all the morass of distrust that has been generated down the track, all the betrayals of promises of heaven, all his experience of Hell. You can flub a little, but if you let the case drift too far out without a win and you will key in the whole background of "There is no heaven," and you will pay the price. The individual's reality on Hell is much greater than his reality on heaven. Thus, the longer you take to produce a result on a PC, the harder it is to get the result because of the distrust factor.

You can't say positively that a person isn't a rockslammer because he may have to be processed awhile before it shows up. Some rockslammers are below being rockslammers at first. The PC may at first simply be nattery, and then you have to rely on intuition. There is no absolute test of absolution except persistent case progress. Rockslamming relates to the degree of overting in your direction and his belief that if you did not exist, he could achieve his basic goal. Once you discover and he discovers that he is a rockslammer, the discovery of it tends to pull its teeth. All you have to do is to list the oppose list to the thing on which he is rockslamming, and it will blow up in smoke. If it's "an auditor", write an opposition list to "an auditor" and get the first PT package. A capable auditor should be able to straighten this out in two or three hours. You can list a goal against any terminal or oppterm that rockslams. Sometimes you will wind up with the person's goal. If so, opposition it.

Unhandled rockslammers will frequently become combination terminals. Squirrels, for instance, combine scientology with something else because they realize that they are as crazy as a loon to be attacking it.

6211C15 SHSpec-213 Clearing Technology

We are pretty well there, technologically, although things can still be sorted out and neatened up. More data keeps appearing, of course. When you are on top of the mountain, you can see alternate routes up. Just don't forget the way you got there and could get others up.

One reason you don't like to see long goals lists is that you don't like having to tiger drill every goal. It takes an average of a minute per goal, even when the case is running well. If the case is not well-prepared, the PC will have a persistent dirty needle. We used to call this the PC's needle pattern. It means that ruds are out, and it is not OK. This dirty needle that you see on goals lists won't clean up with mid-ruds. Persistent dirty needle and a dirty read -- an instant read that goes "Bzzzt!" on the needle -- are not the same thing. If ruds are in and the PC is well-prepared, a dirty needle means the list is incomplete. Or you could have listed from the wrong question, e.g. the wrong pre-hav question. Actually, if you use the right question and the item is on the list, even if it is the PC's first list, when you null it, the dirty needle, if any, disappears. After a PC is prepared, the only reason thereafter that a dirty needle occurs and mid-ruds don't handle it is that the list is not complete. The item is the missed withhold that dirties the needle. Therefore, assuming a prepared PC, there are two variables that cause dirty needle on nulling:

1. Wrong question.

2. List incomplete. This makes it a little more difficult. You may have to use trial and error to discover what it is.

[Details on assessing goals. There is a new experimental process: you can assess the long list of goals, then only tiger drill the ones that stay in after the single assessment. The PC should let the auditor know if pain turns on. Pain goes deeper than the meter, and it may indicate the presence of the item when felt or a few items earlier on the list.]

You can get the PC to list goals from terminals and oppterms, using the commands: "What goals would (terminal) have?" and "If you were (oppterm), what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve?"

Just having the PC write out a goals list is very therapeutic, even on raw meat. Reading something once has minimal restimulation. Beyond three times, you have started running a process. So you can go over a goals list once, and the only thing hot enough to give the PC somatics will be the goal. So watch for the somatic while on that assessment.

Another method of goals finding is known as the prepcheck! You will get an early MEST clear with enough use of the method described in HCOB 21Mar62 "Prepchecking Data -- When to Do a What". A lot of people sit around not looking. They do, not look. That is their motto. A problem that has shown up is that after two or three Problems Intensives, the PC keeps saying that such and such is his goal, and he wants to know what to do about it. In other words, you tiger drill the PC until his goal reads! The vital part is to assess the right problem. If you run the right one smoothly, run it, don't Q and A, keep ruds in, the PC will tend to go MEST clear and the goal floats into view. It could take four or five Problems Intensives. This would be a very simple way to do it. It may not work on all oases. Maybe if we added a Routine 2 button or two to the Problems Intensives, using Roll Your Own Pre-hav against a Problems Intensive, [we might find the goal this way.]

The only thing wrong with a Problems Intensive is to find a truly self-determined change. On the Queen Elizabeth, Reg Thorpe was auditing LRH, and LRH only found two real self-determined changes, this lifetime. So we can assume that most PCs are answering fallaciously. We should realize that there is a trick built into the Problems Intensive. You get the PC to give you a change that he believes to have been self-determined, then you find the prior confusion and the determination for that change. So there is probably something wrong with the question. There shouldn't be a trick to it. You should just use "change", not "self-determined change" We formerly asked for self-determined changes so as not to have him give engrams. However, the prepcheck buttons are powerful enough to run the PC through engrams. He won't get stuck in an engram anyway, if he doesn't have a missed withhold. That is what sometimes makes PCs curl up in a ball and go into an engram while you are tiger drilling: the missed withhold. Pull the missed withhold, and he will come right out of the dramatization. The PC's effort to withhold is what pulls him back into the incident, because he can't be in PT.

So you could ask for "times you decided to change". Then the PC doesn't have to tell you a lie to answer. A bad assessment can give you no TA, so, in handling Problems Intensives, keep your eye on the TA. You should get TA in the first twenty minutes on the first button. If not, drop the first change and do a new assessment.

6211C20 SHSpec-215 Fundamentals of auditing

There are probably thousands of rules you could go by in auditing, but the way to audit has only a few fundamental basic rules, without which auditing does not occur. These are the senior data of auditing:

1. Auditing is a third dynamic activity.

2. The basis of it is communication.

3. Audit the PC in front of you.

Violate those, and you have had it, no matter how many other rules you are following. Never neglect those few little fundamentals. An auditor can forget about communication and sit there as an individuated island. In this case, no matter what is right about what he does, he won't be auditing the PC. Don't be a first dynamic using no communication to audit a book or a nothing. If the auditor and the PC are a group, and if they are in communication and the auditor is auditing the PC in front of him, then auditing will occur and results will be obtained. One day, "all of a sudden a long blue spark hits you, ... and you say [to yourself], 'Maybe if I ask the PC I can find out," and communication starts to occur.

What a St. Hill graduate misses, when he gets back into the field, is any feeling that auditing can happen. People don't know that there is a right way to audit. Also, St. Hill graduates have gotten over being nervous or self-conscious about auditing.

If you overlook these few little fundamentals of auditing, you then need thousands of rules to handle whatever comes up. There is a right way to audit, described above. Relatively muzzled auditing, uniformity of sessions -- these are desirable if an auditor is going to add a bunch of nonsense into the lineup. But muzzled auditing is just a curative measure to prevent people who don't know the above basics from adding nonsense that has nothing to do with auditing.

The other part of the situation is that the human race knows nothing of third dynamic activities or communication. What passes for communication in the wog world is unduplicatable. There are no completed cycles of communication, and communication consists exclusively of a dispersed mish-mash of invalidation and evaluation. The rules about Q and A, TR-4 and a host of others are to keep these aberrated habits out of the session. If you didn't have TR-4, the green auditor would slip right into think-think, figure-figure, evaluation, invalidation, etc. None of these have anything to do with the communication cycle. "Compute" should not be part of the doingness of the auditor. [Cf. the old definition of an auditor, "One who listens and computes", in HCOB 26May59 "Man Who Invented Scientology"] The answer to the PC's origination that "Black is white" is Thank you." It is not "Oh, no it isn't!" or "That's a neat thought," or whatever.

Every time the PC asks you to do something, it is because you have done instead of acknowledged, when the PC originated. The PC has begun to control you. You have driven him out of session and into thoughts about the PT environment by not letting a communication cycle occur. "To the degree that you break down the communication cycle, you break down the third dynamic activity. You individuate the PC, and after that he starts running the session." He has gone on a self-audit. You will have trouble with the PC in direct ratio "to the number of times you have not permitted the PC to originate."

Because the PC is aberrated, it is very easy to individuate him. It is quite a trick to keep the PC from individuating and going on a self-audit. As the PC gets better, he is less susceptible to individuation. His thinkingness should get more under the auditor's control as he goes along. If the PC gets interrupted by the auditor, such that his communication cycle keeps getting messed up, his thinkingness will get less and less under auditor control. The number of times that you have to get the mid-ruds in is a direct index of the amount of thinkingness that a PC, individuated from the session,

has been engaging in. That is how the auditing third dynamic gets broken down into two first dynamics. "Two first dynamics do not make a third dynamic." They make a games condition.

An auditor's perception is not the perception of an individual looking at another individual. It is a third dynamic perception. There is a knowingness about whether the PC is in session or not that an auditor will have when he is genuinely perceptive or intuitive. An auditor's "perceptivity" is bad to the degree that he departs from the third dynamic back to the first dynamic.

Thetans communicate on the same wavelengths used in space opera. You can spot an ARC break before the PC knows he has it, if you are attuned to this form of communication. You used to know and recognize other thetans by their feeling or wavelength and not by their bodies. Dolls know each other, despite not having names, as a rule. It is done by direct perception. You can forge a passport, but try to forge a wavelength! This is not MEST communication, and it doesn't require or use MEST or even wavelengths as a via.

ESP investigators like Rhine err by testing ESP against MEST and by entering "proof" into the computations. Proof is one of the most aberrative buttons on the track.

If you walk through a forest with a gun concealed in your pocket, you will not see a bird or a squirrel. Why? Because you are emanating menace as long as you have the gun, and the game gets the communication, even if the scientist doesn't. The animals don't have to see the gun.

Some thetans evidently emanate more than other thetans. This is also true of PCs. You apparently get more of a relay from some than from others. This is a fascinating subject, as long as you don't pull it down into MEST through the button called "proof". We tried to process people along this line. The biggest indication we have that it exists is the effect of auditing on unaudited third parties. Say PC A is having trouble with person B. We process A. He doesn't have any communication with B. Yet the problem with B evaporates. Furthermore, frequently B often then tries to communicate with A! This is so true that you could legitimately chew out A's auditor for not having solved B's problem with A.

Similarly, an RI will always produce trouble for you. If you are deathly afraid of oil companies, rest assured that you will get bum stock, short changed, etc. Process the PC, and the oil company will stop giving the PC a hard time.

There is, then, a perception factor, but "when the individual is in a games condition on the third or fourth dynamic -- [say] with women -- ... he can't perceive. Perception can't bridge across [a] games gap." So the auditor makes a mess of it every time he audits women. One's perception in such a case inverts, and one reads a "good" wave as a "bad" one, or vice versa. The auditor can't perceive what is happening, so he dubs it in. He "writes script" in session. He thinks and figures, etc. The PC is an enemy, and therefore the auditor doesn't dare to confront or read him. The more the auditor is in this state, the less reliable perception there is and the more substitute perception you will find, taking the form of think. Think = substitute perception. Look, don't think.

Direct perception "only gets invalidated by those who are to some degree in a games condition with what they are trying to audit or perceive." They can't confront, so they can't perceive, so they do a "think" instead of a "look". They "figure it all out."

You have to figure out the way the GPM goes. It is complicated, and aberration doesn't emanate, so you need the meter as an aid. "But as far as the PC is concerned, you should be able to read him pretty directly. But if you can't confront him -- if you don't want to; ... if you don't want anything to do with him -- you are going to get a substitute in there, and that substitute is "think", and you're going to go into a consideration of 'What is going on?', and [you] get script writing at its worst:" the auditor sees an ARC break when there isn't one, he doesn't see one when it is present, etc.

Tension and complicatedness in a session divides the auditor's attention and cuts down auditor perception, thereby impairing his performance. If the auditor takes some weird action, you know that his perception dropped out. The session will be as clumsy as with the sort of limitation of perception that occurs when one gives a demonstration session and has one's attention split up. LRH has experienced that. He flubs in TV demonstrations more often than normally. So that gives him some reality on what a less perceptive auditor lives with.

When you don't acknowledge the PC's origination, he will cut down his transmission power, which will make it that much harder for you to perceive him. He will also go off on a self-audit. So you get two individuals "conducting a disrelated activity. One fellow is busy nulling the list, and the other fellow is trying to keep his rudiments in." The PC tends to individuate to the degree that you Q and A with him and prevent him from blowing something by not just letting him get it off and acknowledging. A lot of auditors think that if the PC mentions something, it means that you have to do something about it so that the PC can blow it. No. The fact that you say or do something in response to a PC's origination, or anybody's origination, tells him that he hasn't gotten it off. He hasn't blown it. It is all a communication activity. When something is fully communicated and the communication cycle is complete, it is blown. The degree that a PC can't blow things is the degree that he has been Q and A'd with. After you have a and A'd three or four times in the session, what is the use of trying to patch it up? Now you have to have rules to cure the ARC break. What the Hell were you doing getting an ARC break in the first place? The rules for getting out of swamps are LRH's a and A with auditors who got into them through not knowing fundamentals.

An ARC break occurs fifteen to ninety minutes before most auditors perceive it, and then they try to clean up the ARC break that has just happened, which is the wrong one to be cleaning up. It is inexcusable for the PC to find out that he has an ARC break before the auditor does! Where is the auditor?

What is wrong with the auditor's perception when the PC, mired as he is in the bank, can perceive better than the alert auditor? The PC never forgives this, because it proves to him conclusively that the auditor has individuated and that he is not in a third dynamic situation and doesn't have an auditor. It is unforgivable because the PC doesn't forgive it. If that is what your auditing is like, you won't have sessions. You will have dogs' breakfasts.

But if you are alert, you will find out ages before the PC does that something is wrong. Don't harass the PC when there is nothing wrong. But if your own perception is up and the PC doesn't feel right to you, just get in 2WC with him to find out how it is going. And persist enough to be sure, without badgering him. There is "nothing wrong with making a mistake in ... session. The only thing that is unforgivable is [for] the PC [to] catch ... it before you do." Perception, then, comes above technical perfection, because you can always handle a mistake if you find out about it before the PC does. E.g. the auditor says, "Is something going on there?" (just light 2WC). The PC says, "No." Auditor: "Well, did you have a thought of some kind there?" PC: "No. I ... well, actually, yes. You used the wrong command." That is OK, because you spotted it first, before it turned into an ARC break that the PC, incidently, would have attributed to something later in the session, if you hadn't spotted it at its inception. If the PC could be relied on to spot the correct source of an ARC break by himself, he wouldn't need an auditor at all, because he would just blow his ARC breaks by inspection. If he has got one, he has misassigned it. Q.E.D.

The degree of the apparent ARC break is related to the number of unobserved ARC breaks that have preceded it. The first ARC break in session is always quite previous to where the PC thinks it is. This is true of lists, where the pain turns on before the PC notices it. The PC is always late, because the bank is instantaneous and he isn't. He wrongly attributes what is happening. To ask him to think anything at all is miraculous. If he knew what was going on, he wouldn't need an auditor.

The communication cycle of homo sapiens consists of:

1. I originate.

2. You invalidate.

3. I not-is.

An auditing session is based on a far simpler communication cycle than homo sapiens imagines. You have to audit the PC in front of you, not the meter. The final step of matching up the items must be done by the PC, not the meter. If you go on the basis of, "If the PC said it, it isn't true," you are again being homo sap. There are some things on which the PC isn't right. He is never right on a misemotional point. But on what the score is, and on whether it is the right item, yes. He can tell you that correctly. You could assess a list without the meter, if you did it very carefully, asking the PC where the pain was.

There is no substitute for putting the PC in session and auditing him. If you get tangled up in all the rules, it is just that many rules between you and the PC that are forbidding auditing. If those rules are used to prevent a third dynamic, to interrupt or upset a communication cycle, or to get out of auditing the PC in front of you, then those rules are not for that session. There are many styles of auditing, but there is no substitute for auditing. What is auditing to the PC? It is alleviation of his upsets and reaching his basic purposes and doing down the GPM. He won't let you near his bank and he won't forgive you if you don't run it out. Nevertheless, if he is making gains and getting someplace, the PC will take anything off of you. On the other hand, your auditing could be the last word in technical perfection, but if you are not using it to get somewhere with the PC, he will be ARC broken all the way.

There is a right way to audit. It is directly, straightforwardly. The good auditor uses the tools that he has to get something done. The bad auditor doesn't know that there is a right way, but thinks that there are thousands of right ways and that he has to dream up a new one in session. That is just another way to figure-figure your way out of giving a session. The more you add to the basics of auditing, the less it will work. The auditor who audits smoothly by pattern gets the most done. Rules are valid, but should never interferes with the three basics discussed in this lecture:

1. Auditing is a third dynamic activity.

2. The basis of it is communication.

3. Audit the PC in front of you.

6211C27 SHSpec-218 Routine 2-12 (Part 1)

Poor R2-12! The first and fundamental error of R2-12 showed up. LRH made a mistake by giving some leeway on List One. Don't add motivatorish items to the list! The list must contain only nouns: no verbs, adjectives, or adverbs. When LRH expanded List One, it escaped his notice that a lot of practice with 3GAXX would invite a lot of things to be entered onto the list by the PC, even though R2-12 says that it is not the PC's list. So List One, issue two, must contain only scientology nouns.

R2-12 is to put the case in condition so that it can progress towards clearing, as well as being in itself a clearing process. What we are fighting in clearing today is slow progress. With R3-21, you will sooner or later get the item that is holding up the case [See p. 332, above], but with R2-12, you will get it sooner. You are looking for the items that pin the PC to present time. You want to eradicate the items that have been keyed in by present time, which now hold the PC in a PTP.

In R2-12, you don't just oppose any item that once rockslammed. You always start from scratch, no matter what has been done previously. You take List One, even if it was done before. Start with the first list. Find what rockslams. Oppose it, etc. The main discovery is that any time you get a whisper on a list, you can represent it and get a rock slam on it. The rationale of R2-12 is that as long as the GPM is keyed in in PT, the PC is left with a full PTP and will show no case gain. You don't have to find his goal to set him straight. This is all based on the observation made in 1949 that what needs to be run to resolve the case always has a little tag sticking out, like a taxi-meter flag. There are lots of these little tags sticking out, but most come out easily and can be thrown away. However, every once in awhile, you get one that is tied to something. It was also known that case gain won't occur over a PTP. The GPM would be the biggest PTP a person could have. The only way you get rid of it is to identify it very thoroughly in its various parts. [This is what the tag gets stuck in.]

If part of the GPM is in PT, walking around, and the other part is buried in the bank, The PC will go around feeling that it is the visible part that is keeping him from getting clear. He never looks to see what is opposing it. And that item will remain so undisclosed that the person could go all the way to clear and still have it. He might, by a fluke, key out the rest of the GPM and still have that buried part of the GPM pair. This gives you a by-passed item par excellence. The probability that he would go clear under these circumstances is very miniscule, to be sure.

It takes awhile to build up a rock slam. It is not from PT directly that the PC gets the rock slam. It is from confusing PT with some opposition mass in the bank. The PC hasn't even seen the terminal in the bank that faces the opposition mass. He has made a mistake. He has mistaken something in the environment for an opposition mass in the bank, and he can't see his terminal in the bank. He thinks

he is opposed to something in PT, when it is just an oppterm that he has confused it with. He is in this oppterm, but he never puts it on the list, so it never blows, and he doesn't opposition it. You will get a recurring item, as the PC lists. It recurs because something is missing -- namely, the other half of the package, the half that he is being. A person doesn't look at things that he is stuck in. That is how the bank accumulates. The person is too close to it to look at it. The recurring item, lacking an oppterm to balance it, creates a PTP in itself. With this condition, the PC will make little or no case gain.

If the PC weren't pinned to PT, he would still have this trouble. It is part of every case, to some degree. Let us define a rockslammer as anyone who slams in PT on any item that is part of the GPM. At first, neither we nor he can determine which item he is slamming on. One fine day, you make a list on something and it doesn't immediately go out on tiger drilling. The tiger drill is what saves our bacon. It tells us whether the worm is still in the ground. In R2-12 you pick up the trace, list it out, and get a slamming item. If the item was accurately assessed, and if it doesn't go out with the tiger drill, then it must be stuck in the GPM. Therefore, you can represent it, and you will get a slam.

So one fine day, he accidentally puts an item on his present time environment list. Now he is no longer able to not confront it. When you oppose it, he now doesn't feel bad about it. You have discharged the mass. Here is another place where R2-12 differs from 3GAXX. R2-12 deals with the tags, the locks to PT, and blows them. On R2-12, the items blow up and go, "Pffft!" On 3GAXX, items stay in there in concrete and brass, because you are diving into the bank to find the fundamental goal; you are reaching for deeper items. 3GAXX delivers goals, but not PT. When you have an item that is in PT, you will get more fireworks.

The amount of case gain that you will get from R2-12 is sometimes fantastic. All the PC's lifelong worry has evaporated. Watch out for doing a misassessment on List 1A and getting deeper than you intended. This is not likely to happen on List One, where he doesn't make the list. If the question was, "In PT, what have you been upset about?" and he gives you something like dragons or spaceships, just pretend to write it down. Don't put it on the list. You will get a terminal and an oppterm from such an item, but they won't do the PC much good in PT. You could use them to get goals, but that doesn't get rid of PTP's. You could get a big read on an item like this, bigger than you would normally get on a List One or a List 1A. If you take up dragons, you are not handling any PT restimulation. You will be led astray if you don't keep in mind that R2-12 is an effort to "locate one of the GPM items, as it seems to be in PT to the PC ... and find its [oppterm], and if you ... succeed, ... you've taken away the PTP."

The PTP is below the PC's recognition of what it is that he is worried about, which is why you wouldn't get the PTP by running PTP's. There is heavy charge on this. Anything with a rock slam has heavy standoffishness connected with it. A rock slam item is like a guy at night shining a flashlight in your eyes. You can't see who it is, and you don't want to look at it, but you have to. The PC can't look at a rock slam item and he can't look away from it. Unless you get it out of PT, he doesn't have enough attention units to look at the bank. If he can be sufficiently aware of the piece of the GPM that is in PT to be nervous about it, he can cognite on it. Other things, equally part of GPM's, are so buried that he can't even slam on them. They are too tough for him. They won't read or be real to him, until later, when the case is unburdened more.

"A person who's getting [off] motivators is being an oppterm to himself. He's out of valence. He's not even in his own terminal line." He will therefore turn on sensation all over the place.

The terminal is always at cause. If you try to list something causative for the oppterm, e.g., "Who or what would [the oppterm] oppose?" or "Who or what would [the oppterm do something to?" instead of "ho or what would oppose [the oppterm]?" you will get a total stuck needle, misemotion, etc. [This is the "wrong way to" phenomenon.]

If you get rid of a problem on which the PC has great reality, the PC will have a tremendous resurgence. When you do a skilled R2-12, that is the result that you will get, even though the PC doesn't even know that he has the problem. In order to handle the problems in his environment, he must not have a problem on scientology. The session is closer to the PC than the rest of his environment. Therefore, in doing R2-12, you take his scientology problems away before you take the other environment problems away. Get them out of the way, and watch the PC's relief! If you aren't seeing it, you are doing something wrong.

LRH has been auditing R2-12 for about eighteen months, now, and he has made all the mistakes. The procedure, as now released, is the no-mistake way to do it as an invariable action. Even when it is done perfectly, it will occasionally lay an egg. Why? Because you might pick up an item on the first assessment that isn't part of a GPM, and the clean-up that it gets on tiger drilling may not clean it up entirely. In that case, you are "currying a dead horse," i.e. you are not going anywhere.

The source of the dead horse is some withholds or something on the item, when it is not part of the GPM. What is a dead horse? It is a list, whether a represent or an oppose list, that contains no wide slams, after you have gotten mid-ruds in for the session. If you have gotten nothing but dirty reads and dirty needles and nothing has slammed by the time you get up to fifty items, you will lay an egg. The best thing to do is to carry it to fifty items, and if there is no slam, abandon it.

The likeliest way to get a dead horse list is a wrong assessment. The auditor doesn't check, if he is in doubt about a read, he missed reads, ARC breaks the PC, etc. You can also have an item reading on an ARC break because the PC doesn't understand the word. The E-meter "is a reality indicator." Another way to get misassessment is for the auditor to misduplicate what the PC said on listing and to write down something else. Then, when the auditor assesses it, the PC will protest it, since it is not what he intended. If you don't understand what the PC said, you have to get it understood, even if he ARC breaks every time you ask him. The way you ask a PC to repeat something is to take responsibility for not understanding, in a way that doesn't challenge the PC. You can ask him to spell it. That's fine, unless he can't spell. Do not repeat the item after the PC! It will drive him around the bend. It can make him feel like he is spinning, and it tends to shut him up. Don't ask, "Did you say _____ ?" That causes him to protest and can leave a mark on the list. It also looks like you are correcting him. Also, never point to an item on a list. Don't ever point towards a PC anyway. [Cf. not pushing in anchor points] The thetan will put his theta beams against that finger, and his theta beams will get bent. This includes pointing to list items. It makes wrong items stay in.

A PC must be able to put anything on a list, but he must never be allowed to take anything off. If he wants a word changed, take it down and add it as a new separate item. E.g. the PC says, "Oh, that should be 'a cow' and not 'the cow'." Acknowledge and add "a cow" to the list, at the bottom of the list, and leave "the cow" on the list.

If you null a list that has given you a persistent dirty needle and then oppose that, you won't wind up with much. The invariable actions of R2-12 eliminate that pretty well. If you are listing on a list and nothing is slamming, get your mid-ruds in. But don't get them in when the PC originates. If the auditor isn't sure whether or not he is doing it right and has a guilty conscience about it, that auditor is very vulnerable, because he thinks he might be committing overts. Therefore, he tends to withdraw from his PCs. Even an auditor who is doing letter-perfect auditing can be shaken up by a PC who snarls about mid-ruds being put in. Treat this as an origin. When the PC is protesty, keep him talking. Don't punish him with the missed withhold question. But get it handled sneakily by finding what you haven't found out about -- his state of mind, or something. Then go ahead and get the mid-ruds in. That is the way to handle this situation, not with Q and A.

The next big source of dead horses is an incomplete list. If the PC says that last item he gave you is it, that is a sure sign that the list is incomplete and that there is a slamming item coming up. Don't quit listing when the PC tells you that the last item he gave you was it. What he means is, "That is the last safe item." The list is incomplete and the rock slam is just over the horizon, and the PC has chickened out. Don't ever quit until the list is complete. The PC will never forgive you for not getting the item, however much he protests further listing. So get the list done. That is the only road out, unless the PC has a legitimate beef. For instance, if the PC insists that an item is reading on protest, check "protest", clean it up, and recheck it. Don't take items from what the PC is giving you as protest or 2WC. That is robbing the PC!

In the process of listing a list, you are liable to run into a dwindling or sporadic rock slam. If you don't get an item that slams while listing, you don't have a list. The classic dwindling rock slam is common. Don't stop listing just because the rock slam stops. You can get mid-ruds in and ask the question you are listing from to see if it reads. That is not certain, but it is a good indicator. The proof that a list is incomplete is that when you are nulling and the needle is dirty, when you ask, "Did you think of something?", the PC gives you something that doesn't clean up the needle. If you find

yourself having to keep using this question to clean the needle, it is an indicator that the list is incomplete. It also invites more items.

The PC's ARC breaks about not completing the list do not stem from the auditor or auditing flubs. They come entirely from the PC's unwillingness to confront. When a list is complete, the PC will be willing to go on listing forever. He only balks when the list is incomplete. So "any balk by a PC is an indication of an incomplete list." So you keep going, on a list, until you don't have to get mid-ruds in to null it. On assessing a list, two consecutive items in almost always means that the mid-ruds have gone out.

The list will be more than ten to twenty items long, but some PCs go for long lists -- 500 items or so. 80-150 items is more usual. Anything that restrains a PC or keeps him from giving a complete list will wreck R2-12, as well as 3GAXX. The more you harass or worry a PC, the less you will get done. Don't ever yap at a PC about his dirty needle. It does no good. Never stop a PC from listing. You can get as many as three dwindling rock slams from one item.

There is an accidental on List One. Since you didn't just do a list, mid-ruds aren't in. So get them in before you assess List One. One reason not to let the PC add items to List One is that once you start, the PC is listing, and you will have to let him list it out, or you will have a dirty needle. So just don't start.

In R2-12, what you are trying to do is to find a tag, first in scientology, then in the present time environment, off of a GPM that is hooked into PT by the A = A = A nature of the bank. You are doing this because if it is there, the PC has a chronic PTP. Recognize that the other side of the package -- the side that opposes the PT item -- is keyed in all the time. Recognize also that it is a lie to say that it is in PT. It is only keyed in to PT. The moment you start your represent list, the PC will fly out of PT. That's fine. On "represent", what else is there to list? On the represent list, very likely the PC will go back track. Recall:

1. Identities.

2. Similarities.

3. Differences.

The PC has the GPM mass identified with a PT item. The PTP is in PT because of A=A=A. The GPM item is identified with the item in PT, minds being what they are. When you represent anything, you are peeling identifications off of it. This is not true of opposing. Listing is auditing. By taking anything someone is worried about and by representing items, the PC will see similarities instead of identities. Get the represent off first. That helps him differentiate. You could do this as an assist, not even on the meter, using, e.g., "What does a bellyache represent to you?" Also, many PT items don't have opposites, you need the "represent" step for them also. In fact, any time you say, "Who or what would _____ ?", you are really doing a represent list, so it is therapeutic, because it separates out items. It separates what is true from what is false. The more identified a person is with something, the more items will come off of that thing. As you list or null, you are auditing like crazy. This is solid auditing and about the soundest and most condensed auditing you can do. It produces the most gain per auditing hour. So long lists are lots of auditing. Every time you null, you are differentiating. Done right, getting items, it is fantastic.

6211C29 SHSpec-220 R2-12 -- Theory and Practice (Part I)

There are many indicators and few stabilities about lists. There is only one absolute rule about lists that we have as a stable datum: a list must be nullable. There is a difference between an indication and a rule. The following gives some indications.

First of all, where there is no rock slam on the list, you have a dead horse list. Dead horses consume most of the auditor's time in R2-12, so this is of interest. But if, after fifty items with no rock slam, if the PC is still interested, go on to seventy or eighty. If there are no rock slams by then, unload. A list with no slam won't produce an item. On the other hand, a rock slam on a list doesn't guarantee that you will find an item.

A nullable list is a list that you can go down without getting mid-ruds in every eight to ten items, to clean up a dirty needle. If you find that you have to put in mid-ruds this often, that is an indicator that you may be on a dead horse.

The study of what makes a non-nullable list is a point of orientation from which to study assessment. There are three sources of a non-nullable list. The first is wrong source. The thing from which the list is being listed is improper. There is no way to establish this on an early List One assessment. The item could be one that merely parallels the GPM without ever leading into it. It can also be wrong source because you are opposing the wrong item. Maybe it rockslammed and turned on sensation. You list from it. Then, when you null, the needle gets dirty even after you have extended the list. It could have looked perfect when you listed it and still not be nullable. What happened was that the item's rock slam wasn't solid. It was a lock on the GPM. A rock slam needs something to lean on, for you to wind up with something by using it. When you have a reliable item -- a wall to discharge against -- you will find the opposed item. If you have a clean needle on an item, that is not a reliable item. If you oppose it, the list is never going to end. You are cutting out paper dolls from the GPM; you are just picking off locks from the GPM. If sensation turned on, however, be sure to continue to list until the somatic turns off, even if the list goes nowhere. You can settle for a light case of sensation. Get off the horse and find another item from your List One. Dead horse lists do produce some gain. PCs can cognite, etc.. Don't stay with it forever. Unload when the PC feels pretty good.

If the PC has no interest, gets no cognitions, and has no rock slams, this guarantees that the list is a dead horse. However, the presence of these indicators doesn't guarantee a nullable list.

Another way to foul up and get a non-nullable list is to audit the case in the presence of tremendous missed withholds. That's rare. Getting ruds in should be enough to handle this situation. Actually, it is really the missing item that gives the PC a feeling of having a missed withhold.

The third source of trouble is the incomplete list. An incomplete list may look like a non-nullable list. If you find this to be the case, unload. It is a rule that a list must be nullable. So, at the point where you find that a list is non-nullable, go back to List One.

A nullable list is one where items go out easily and the needle stays pretty clean and cleans up easily if it gets dirty during nulling. It is a good idea to check "suppress" about once a page as you null, because a suppressed list Acts like a complete list. You don't have to go over what you have nulled if "suppress" reads. Just clean up the "suppress" button.

Get used to how many items need to be listed before you get rock slams. This depends on how identified the case is. The more jammed up and messed up the PC is, the longer the list will go. The odd case that is very heavily identified may go 150 items before rockslamming. Another lighter case may go fifteen or twenty items. The TA doesn't necessarily indicate the degree of identification. Mass doesn't necessarily equal identification, and some items are massier than others. What if the PC has an item, "Solid steel"?

The "dead thetan" case will require a lot of listing. He will need represent lists by the carload, getting no rock slams. The PC will feel better, and eventually the List One will get hotter and hotter. The mechanics of it are that, essentially, we have a new therapy. Listing is Auditing. LRH knew that listing on a goal was auditing. Now it is clear that listing in general is Auditing. Listing an opposition list to anything that continues to rockslam (i.e. a reliable item) is auditing.

The more magnitudinous the read; the more reality the PC has on the thing. Anything that reads is safe to list. You could develop a process for, say, a sick PC. You could find out what is bothering him. He says, "My liver." You check it for read. If it reads, you do a "represent" list, with, "What would represent a liver to you?" Pretty soon he has no more liver trouble. You could even assess it by interest without a meter. The thing that combines interest and reality is the rock slam. It is also a ridge wherein everything is identified. The dynamics are collapsed (e.g. the food faddist). When you hit the button, you get an automatic release. It is not that the PC is thinking.

So, to summarize what makes a non-nullable list:

1. Wrong source.

(a) Faulty assessment, e.g. of List One.

(b) The thing from which the list is being listed is improper. This may not be auditor error. On early List One assessments, thereis no way to be sure that you have the right thing to oppose or represent. The item could be one that merely parallels the GPM, without ever leading into it.

(c) Using a non-RI to oppose. It could look perfect when you list it and still not be nullable.

2. Auditing the case in the presence of many missed withholds. This is rare.

3. List is incomplete.

An indicator for a nullable list is that it comes out with interest and positiveness. So the rule is that a list must not be continued that is being invalidated by the PC. That is overlisting. Another indicator of overlist is comm lag, or groping for items. That is a danger sign. Don't worry about these phenomena in R2-12, but do pay attention to these last two when listing goals. Invalidation is not OK in any case. Inval is preceded by comm lag and then the PC groping for the "right way to word it". All will produce a non-nullable list from that point on. [So the signs of overlisting, in order of appearance are:

1. Comm lag.

2. Groping for items.

3. PC invalidation of the list. The invalidation can be fairly faint -- just a questioning, a doubt, a hesitancy About the items. The list might have been nullable earlier. You can try to null the earlier part. list is not nullable if:

1. It does not produce a rock slam, and

2. If it is being delivered [by the PC] with great uncertainty." However, "the most uncertain person in the world, listing from a proper source, will be the most certain person you ever saw."

Good indicators in listing are:

1. Interest.

2. Certainty.

3. Rock slams.

Bad indicators are:

1. No rock slams.

2. Uncertainty.

We aren't too concerned, in R2-12, with whether we get an item or not. Many cases are below rockslamming. So you just keep assessing. You keep listing. The PC's out-of-session appearance is no concern of yours, as long as he stays interested while he is in session. He may well get fancy somatics if you quit in the middle of an opposition list. Just complete each cycle to the best of your ability. Some PCs will run fifteen lists off of List One with no rock slam, then get one on the list itself, which continues to rockslam. Make sure the PC isn't thinking of items and then suppressing them. All the items he thinks of should go on the list.

R2-12 is itself a therapeutic activity. If we also get a reliable item, slamming persistently and get the opposition list listed to an RI, the PC will feel marvellous. How often this happens is monitored by the accuracy of the auditor. An auditor who is doing it all right should expect to be dead on the beam about fifty percent of the time. This is due to the A=A=A factor. If you are batting fifty percent, i.e. half of the "represent" lists you do, wind up with an Rl and half of the opposition lists get an RI, you are good. A poor auditor may get an RI ten percent of the time, and someone will have to straighten out the case sometime. But the case will feel better and make gains. Fifty percent of the time there isn't a reliable item there to get, so when listing, you are only being therapeutic. The PC will feel almost as good, even if there isn't an RI from the GPM on his R2-12 list.

6211C29 SHSpec-221 R2-12 -- Theory and Practice (Part II)

R2-12 bridges over easily into 3GAXX: step four of R3-21. But the purpose of R2-12 is to cure the great big PTP's that are impinged on the GPM. The PC's bugbear, that which he "must destroy", is half of a dumbbell package of the GPM. The PC looks only at one side of the package. He never says, "Who am I?" Everyone accepts this, because the PC's objection to the other side looks "reasonable". The green auditor in particular is likely to think, "Of course!", and pay no further attention to it because it doesn't seem aberrative. This is clearest when rockslammers can't find rock slams on other rockslammers. This reasonableness is your most fruitful source of error. This is a sort of mutual out-rud, a tacit consent.

The mechanics of the situation is that whenever a person has his attention fixated on some PT thing, that thing represents a piece of one side of the GPM. Its opposing piece or side lies hidden. A rockslammer is dramatizing the other half of the dumbbell. The first half is being represented in PT by scientology, the PC's wife, the boss, etc. The PC never asks himself, "What would oppose _____ ?", because he opposes it and he has keyed in some unconfrontable terminal. But the PC is being audited over a considerable PTP. His fixation prevents him from going back track. He is dramatizing the other terminal. The thing he is fixated on in PT is not part of the bank. It is a substitute for, a lock on, the GPM item, that keeps the GPM item in continuous restimulation. Therefore, because one side is restimulated, hidden, and out of sight, we have the PC's terminal. The PC never recognizes this, but he does dramatize this.

The rock slam on an item means overts against, withholds from, fixation on, reality on, and a games condition with, the item.

So we find that the PC gets sensation when we call the item. We list, "Who or what would oppose _____ ?" and we get a rockslamming terminal. If the original thing didn't rockslam, we do a "represent" list to get something that steadily rockslams. Either way, we get a package that will discharge. You can do other things with the package. You could represent each, sending the PC deeper into the bank, or you could get goals with the items you find.

Why is it called a GPM? It is" a mass which is composed of identities which oppose identities, and they are so delicately faced against each other on the track that they don't slip.... Neither has ever overwhelmed the other." They finally make up a big black mass. The identities in the GPM are round black ridges. They are black. They are round. They do have mass. They do oppose each other. This is not allegorical. The anatomy of a problem is item vs. item, postulate vs. postulate. It is a game where you have two sides equally opposed. A problem doesn't become a problem until one is unable to overwhelm and won't be overwhelmed. It is a matter of balance.

"Don't underestimate the age of a pair of items in the GPM. [The] whole thing is built ... basically on the alter-isness of goals." It has gone on for trillions of years. You may say,

"Why not resolve it all by just finding the PC's goal?" Because it doesn't immediately resolve the PT items, that's why, so you are trying to audit someone with a screaming PTP. The by-passed items are primed into PT and are beyond the PC's reach or confront. So the PC doesn't list to a free needle after you get the goal. The opposed items could have been there for trillions of years.

The game before that, likewise, etc. It takes a long time to get in that condition. The PC has lived many lives corresponding to each pair.

To the main pair are accumulated thousands of lesser ones, also opposed [in groups of two]. The GPM would be easy to plot if all the pairs were neatly aligned in the bank, on a neat time track. But the PC is a case of "Scrunch!". The reactive mind has no time. This is also one of the highest characteristics of a thetan. A thetan has no time. The bank is the lower-scale mockery of this. To the PC, the whole of the GPM is now. So when you null, things react in this instant; hence instant reads. The analytical mind would require time, so analytical reads are latent.

The most aberrative thing is time. To the bank, a hundred million years ago is now. So if time is all the same, what differentiation can we use to work on? In theory, whenever you say, "Boo!" to the PC, the whole reactive mind reacts. But this is an unattainable absolute, a nonsensical statement. In actual fact, the situation, as we look at the meter, is only saved by the reality of the PC. "The meter reads on what the PC has reality on, not what the PC is momentarily in."

There is free track alongside the GPM, and the PC can move along it. Dianetics is the study of that free track. Free track is timed. The reality of the PC is governed by the PC's tolerance of force. A thing reads because it most closely approximates a PC's limit of reality on force. You can always run against the ceiling of that limit. That ceiling is marked by the rock slam. That is how much force the PC can confront. A person "is as sane as he can tolerate force. Not use force, [necessarily]. Tolerate it." If you run around banning bombs, you won't get much support, because the bulk of the population don't believe in them. There is too much force to confront in one of them, so people don't confront them, and they are not real. If the populace could tolerate force, they would long since have torn the governments of the U.S. and Russia to shreds. Wars occur because people can't tolerate force, so they have no reality on what they are doing. They don't know how much force they are going to turn loose. It is an irresponsible action. The amount of force a person will throw out is no measure of sanity, but how much he can confront is.

As the person comes down the track through the GPM, he has become less and less capable of tolerating force. So the PT terminals and oppterms usually seem quite insurmountable to the PC, until [they are] audited on R2-12. All PCs suffer from some reaction like this. They think that there is more to it than there is. That is one of the guiding idiocies of a thetan. For instance, a PC will think that he has some huge, dramatic withhold to account for the fact that his ruds keep being out. Then he finally spots the withhold that he thought the instructor's tie was crooked. Drama, i.e. dramatic, heavy events in PT, seldom has Anything to do with the degree on enturbulation of the PC. He is trying to match the significance, in PT, of the drama that does exist in the GPM. Auditors do this sometimes. They hound the PC because he has a dirty needle.

PCs have been "good" for hundreds of years. Underlying it will be the reverse, but it takes some time for the PC to confront this fact. You do find dramatic stuff in the GPM: magnitudinous overts, etc. But you don't pull them out bit by bit. They come out as packages. PCs try to match up with the GPM. It restimulates them to believe that they must be guilty of something, but they can't put their finger on it. It is in the GPM. If you know this, you will realize that some of the tech for freeing people on this planet is utterly outrageous. What we are doing is quite fantastic. PCs can get quite upset doing this, i.e. being audited, so it requires an auditor who can go steadily on to complete the job. There is no room for an auditor who quits because the PC twitters or gets a somatic. He has to complete the cycle of action that is in progress. We could clear somebody, albeit slowly, by continuing to find and oppose RI's. More importantly, as you go down the rock slam channel, the PC will eventually find his goal. But a goal is senior to items. It is easier to find the goal first and then, from it, to find the RI's. You would now be doing R3-21. So

R2-12 cuts into R3-21 at a place determined by the extent to which R2-12 is run. You could go into 3GAXX, using the pre-hav scale to get more items. If you did R2-12 and had the case flying, you might find the PC coming up with his goal after six packages had been found. If you have a PC who is very stacked up and identified, it may take a good deal longer. You could just keep finding items until the PC goes clear, doing nothing with his goal. Of course, if you ignore it and don't acknowledge it, he is thrown into protesting the goal, and he won't go clear. When the PC may have had a wrong goal found and/or run, you must get rid of the wrong goal as a senior action to R2-12, since that is now his PTP. You run "Wrong goal" with big tiger [See p. 295a, above.] if it has just been found. You prepcheck it if it has been listed.

When you have a PC who has had bad auditing and has been "all fouled up ever since that session" do R2-12. It will handle it. An item was loused up, not the PC. Items are senior to any other auditing except goals.

R2-12 is also usable as an assist. If the PC is bothered by something, you could ask, "What illness of yours have you been interested in?" The PC answers, "My lumbosis." You ask, "All right. Who or what does your lumbosis represent to you?" That would use the principle of R2-12. The question could be unmetered and unnulled. If the PC is interested in it, it is identified like mad. He must have an A=A=A about it. If the PC has a psychosomatic illness, he must have the past in PT. Therefore there is instantaneousness connected with it. Therefore it has some connection with the GPM. If the PC has an engram chronically is restimulation, one tag end of it must be headed into the GPM.

Otherwise it would destimulate in three to ten days after going into restimulation. To do an assist on chronic somatics, i.e. timeless somatics that didn't disappear in three to ten days, the first thing you have to know is that they are hooked up to the GPM. The GPM, or any part of it, can never be educated out of anybody. That is the source of repetitive criminality. Nothing will cure it, short of

getting rid of the GPM. The criminal has been a criminal longer than one life. "He's straight in the middle of [an] identity of the GPM. He knows what stores are for: to put in trucks at night." He can't be handled by do-gooders. Some processes can key out the valence, remarkably enough. That we can have MEST clears is fantastic luck.

Matter, energy, and space are also in the GPM. Probably the GPM has mass simply because time is nothing, but the energy, space, and matter isn't nothing yet. This makes an interesting mathematical proposition. If time were actually zero, there would be no matter or energy, and possibly no space. So there is only an apparency of no time in the A=A=A nature of the bank, and although there is an apparency of no matter, there is mass. There is an apparency of no energy and no space, but in actuality there is energy and space. So matter, energy, space, and time are in the GPM. Whenever you restore any differentiation, even from identity to slight similarity, you get more matter, energy, and space, because you get more time. Things cease to read instantly and you start to get prior and latent reads. The case that has been a dub-in case may get very upset to find himself going black. As you get more differentiation, you get more mass.

Smooth auditing is essential in handling the GPM. Otherwise, the PC's ability to confront the increasing matter, energy, space, and time in his bank is repressed, so he would tend to hang fire. Auditing could take the place of the PTP. Some cases see that they are being asked to confront more than they care to. They will turn off the reality that has been turning on and momentarily get worse. The more the PC lists, the more matter, energy, space, and time is materializing. Probably the only thing that permits the process to work is that there is more time. Time permits escape from the pressure of the increased mass, etc., as past time becomes differentiated from PT. So the PC is not so stuck in the mass, energy, and space.

6212C11 SHSpec-222 R2-12 Data

[Much of the data in this lecture is given in HCOB 15Dec62 "Urgent -- R2-12, The Fatal Error" and HCOB 30Dec62 "Urgent -- Important -- Routines 2-12 and 2-10: Case Errors -- Points of Greatest Importance".]

Don't overuse 2WC, e.g. "Did you just think of something?", in mid-session. "Have you thought of anything?" tends to put responsibility on the PC. This tells him to self-audit. If the PC says that he has forgotten something, don't say, "What was it?" Give the missed withhold question.

Cleaning a needle is just fundamental auditing. You could do it thoroughly with an eighteen button prepcheck "In auditing", or even just "suppress" and "invalidate" as a prepcheck assist. You could assess the eighteen buttons and run what reads best. That would clean up a needle. A very high TA will also be brought down with this basic stuff. Don't spend a lot of time fixing up the case before you audit it. You can also clean up a needle with R2-12.

If a case doesn't move on R2-12, assume that he is a rockslammer and take the largest read on List One and oppose it. Or just do an oppose list on scientology. [Cf. the green form handling, "What are you trying to prevent?"] There is no disgrace in being a rockslammer. Some people have lied about whether it was pain or sensation, so as not to seem "declasse". So LRH checks "untruth", because if you write a backwards list, it is useless, as well as hard on the PC.

There are two ways to approach the persistent dirty needle. If you don't have someone to do R2-12, pull missed withholds, etc. Do a prepcheck of sorts to clean the needle, and teach the auditor to get missed withholds. If these attempts to clean the needle go on too long, there is a point where the PC's anxiety about no auditing dirties the needle. So don't overrun this repair action. No-auditing can be counted on to dirty a needle. The PC can also get anxious if nothing is reading on nulling. He can be afraid that you are going to go into mid-ruds and get a dirty needle from that.

The first symptom of a session blowing up is the PC getting a little bit critical of the auditor. This is the only thing LRH stops at when putting in mid-ruds. It is always the sign of an O/W underlying it. To neglect it lets it multiply into a screaming ARC break later. So pick up "critical" with "missed withhold" at once. This is fundamental! Any indication of missed withholds makes LRH go after them. You don't use "missed withhold" to punish the PC but to prevent the PC from blowing up.

In R2-12, one mistake you can make is not to know what a rock slam looks like and therefore to neglect a rockslamming item. The auditor knows that it reacted, so he represents it. This isn't invariably disastrous. The command value of a rockslamming item is terrific. But the PC's Attention is not on the slamming item. It is on what opposes it in the GPM. So, when you do a represent list, it takes the PC's attention off the item that claims it and it drives the PC around the bend. If you really get mad at someone, when he is rockslamming on something, represent it instead of opposing it. He will practically go out the bottom. Another goof would be to null the opposition list just to the point where all the reads are gone, without finding the item. Then quit, just short of getting the package. This leaves a hidden pair in PT. The PC will feel better, but there is still something there.

Nulling the represent or oppose list makes it easier for the PC to extend it. You can get to a point where a list can be nulled even though it is incomplete. Just continue the list, and you will see another rock slam turn on, and the rock slam on the original item you were opposing will come back.

Another error that people are making is abandoning lists that had rock slams on them. They can get into this mistake by representing instead of opposing a rockslamming item. The list will go nowhere, because there is nowhere to go, except to the original item. Sometimes an item which didn't rockslam at first will unburden enough when you start to represent it to start rockslamming. So check for this, when the "represent" list gives a dirty needle and no item.

"The less attention one has in PT, the more one is likely to go down [the] tone scale." As the PC takes his attention off past incidents to handle PT, these past incidents collapse in on him and he dramatizes. This is applicable to the fact that we have found the worst attention trap there is: RI's represented in PT. The rock slam is caused by the fury and franticness of the PC's attention and opposed attentions.

Never fail to pair an item, once found. If you only find one item of a rockslamming pair, especially if you do this several times, after awhile you will get no rock slams. That amount of attention is absorbed in the bank, and all you will get will be dead horses, thenceforth. This isn't terribly serious, since we can take the folder and go back to find the incomplete packages. If you don't do this, the packages can add up to a point where the PC won't go clear. An auditor who repairs a situation like this gets all the residual gain. The PC will already have gotten gains; he will have felt much better, even before the repair. It is not dangerous to put R2-12 in clumsy hands, as long as good records are kept and common ordinary good auditing gets done. Doing R2-12 right is last in order of importance.

If you simplify this down to the bare minimum, omit mid-ruds and anything at all complicated, you have R2-10, to be run on a heavily supervised co-audit basis.

The only place you will have trouble is deciding whether to represent or oppose an item that rockslams cyclically, so you don't know if it is an RI. Learn what one of these cyclic dirty needle opposition lists looks like. Then you will know what you are listing.

6212C11 SHSpec-223 Phantom Rock Slam

The phantom rock slam is a special manifestation of R2-12. This is not a rare manifestation, and it causes trouble.

There is a rule about this: You mustn't grab rock slams from ruds. Get them from R2-12 or case records, e.g. old sec checks, List Ones. The phantom slam will attach itself to various terminals and anything and everything in rudiments. You can wind up with this peculiar phenomenon: opposing something that isn't a rockslamming item. When this happens, in R2-12, you may get a rock slam in the oppose list, but it will be a cyclic proposition. The rock slam becomes a dirty needle, becomes a clean needle, every two or three pages. This cycle never ends. The list is unnullable. This phenomenon is peculiar to the opposition list. You could make this happen by taking a list of unreading items and insisting that the PC oppose one of them. The PC will go ahead and do it, but the list is unnullable.
In R2-12, it is an enemy that is helping the PC. [i.e. scientology, an auditor, etc. Anything from List One that the PC rock slams on.] Therefore, the PC can't accept the help. The enemy is right here and now in this session. List One is also right here and now. It is what is being used on the PC: auditors, E-meters, sessions, etc. If List One isn't used, these things are never located. The most crude manifestation of a failure to locate rockslamming items to oppose is the phantom slam, which comes and goes. You will only get dead horses doing lists from other sources. If the PC is on record as

having slammed on List One, but you can't turn on the rock slam now, tiger drill three or four main points of the list until one ticks, then go ahead and oppose it. It will turn on a continuing rock slam and get you a reliable item.

The case that slams on this and that is the puzzler. It confuses the auditor. You eventually realize that the rock slam has nothing to do with what you are listing or nulling. It turns on incidentally. It will turn on more powerfully on a heavily charged list, that has some rock slams on it anyhow.

The phantom rock slam is generated by some tiny withhold and not by some item on the list. The test of the phantom rock slam is, "Do you get one rock slam in nulling that stays in, or does the PC rockslam on ruds or mid-ruds, especially since big mid-ruds. The latter is a more powerful rudiments action than is in a regular model session. If you see a rock slam turn on during a ruds action with a time-limiter, like, "Since your last session," you have a phantom rock slam. Sometimes the PC graduates upstairs to having a phantom rock slam, as his case unburdens. The rock slam can be absent at first. Then it develops first into a tame rock slam, then gets frantic, then cools off again, as the case unburdens. Then, when you hit the item, it is there again in force and blows. The rock slam tends to stay the same size, but it changes speed.

A phantom rock slam is any slam that turns on in ruds or general O/W. It is caused by any withhold the PC has from you or the remainder of the dynamics. Every now and then, you will be fixing up someone's line plot, done in a co-audit or something, and out of twenty-four packages, only one will rock slam. You may think, "Well, the charge is blown." No. It was a phantom slam all the way.

Fortunately, there is a solution. A phantom rock slam is turned on by something in the immediate, instant PT of the session. It is turned on by something immediately in or in the vicinity of the session. Something right here. It is not a fight with the D of P, because he is down the hall. The way you smoke one out is to get every possible element of which the session consists. With the PC's help, you make a special list, which must include every part of the PC (his name, "myself", badges, symbols, tables, etc.). [Cf. the expanded dianetics present time environment list.] With this list, you will get the PTP that is "right present in the session". The phantom slam will show up on the list. The PC won't help much, because, since he slams on the item he can't see it. He has overts on what it will be, so he can't perceive it. So you may have to suggest some items. The majority of items will probably be first dynamic items. The item could be "me", but it could translate as "my mind" or some such thing. But as you continued to get more and more packages, the item would gradually change in character [e.g. to include more dynamics]. The rock slam gets gradiently more sudden and more constant. Finally, the PC could just blurt out the item. The only test of whether you have found the source of the rock slam is that the rock slam doesn't recur. So you can't tell for several sessions whether you have got it.

So the phantom rock slam item is an even more immediate version of the List One items. It is something so much in PT and so disturbing to the PC, that it is a total PTP, a very screaming one, because it is so close to the session. This PTP blocks him from getting gains. It was in 1956 or so when LRH isolated the PTP as that which prevents case gain. The GPM was discovered via the PTP. The closer to auditing and PT the PTP is, the less gains are obtained from auditing. That is why List One is a cure. Note that we include other dynamics besides the first dynamic in List One. There are other dynamics in PT. You can point at the PC and say, "me," or point at yourself and say, "we," to get the point across. Ordinarily, careful attention to List One will get the phantom slam and clean it up.

So the proper procedure is:

1. Complete running List One.

2. Make a session List One. If you run into a phantom rock slam after completing List One and cleared up all the slams on it, what you should do is to go over with the PC all the parts of the session, so you can locate the in-session rockslamming item. Keep your eye on the meter so that you can steer him and pick up something he thinks of that turns on a slam.

3. Just go on finding reliable items. Do this to the best of your ability. Don't buy anything that doesn't stay in pretty well, and make lists long enough to be complete. Get your packages, difficult though this may be. You will see the slam turn on more frequently, and get progressively less frantic, until one day the PC volunteers the item, which slams beautifully and can be opposed.

4. Pick up all past incomplete or dead horse lists. Go back to all those lists that appeared to give lots of bonus packages and no RI's. Now you will be able to find some RI's. R2-12 should have a positive result. Everything shouldn't just go up in smoke.

Here is another point. You can represent massless things -- ideas, conditions, etc. -- and you will get nice massy rockslamming items. But if you oppose significances, you can get in trouble. If a significance rockslams, you do oppose it. But you are actually opposing a nothing, an idea. So get the item -- the identity -- that opposes the significance. E.g. "mouse" could oppose "attack". Then oppose the item you got (e.g. "mouse") right back, to get a second solid item (e.g. "cat") with which to make up a package. Otherwise, you don't have two terminals. This is the original 3DXX. List long enough on the "oppose" list to the significance to get the item. You can have a package consisting of a significance opposing a significance, but it is not much of a GPM package. Significances easily go blank, so the rock slam can wash out, doing the oppose list. The rock slam isn't really gone. It is just submerged. Complete the list with a mass. When you have the item opposing the significance, see if it has pain or sensation connected with it, so you know which way to oppose it. Then oppose it and get the other mass.

Rule: If the list is nullable and rockslamming, you can find a juicy item on it.

A list can be nullable and still incomplete. Don't use invalidated items for anything. If the PC is invalidating the items that he is giving you -- yes, that's a valid test. But don't use the invalidate button for other purposes than to clean off real inval. Don't use it to keep from having to complete the list. PCs may try to get out of completing lists by invalidating items. Just go on and get the item, after you have finished nulling the list or checking mid-ruds. Sometimes a PC can't give you more items until you have finished nulling the list.

The basics of auditing cover most of the difficulty a person will have. The danger of R2-12 is that the auditor can get a result that he and the PC are happy with, without doing it right and getting all the available gain. The residual gain is 1000% worth.

6212C13 SHSpec-224 R2-12 Data -- Needle Behavior

A clean needle is a free, flowing needle, a slow, pleasant rise or fall, which does nothing when the auditor is doing nothing. It has no trace of irregular or reacting motion on the meter. A clean needle is like molasses "being poured out of a bucket by a statue." Flawless mid-ruds will give you one. It flows at a uniform rate of speed. The PC may have an intransigent dirty needle, but after you find the first RI, you will get a clean needle. The only problem with this is that you have to assess over a filthy needle. A dead horse list does a minimal amount to clean the needle.

Cleaning a needle is not the same thing as cleaning a read off the needle. You will see a clean needle when you have finished a list, before you have done anything else. It will be slowly, flowingly rising or (more rarely) falling. This is particularly visible on a Mark V E-meter. That is what you should have before you start nulling, so as to be sure that you can null. If you put big mid-ruds in faultlessly, without missing a read or cleaning a clean, a clean needle is what you will see.

R2-12 is such a good process that it shows up any flaws in the auditor's TR's, model session, or metering. You cannot use PC upsets as an excuse. There is only one point in running R2-12 where things look awry: about half or a third of the way through a list, when the list is getting hot and the PC doesn't want to confront the next string of rock slams, or when the auditor tries to null an incomplete list and finds the needle frequently getting rough. In these situations, the PC will undoubtedly get somatics, misemotion, etc. That is usual.

The final check for completeness of a list consists of asking:

1. Is the list complete?

2. Are there any more items?

3. Have you thought of anything else that should have gone on the list?

4. Could there possibly be anything else on the list?

If you get any reads on these questions, the list is incomplete.

The reverse of a clean needle, more or less, is a needle pattern, a chronic needle behavior that a PC exhibits while the auditor is saying and doing nothing. "A needle with a reaction on it is a dirty needle.... [It] doesn't look like molasses being poured out of a bucket by a statue: any ticks, any roughness, any slight speed-ups as it goes.... A dirty needle is any needle that departs from the appearance of a clean needle.... It has nothing to do with the auditor." He is doing nothing. "If [in mid-session with an auditing cycle complete] it is doing anything that has any irregularity if it of any kind whatsoever, that is a dirty needle, and your mid-ruds are out!" Watch the needle for a count of five, doing nothing, and that -- whatever you see -- is "the state of the needle". It is not how sticky or unsticky the needle is. It is whether the needle is ticking at all or halting at all. Seeing this, the auditor is expected to get mid-ruds in. Not to do so is a goof.

A raw meat PC or a PC who has had previous bad auditing and has a filthy needle presents a problem. On such a needle, you can't expect much until you get your first RI. That is the easiest way to clean the needle, except that you have to assess accurately through a dirty needle. That is your most critical time in auditing. It lasts only as long as it takes you to get an accurate first assessment. It should take you only the first hour of auditing, assuming that you don't get a lot of dead horses. If you get a hot item, just listing it will clean the needle. You don't even have to null to clean it. After you have the first RI, you should be able to get mid-ruds in pretty fast. The PC will probably rockslam on List One, anyway.

Needle characteristics tend to become misinterpreted. For instance, people have failed to recognize rock slams. A rock slam is simply a slashing agitation of the needle. A dirty read is a buzzing agitation of the needle. A rock slam always has a slash in it. A rocket read "takes off. It always goes to the right. It takes off with a very fast spurt and does a very rapid decay, like a bullet fired into water. It's very fast. It goes, "Pshoo!" It looks like it's got all of its motive power from its first instant of impulse, with no additional motive power being imparted to it by anything. It's kicked off, and it has no further kick, so it just rapidly dies out. How wide is it? That's a silly question. I've seen them from a sixty-fourth of an inch to a dial wide. You see, they are any width." A rock slam can have its first slash mistaken for a rocket read, if the auditor has never seen a rocket read. But the rock slam doesn't go in a spurt. It is uniform and has power put to it the whole distance of its slash. It doesn't decay. It stops suddenly. Most commonly, the first slash is to the left. Just one slash to the left is enough to identify it as a rock slam, even if it doesn't continue. It can be awfully tiny, too. The first stroke could be a sixteenth of an inch, followed by a dirty read. A rocket read should never be confused with even a one-stroke rock slam, because of its rapid decay. But a dirty read is different. It "looks like an electric buzzer going. It doesn't look like anything slashing, and a rock slam always slashes."

A dirty needle is caused by big mid-ruds buttons being out. Every PC has a favorite button, as you find out when doing an eighteen-button prepcheck. If you go beyond eight or nine buttons to get big mid-ruds in, you might as well do a full Roll Your Own Pre-Hav [See pp. 333-334, above.], except that you are now doing Routine 2 [See HCOB 5Jun61 "Processes Allowed" and p. 34, above.], instead of R2-12. The only trouble with Routine 2 was that its results weren't lasting, good though they were at the time. You have to find items for the benefit to last. It is the need for mass that requires R2-12.

Item 1 is held in suspense in time because it is held in balance against item 2, which is also held in suspense in time. This configuration can be unsettled somewhat just by running item 1. The balance will stay out. But full benefit, i.e. ten to fifty times as much benefit, will result from running the whole package. If you leave too many of these single items around the PC doesn't know what he is leaning against, now, and he doesn't think that he has gotten any gain, even if he has. After about six unfound items, the PC will start getting nattery.

Therefore, you will get only so-so gains on R2-12 if you don't really find both sides of the package, although you may think you did. You can get lots of gains if you go back to the lists that didn't end up with an RI and extend them to get the item. You will get no gains if you represent an item that rockslams or if you fail to complete your cycles of action. In fact, you will get adverse results, especially if the PC was very interested in the cycle you were on.

You must have a clean needle before you nul. A Mark V E-meter expresses a clean needle much better than a Mark IV. It expresses a "ruds in" PC. When the slightest little thing is out, the Mark V just

doesn't look clean. It gets less flowing, less "right". The Mark V just amplifies the Mark IV's tiny little ticks. It is not more sensitive. It is just easier to read.

You can harass a PC in trying to clean up a needle, to the point where the needle gets dirty, especially by asking a super-generalized question like, "What are you thinking about?" If the PC knew what he was thinking about, it wouldn't make the needle tick. Therefore it is useless to ask this broad a question to clean the needle. You will do better to get in mid-ruds. On a heavily charged list, the PC's think influences the needle more than on a less-charged list. If the needle has been clean, then slowly dirties up, don't leap to put mid-ruds in. The PC will feel interrupted and protesty if you do this. When the needle gets dirty, you can't always put in mid-ruds, or you get no-auditing. So when the needle was clean and gets dirty during nulling, slowly twist the list around and show him as much as the needle has been worse on and ask which item he has had thoughts on. Get his suppressed and invalidated items cleaned up, and go on nulling. The PC may get allergic to this after while, but this is not as bad as running mid-ruds all the time.

The rud that goes out on checking, especially goals checking, is "anxious about".

Getting a needle clean is an operation that takes all reactions off the needle when the auditor is doing nothing. If the list is complete but the PC has some minor withhold from the auditor, the withhold will cause him to be individuated, so he will think things as you assess which, because of the missed withhold, will read and make items appear to read that are not reading. You will have to clean them up. Also, a PC with an incomplete list essentially has a missed withhold. Hence he has a dirty needle and the needle reacts on everything the auditor says. The PC is vulnerable to auditor actions [because of the inflow of the withhold]. He isn't critical yet, but he thinks extra thoughts. He is individuated.

High sensitivity picks up all the analytical thoughts of the PC.

A really severe ARC break will give you a very nice flowing needle, also.

6212C13 SHSpec-225 Repair of R2-12

[Some of the material in this tape is covered by HCOB 30Dec62 "Urgent -- Important -- Routines 2-12 and 2-10: Case Errors -- Points of Greatest Importance".]

There is a law embracing your disheartenment. The more you goof, the more disheartened you will get. We are no longer dealing with a process that has to be tailored to the PC, so any problems have to be with the auditor. Someone has to be shoved through it to a win as an auditor so that he has reality on the workability of the process. This is hard to confront. It is like someone saying, "Be responsible." R2-12 produces results when it is done right or even not quite right. When you first look at it, you will think that R2-12 has hundreds of variables. Training auditors in R2-12 is based on the idea of, "Walk before you read a book on walking." The only liability of this teaching method is that you need someone there who can untangle the inevitable goofs, when several have gone by and the PC has gone weird.

The whole technology of straightening out a goofed-up R2-12 is to do it right. The only crime is to lose the session records. One way to lose them is careless labelling, e.g. no PC name or date or page number. You need to know what went on and what the items were, etc. Let anyone do R2-12, as long as they keep the papers. This applies to goals. Don't lose old goals lists. There was a place to write goals in Handbook for Preclears; those goals could very easily get lost. R2-12. lists are even more important than goals lists, since you can get back to goals with R2-12, if need be. So mark down what happened, especially if something rockslammed. Pain and sensation are less important to note. Note what happens to items when tiger drilled. Auditor's reports are less important than lists. They can be used to summarize, not to keep track of TA reads. Needle behavior on lists is what counts. Give a detailed report of results, not session actions, in the Auditor's Report Form.

Don't get the ideas that there are lots of rules covering lots of variables in R2-12. One thing that will louse up some, but not all, cases is to represent a rockslamming item, instead of opposing it, especially a List One item. "You never represent a rockslamming R1." The PC will go along with it, the idiot! But he knows that he shouldn't take his attention off the rockslamming item itself for a second. You are pulling his attention away from where he thinks he must remain, with fixed bayonet. So when fixing a case, check to see if that has been done.

When repairing a case, take repairing the first List One mistake as a priority action, because it has more bearing on the session. The worst goof on List One is to represent what was rockslamming and should have been opposed. It is less awful to oppose something you should represent. Complete opposition lists.

Which way an item should be opposed can be problematic. The closer things are to PT, the more likely they are to be co-terms. Therefore R2-12 has more co-terms than 3GAXX, being closer to PT. Coterms are opposed both ways: "Who or what would (co-term) oppose?" and "Who or what would oppose (co-term)?" You can swap it back and forth, half a page each. One side will run more smoothly after awhile, and that is what you use. Opposing a co-term can be tricky. The commonest goof is not completing the list but trying to make it oppose instead. This co-term thing is one thing that that makes it hard to complete lists.

A represent list that goes nowhere can be dumped with small liability. The item will be found later, somehow. There are lots of rock slams in the bank. But opposition lists must be completed. If you represent something that didn't rockslam, you should check, if you having any trouble with it, to see if it is actually rockslamming. What you are representing might be the item, suppressed, and your representing it cleans it up, so it now rockslams. Like prepchecking, representing is powerful auditing.

On the other hand, when you start to oppose something, you key it in. Therefore, you must complete oppose lists. On R2-12, the commonest goof relating to this fact is failure to oppose something both ways to. The method described above for handling co-terms is not infallible. The item might not be a co-term, wrong way to. It might be an item that is deaded down, never rockslammed, or wrong source. If it is wrong source, it never becomes nullable. "Nullable" is different from "item capable of being found on it". A non-nullable means a list where the needle won't stay clean enough on it to null it. So extend the list. The trick in extending an "oppose" list is to do it the reverse way to, the other direction. This will prevent a list from becoming 1000 items long with no RI's. If it is wrong way to on "oppose", never renull. Extend the list and null what you now have. This, because an incomplete list is the commonest error in listing. If you nulled it to nothing and ran out of rock slams, it is incomplete, so get more items. Your auditing could become good enough for you to be able to null a list that isn't complete to nothing. If you continue the list, you will find that the rock slam will turn back on, on the thing that you are opposing, and you will get a reliable item.

In repairing lists, get old cycles of action done in order, from first to last, starting with "oppose" lists, then doing "represent" lists. Always begin with Scientology List One. So start with the first goof made on List One. This usually involves getting the rockslamming item that was missed and opposing it.

In any new group on R2-12, there will be people who tell you that it doesn't work. This is the not-going-right type of case. There are two possible reasons why the case is not going right:

1. A rock slam on List One was missed and not opposed.   or   2. Somebody shifted the cycle of action.

Opposition cycles of action are always more important than represent cycles. So get the earliest and come up the track consecutively, unless the List One was done as a later case action, in which case you fix any goof there first. Fix the first goof on List One first. So the order of repair is:

1. First goof on List One.

2. Rest of List One goofs in chronological order.

3. First goof on R2-12 oppose list.

4. Rest of R2-12 oppose list goofs in order.

5. First represent list goof.

6. Rest of represent list goofs, in order.

Then there is the dead horse case, on which no one can find a rock slam. This could be an incomplete cycle of action case. You should look for the following in such a case:

1. Failure to oppose a rockslamming item, particularly on List One. List One must be in restimulation for the case to now be laying dead horses.

2. Failure to complete the "oppose" list, if the item was opposed.

3. Auditor needed a white cane. He didn't recognize or report rock slams that were there, particularly in a co-audit. To determine whether this is the case, you have to observe. Get one of the dead horse lists extended and see if it rockslams, or extend it yourself and see.

4. Representing something that would become a dead horse. You will get complaints about cases rockslamming too much to get ruds in. The best way to turn off the rock slam is to represent something that would become a dead horse. The rule is that a case will continue to rockslam only when the subject that the rock slam is on continues to be addressed by the auditor. If you are listing one thing, the PC doesn't rockslam on something else.

"You don't even get a phantom slam on an uncharged list. The list has to be hot ... to turn the slam on." You can get confused as to which item is slamming, as the rock slam turns on and off. The phantom slam has this characteristic: it never obeys the auditor. It turns on and off, but it can't be controlled. The PC, in such a case, can't be controlled either. He is never doing what you tell him to do. But a rockslamming item on such a case will obey the auditor. The item will slam as long as the PC thinks about it, then stops when he puts "suppress", etc., on it. If you get these buttons off, it will slam again.

However, you can kill an R2-12 item with tiger drilling. It should be done briefly, because the items are in PT.

So, in patching up a case, look for:

1. List One errors.

2. Oppositions.

It is lucky that case patch-up is so simple, since the number of possible errors is almost infinite. However, there are not infinite numbers of special cases on R2-12. The commonest mistake is for someone to go on and on representing and never check whether the item they are representing is now rockslamming. It may well, now that it has been unburdened. So check it from time to time, especially if it won't null.

False reports will give you the least difficulty, except for cases where PCs tell you that they have pain, when it is really sensation. They will also lie about the fact that they have been invalidating items. Getting a clean needle before nulling pulls all that up.

Running the case parallels repairing the case. Doing R2-12 follows the same order of importance as the repair priorities.

An embarrassment you can get into is getting rocket reads instead of rock slams on R2-12. First be sure it was a rocket read. Rocket reads take precedence over rock slams, so just oppose it. Since the PC can use a rocket read item to find a goal with, the PC may be continually intruding his goal, at this point.

Fine. Get it checked out. Don't leave it in doubt. When he gets his goal he can run R2-12 better. This doesn't mean that he can be run on his goal. Complete R2-12 first. The case that is being cleared over the top of an R2-12 PTP won't stay F/N'ing, even if it gets to an F/N. Eighty percent of all cases that have tried to go clear have hung up here, so it is very

6301C08 SHSpec-226 R2-10 and R2-12

[Part of the data in this lecture is also found in HCOB 30Dec62 "Urgent Important: Routines 2-12 and 2-10 -- Case Errors -- Points of Greatest Importance".]

"In August, I wrote a jerk ... named Kennedy. This latest adornment of the Russian victory parade was offered help in the space race -- straightening up I.Q., etc. This 'lighthouse' has twice asked for presentations of scientology. We've granted them, and they have done weird things like fire the guy who asked for them." Time rolled along. The FDA started sniffing around. The government organized a smear campaign in the press, and they raided a church, seized philosophic texts and E-meters. How did they do this? They lied to the court! They didn't tell the court who the warrant was for and they didn't mention books. The warrant was signed by the president.

So ads are being placed in newspapers in the bible belt, and there will be a delay in the court hearing. "I frankly was getting worried. We'd been ignored too long!" We needn't waste time fighting the government. It is its own oppterm!

What should happen when you find an item? If you give the PC the wrong item, he will have markedly more mass than he had a minute before. If the list is incomplete, the PC will also ARC break in the next few minutes, and you will be unable to get him out of it except by completing the list. With a right item, mass diminishes. A PC knows whether or not it is his item. You are only auditing up to the PC's knowingness, so if he doesn't know whether it is his item, you know it isn't. He has to be certain that it is right. Also, when you package the item, the PC must know that it is a package. If there is any queasiness about it, it is out. The PC's knowingness is paramount, in getting the right item. Well done listing should produce an item that brings in VVVGI's, not just agreement.

Routine 2 has a little miracle to offer. Done this way, the masses go "Pffft!" against each other; the rock slams cancel out. Wrongly done, R2 delivers more mass; done right, the PC has less mass. It is a question of havingness. The wrong item has mass because:

1. Though it does have its own mass, it is not the fundamental mass.

2. You have told a lie about it by saying that it is the fundamental mass.

[More data on running Routine 2]

Some day, on Routine 2, you will have the bad luck to have a very suppressed PC. He will suppress the item as he puts it on the list. You will miss the rock slam, and you will know you goofed and have to do something extraordinary. The PC may ARC break very thoroughly and auditing with ruds, missed withholds, etc., won't handle it. Only Routine 2 will fix it. Get him to extend the list; get the item, and the ARC break will be gone.
The more unnecessary arbitraries you introduce into how something is done, the more trouble you will have with it. R2-12 began to handle rockslamming. R2-12 can be done at several levels. There are a lot of results to be had, even doing it wrong. Auditors have had more trouble with it than LRH expected.

There are three sources for the first list in R2-12.

1. The PC's immediate session environment.

2. The environment the PC lives in more generally.

3. The various parts of existence. If you already have the PC's goal, you can ask, "Who or what, in PT, would your goal influence?" to get a rockslamming item. You could get life and livingness sources by asking, "What is part of your life and livingness in PT?" and "What is not part of it?" Each could be a complete list. If one doesn't rockslam, the other will. Often both will.

We have to find something that isn't rockslamming to get a list, when you are after a "part" or "consist of" list, because you only oppose rockslamming items. If the PC rockslams on "Your life", don't list, "In PT, W/W does your life consist of?" Test the source of a list to make sure that it doesn't rockslam. You can even tiger drill sources to be sure. If a source does rockslam, skip it for a represent list. Also, don't oppose some out-of-the-blue rockslamming item. A rockslamming source for a list is always out of a context of another incomplete list that you don't necessarily know the heading of. A rockslamming item is therefore not necessarily an RI. It is not totally destructive to oppose such an item, just dicey. Sometimes the lists you get when you do this won't complete, or you will get lots of co-terms. If you found "scientology" rockslamming, you could just oppose it as a security measure, but there is a liability to doing this.

So avoid the sourceless rock slam as something to list from. If "scientology" rockslams, find something else to list from that gets at the same thing. You can't do a "represent". You have to find some way of saying scientology" so you are not representing scientology, e.g. "Ron's work", or "mental activities", or some such. Say four dynamics rockslammed. Therefore the source is an incomplete list. You have to complete it, but how? You find something about scientology or the dynamics that is broad and embracive, like "mental activity", or "What is/isn't part of existence?" Then you get an item and oppose it.

Your success is monitored by this: Do Routine 2 right and repair it with Routine 2. A little Routine 2 and a lot of general auditing won't give much result. R2 is more powerful because it is hitting at the PC's PTP and hidden standard. He doesn't know what they are until you direct his attention to them. You could ask, "What would some healing process have to do to you in order for you to know you were better?" The PC will consult with a circuit and give you his hidden standard. If you tried to list this PC's goals, all you would get would be the goals of those circuits. This is another reason why you cannot get the PC clear with these circuits and hidden standards in the way. After Routine 2, you will begin to get the PC's goals instead of circuits' goals. Get a few packages off and out of the way, and the PC will give you his goal. Then you can run him on a goals process and clear him. But you have to clear up the PT environment first.

6301C08 SHSpec-227 Case Repair

If you did the pure form of listing and opposing described in the last lecture, you get less mass as a result. If you start seeing more rock slams than before and there is more mass on the PC, you have been goofing. The best visual indicator is the PC's skin tone. If mass is increasing, the PC's skin goes green or yellow or grey or black. The eyes are also an indicator, although they are somewhat less reliable, because going through a period of sen. will make the eyes look "sen.-y". But do note the PC's skin tone at the start of the session, so that you can compare this with its later appearance. Age is another symptom. The PC should look younger half way through the session. Even hair color will change: it will get grayer or less gray. Weight will also change, over the course of two to three sessions, in the direction of optimum weight. The meter should also behave better. It should be more responsive; there should be a cleaner needle. Routine 2 doesn't do much for the TA position. The needle is more indicative. The PC's TA can sit at five, with the PC getting better and better. If the TA remains motionless throughout listing, that's fine. After awhile, there should be some change. It is not in the course of one session, but after several. Eventually, there should be improvement in a high or low TA, or the mass hasn't been cleaned up. Persistent low TA is worrisome. Seeing no change in TA, look for:

1. A wrong source or 2. A list that should be completed. You should be especially concerned if the PC was at 1.5 and didn't change after a couple of packages had been found.

Listing wrong way to makes the needle stiff and jerky. On a right list, the needle should free up, get clean and stay clean. A list can go clean needle before the item is on it, so avoid short lists. A super-long list, say twenty-five pages, is from wrong source or wrong way to. Five to six pages should do. The wronger you are, the longer it takes. The right way goes fast. When nulling a list, don't tell the PC that an item rockslammed until you have finished nulling. Then watch his indicators to be sure that it is his item. Don't shift his attention after telling him the item. If he ARC breaks when you have given him the item, it is wrong, and you had better get him to go on. He won't mind, if it was the wrong item. If he knows it is his item and you try to make him go on, he will ARC break.

When do you repair a case? When it won't run right. The commonest error in Routine 2 is wrong source, and the commonest source of that is an item taken from an incomplete list. Any item is viewed as coming from a list, even if it was never before listed.

The three areas that you have available to get items from are:

1. The PC's PT session environment.

2. His PT non-session life and livingness environment.

3. The parts of existence.

So if the PC has several rock slams on List One, you know at once that List One is an incomplete list. This gives you the problem of regress: you are always starting from a list that hasn't been written. The auditor's responsibility is to make sure that the list source question doesn't rockslam, since if it does, it is obviously part of a list, so he can't use it for a represent or a "consist of" list. All lists start with a represent list.

Just because something slams, you don't necessarily oppose it. You might try to find out what the item is from by asking, "What list question would _____ be an answer to?" If you have been listing from something which, when you check it, now slams, it is wrong source. It is not that it is "getting unsuppressed". So what you want to do is to find a non-rockslamming list question that produces rock slams. There must be no rock slam anywhere in the list question.

If you list from a non-rockslamming source and don't get rock slams, you can always use the negative version, "What doesn't _____ consist of?" If you don't get anything on "Parts of existence", try, "What isn't part of existence?" You can also do this with List One. If a PC has his interest stuck on an item, find what list that item was on, and complete the list. Once you have got a rockslamming item from a complete list, you can go ahead and oppose it.

What about a case that has been run a long time on wrong sources, wrong way to, and has lots of wrong items? This is pretty sad, but the case will still have been improved. Just repair it by finding the first incomplete list on the case, even a suppositional one or a List One, or whatever. Get a list question of some sort that doesn't rockslam, add to the list, and try to tiger drill alive what originally rockslammed. If you get a rock slam while extending, watch to see whether you keep getting them. If you do, it shows wrong source or wrong way to. Try it the other way around. If it still won't clean up, it is wrong source. Complete all such incomplete lists. Where you get RI's, oppose them, and the bric-a-brac will blow off.

When repairing lists, just examine the genus of the list and see if it needs completing. Get it completed to its proper item, oppose it, and package it up. Before this is done, the PC will be interested in the item. Afterwards, he will have no interest in the item; it erases. He will cognite on it. The PC may have trouble remembering right items; wrong ones will be memorable because the PC's attention is still stuck there.

The purpose of Routine 2 is to clear away chronic PTP's and hidden standards, so you can find and run the PC's goal. Having found his goal, you may still need to use Routine 2 to wipe out restimulated terminals, when the PC caves in while running the goal. You can use, "What does PT consist of/not consist of?" or "What does auditing consist of/not consist of?" Everything said here about lists also applies to goals clearing lists: Routine 3-21. [For more data about R3-21, see pp. 332 and 356, above. More data is also available in confidential HCOB's 7Nov62II "Routine 3-21: The Twenty-one Steps -- Finding Goals" and 17Nov62 "Routine 3-21".] One of the hardest things you will use to get a rockslamming item from is a goals list. Goals lists almost never run out of slams. When they do, though, they behave like any other list.

Remember that a rocket read is senior to a rock slam, and that in other respects, you trust it the same. If you find rocket reading items on a (therefore incomplete) list, complete it to one rocket-reading item.

The "frequency of rock slam" test is senior to the "stickier needle" test on wrong-way-to. Having found an RI, a PC's needle may be fine, but the wrong-way-toness of it will beef it up. Do it the other way. If it still doesn't clean up and give one rock slam on nulling, the source item must have been from an incomplete list, so complete it. Be prepared to be wrong, and straighten it out. Straighten up Routine 2 thoroughly; fix up auditing briefly. You could also find one rockslamming item that never got opposed. So oppose it.

You could take List One and ask, "What question would complete List One?", and complete it. This would handle most problems.

6301C10 SHSpec-228 R2-12

The only Commonwealth nation that has picked up on the FDA raid was Australia. This shows the connections between Australia and the U.S.

Routine 2 has an important liability: someone can be put off but good if you miss an item [e.g. by giving the PC the wrong item], since the missing item acts as a super-sized missed withhold. You must get the item on the list, or run into this missed withhold phenomenon. On a certain PC, you may get away with having an incomplete list sixty to seventy percent of the time, but the time you don't get away with it makes up for the lot. The PC becomes unauditable. He doesn't know why, and he will just go 'round the bend further if all you do is to pull missed withholds, without completing the list. Say you give him a wrong item. He may not ARC break spectacularly then, but his session goals in succeeding sessions will get less and less bright. You should be able to see this as you go over the auditing reports, and pick up the list where this goof occurred. The PC will also be very massy, ARC breaky, looking older, darker skin-toned, etc. He may also be ARC broken when you tell him to complete the list. This doesn't matter. Complete it anyway.

A wrong-way-to list doesn't produce the ARC breaks. Neither does wrong source. It is just incomplete lists. So watch carefully when you abandon a list or give a PC an item. If he goes out the bottom, immediately or slowly, repair by completing the list, even if the PC has been doing lists off the wrong item for eighteen sessions. On a wrong-way -- to list, the rock slams keep increasing in frequency. That is a good way to spot one. But beware of PCs wearing rings. That can cause "phantom slams". On a right-way-to list, the slams will be less frequent from the third or fourth page on. You may go another six pages before you get the next slam, before the needle goes clean and the item is on the list.

If you give the PC a wrong item, he will do a downcurve on the tone scale. If the PC starts to go the slightest bit BI's on being given an item, tell him that you are sorry, that is not his item, and that you are going to extend and complete the list. He should brighten up immediately. That's all it takes. Don't ever shift a PC's attention immediately after giving him an item. Watch him. If it is the wrong item, he will age, subtly but definitively, before your eyes. You can watch his tone level go down by the second if you have handed him a wrong item. Just tell him, "I don't think it was your item. We'll extend the list," and he will brighten up.

There are a very few PCs around who are ARC breaky as Hell and have been for several years. They can get audited, but it is gruesome. What is wrong with them is most likely an unflat repetitive process. The omitted Answer is the "missed item". Of course there is no list! A Problems Intensive approach, sorting out when they were happy with auditing, using the meter as necessary, can be used in this case. Using "suppress', you can fish up what process it was. Theoretically, then, you could prepcheck it out. But why not let him complete the process? So -- when the PC is left ARC broken with the auditing, the organization, or whatever, find the unflat process and flatten it. You wouldn't have to flatten everything ever left unflat. It [the unflat process? a missed item.] could also turn up on an "oppose" list to "auditing".

But a missed item could turn up on any case that you are doing a list on, so watch for it.

Another source of missing items is failure to oppose. This especially happened when the List One item was opposed, but the item found from this was not opposed, in its turn. The rule is that anything that keeps slamming must be opposed. So you could get two packages by the time you are through.

An item from a wrong source will slam until you straighten up the source. A rockslamming item from a right source should always be opposed.

Routine 2 is like a racing car. It gets you there fast, but if you drive it wrong, you can really wrap someone around a telephone pole. So you have to be skilled at case repair. This has become an important skill.

The reason the PC gets more upset if you try to pull missed withholds when it is a missed item, is that the item keeps getting restimulated, but he can't give you the item, because you are not listing. The PC may not be enthusiastic about extending the list, but he will do it and brighten up.

Watch out for this situation: If you had two items slamming on the list and when you null only the second one slams, beware when you give it to him as an item. Watch his indicators for a few seconds before you go on. Don't distract him at this point. It will aggravate the ARC break if it is the wrong item, among other things. If it is wrong, backpedal gracefully and continue the list "a bit" to get the item. Of course, the list may go on for pages, also.

6301C10 SHSpec-229 How to Audit

For years, we have had the problem of finding some PC who, even when run on proper processes, tears up the neighborhood. This is the problem of the missed withhold. That is all it is. "The biggest missed withhold you can have is the missing answer to the auditing question. He didn't give you the answer. He didn't put the item on the list." This is such a big missed withhold that if you always got it right, you could virtually omit pulling missed withholds. But you can't totally omit pulling missed withholds. Here's why:

Among the manifestations of missed withholds are dope-off and boil-off. Dope-off and boil-off are only caused by missed withholds, not by anaten contained in GPM's. Anaten is contained in a list, but only acts on the PC when there is an actual nearly-found-out in PT. You have to keep the little missed withholds cleaned up, because they are the ones that make the PC groggy and dopey, not the missing items. It is a PT nearly-found-out that makes the PC "go under" on an item or a list. It doesn't happen just from the list. R2-12 pulls withholds by the carload on track. If you miss a package, it is a giant missed withhold and a screaming ARC break. But if you see a PC go even slightly groggy, dopey, slumping down and shutting his eyes, etc., on nulling, "pull up right there and get the nearly-found-outs!" You are after regular, PT-type missed withholds, because a missing item on a list doesn't give the same dope-off symptom. Having missed an item will give this other phenomenon "body". [See HCOB 3May62 "ARC Breaks -- Missed Withholds" for the fifteen signs of missed withholds.] The expected behavior of the PC during L and N and receiving or thinking of items is wide awake. though the PC could have his eyes closed. This is terribly important during nulling, when you are depending on the item rockslamming. It won't happen if the PC is anaten. Meters don't rockslam when the PC is anaten. A meter will tick, but you can't depend on it rockslamming when there is insufficient attention present to charge up an item. The same is true for rocket reads in goal checkouts.

Boil-off, anaten, etc., were discovered in 1952 to be "a flow running too long in one direction." A missed withhold is a restrained flow. Any effort to outflow, by a PC who has a missed withhold, is blocked and only causes a further inflow. The PC has a stuck flow. If the "PC has a missed withhold, he's inflowed as far as he can go, and he's very, very prone to boil-off." He is holding back a flow, so he gets a stuck flow very quickly.

Sometimes a missed withhold from out of session is keyed in by a withhold in session. Then the PC boils off. In this case, you have to run the out-of-session missed withhold. That is why "missed withhold" stays in as a random rudiment. It gets you out of more trouble than it gets you into, if you broaden the missed withhold question to include the track. Then you will get the restimulated ones too. For instance, you might ask, "In the past week, has a withhold been missed?" Do this when you can't wake the PC. Not all missed withholds are on the second dynamic. If you start steering missed withholds by dynamics, you will start more incomplete lists. Keep the question general.

The nearly-found-out is a "left-hand" button, a suppressor-type button, which doesn't necessarily read on the meter. If you pull a session missed withhold but the PC goes dopey fifteen minutes later, prepcheck the nearly-found-out button, with or without a time limiter.

Left hand buttons are those that prevent things from reading, e.g. suppress, fail to reveal, anxious about, careful of, nearly found out.

Right hand buttons make things read, e.g. mistake been made, suggested, decided, protested, invalidated. "Protested" follows on the heels of a "nearly-found-out"; thus it is a point where left and right hand buttons meet.

In a co-audit, watch for dope-off and put in the random rud yourself. Don't try to get students to do it. Take for granted that it is something out of session that keyed in. You can use, "Is there anything we nearly found out about you?" The "we" limits the question. Or get the student to run the random rudiment muzzled and repetitive, until the PC looks desperate and about to ARC break. Then go back to listing.

Which model session should one use? As much as necessary; no more. Model session has these elements:

1. Adjust the PC's chair.

2. Get a can squeeze.

3. Give the R-factor for the session.

4. Give Tone 40 start of session.

5. Find out if the session has started for the PC.

6. Have the PC set goals for life and livingness and the session.

What you do next depends on whether you are going to list or null today. Don't worry about ruds in a listing session. Who cares what the needle is doing? A dirty needle can best be cleaned up by listing. The dirty needle is probably being caused by thoughts about doing the list. If the list is complete, the PC's list will be clean. In this case, it is no-auditing to do anything other than to null the list. Take a chance on between-sessions out-ruds. Only get worried if the PC starts to boil-off. Get off missed withholds if possible. If it is not possible, the list is incomplete, so extend it. In a listing session, get goals set and go right into listing. That is more effective in cleaning up the needle and having the PC in session then anything else. If the PC won't sit there and list, that is different. If the PC stops listing, it is either suppress or inval. Forget the rest of the ruds. Take any items the PC gives you on these buttons, put them on the list, and go right back into listing. That was the purpose of the rud, after all.

At the end of the session, discuss where you and the PC have gotten to and where in general you are going. Close off the body of the session. Then check end-ruds at sensitivity 64. Get the PC out of the auditing environment with, "In this session, was the run all right?" Get your question answered, but don't grind the PC to death. Check protest if this looks necessary.

Refer to Scientology 8-8008. It talks about a thetan in the physical universe. All the thetan is doing is stacking himself up against the physical universe and batting around like a bluebottle fly in a cage. If you want to free the PC from the session, ask if the room was OK. Then you have got the thetan and the physical universe straightened up. If the PC starts inventing answers or seems nerved up, it is probably a missed withhold. You won't do anything about it.

Then get a can squeeze. Asking about whether the run was all right usually gets his havingness back up. But if he is down on havingness, don't work over ruds. Run some havingness for a few commands, to restore the can squeeze, not to run the bank. The best havingness processes are:

1. Feel that _____ .

2. Touch that _____ .

3. Notice that _____ .

Only use a few commands, not more than twelve. This is also a good way to get the PC back in session.

Then take up session goals, not life and livingness goals. Take down whatever gains the PC mentions. Get ask/say. Answer a question if he has one. Don't start handling what comes up. You are ending session. Don't press for more.

Give the PC a Tone 40 end of session, and have him tell you that you are no longer auditing him. Give him an altered visual aspect also, to keep him from going on running his case. Look more cheerful and natural. Ask for a cigarette or something.

This is Routine 2 model session. Using more than this minimum can get you into trouble. For a nulling session, you can show the PC the list and ask for any major thoughts that he has had about it. This practice lets the PC get off out-ruds on the list. Then you don't have to ask for them.

If the PC gets agitated in a Routine 2 session, the first thing to assume is that there is something wrong with the Routine 2. If the PC gets self-audit-ish or interrupts to get his ruds in, just give a cheery acknowledgment and go on. Don't let the PC obscure reads while listing.

If you are nulling, just go down the list, going, "Bark! Bark! Bark!" If the needle gets dirty, don't assume that it is out-ruds. It is more likely that the list is wrong way to or from a wrong source, especially if your nulling was too brisk to give the PC time to think. Even more likely than the above is that the item is not on the list. If a list is incomplete, a PC won't register protest on the meter when you ask for more items, even if he is protesting verbally. You could also list for pages beyond where the list was complete. Then the needle can go dirty on protest. But all other crimes fall short of not completing the list.

R3-21 requires more mid-ruds than Routine 2 [See p. 371, above for R3-21]. As soon as you have PTP's out of the road, the case is ready for R3-21. Find his goals nice as you please. It is safer for an expert auditor to do goals on a case than to do Routine 2. An inexpert auditor is safer with Routine 2.

The list, "In PT, who or what are you upset about?" would probably run more easily on a PC simply in the form, "Who or what does present time consist of?" [Cf. Expanded dianetics PT environment list.] This is the basic model, but you could use, "Who or what are you in contact with in PT?" On missed withholds, realize that you can list whichever area is of most interest to the PC. If you pick the wrong one of the three (Session, Life and Livingness, Parts of Existence) to do first, it can react like a missed withhold. Make sure you get the universe where the problem lies.

6301C15 SHSpec-230 Dead Horses

An emergency is an unpredicted event -- a failure to predict. Anything else is life.

Dead horses lists are a problem. Often you do a "represent" list, and it misbehaves. It is hard to complete; it cycles. The essence of a cycling list is that the needle periodically goes beautifully clean, then dirties up again. When LRH first noticed this, he didn't understand. It was like a list wrong-way-to, but how could that be, on a "represent" list? The cycle on a right-way-to list is: dirty needle, dirty read, rock slam, dirty read dirty needle, rock slam, rock slam, then needle clean, and it stays clean, unless it rockslams. On a wrong-way-to "oppose" list, the rock slams increase in number. The clean needles do, too. You can tell by looking at any PC's list whether it is OK or wrong way to. You will need to be able to do this when you are auditing in the field, where you will have to repair other auditors' PCs. PCs can get sick on R2-12, and you had better know what could be wrong, so that you can fix it. Compare page two and page five of the list. If there are more rock slams on page five, it's wrong.

You can list a list each way for a page or two, observing how the PC looks before you start and when you stop. You will get good at seeing changes in PC appearance as his bank caves in on him.

Don't let anyone who isn't a real expert do R2-12 on children, because they won't sit still long enough to be repaired. They are easier to cave in.

So, getting back to dead horses and "represent" lists acting like wrong-way-to lists: "The flaw in Man is that he does not know himself." He is "much more [able] to observe enemies than self." Ask a guy to name his enemies and he will give you a list of names. Ask him to name himself, and you will get, "Joe". That is why "represent"lists tend to be wrong-way-to sometimes and to give you oppterms. They are easier to see than selves, and they often don't rockslam properly. The PC gets a stuck flow of listing oppterms, enemies, and you must find a wording that causes the PC to list himself, his terminals list. So the "represent" list is all oppterms, and it doesn't rockslam, and it gets a clean needle -- dirty needle cycle. If you are lucky, there will be rock slams on it, and you will find an item. But often the PC will go greenish and the list is a dead horse. The case that gives you a wrong way to "represent" list or dead horses, is someone whose next available item is a terminal, not an oppterm. The more the PC lists oppterms, the worse he feels. The missed item is the one that the PC is being right there in the session. This also applies to the "skunk" list, which runs out to no item, despite rock slams. A dead horse list is a list with no rock slams on it, even with mid-ruds in; a skunked list has a rock slam, but doesn't go on to an RI. The PC doesn't know from which point of view to give you enemies, so he has to give you everything. Say the terminal is "a bad boy". We are asking, "To a bad boy, what does life consist of?" and we get just oppterms. That is how you get a wrong-way-to "represent" list.

R2-12 can be run over another PTP and still get good results, although under these circumstances, the PC gets a bit dispersed at times. R2-12 gets the big hidden PTP's and hidden standards out of the

way, so that goals can be found. Until these PTP's are out of the way, the PC doesn't have enough free attention units to do R3-21.

Most people don't think at all. They just feed questions to circuits, which answer. A special case of this is the PC's hidden standards. "A hidden standard is a circuit that is telling [the PC] what to think." The PC has a signal system rigged up: "Scientology works if _____ ." It is quite a complicated communication system, like an automatic train-stopping system. The guy who leaps up and says, "Oh, yes! Scientology works!", first had to ask one of these systems. They don't think at all. For instance the FDA thinks the whole world is composed of two valences: victims and victimizers. There are no other items for the FDA. The guy who makes food is a victimizer and the guy who eats it is a victim. This makes the FDA an enemy of all industry, since industry emanates, and those who don't are victims. The FDA, lacking any other than those two terminals and wanting to be Effective, is a victimizer and can only create victims. This leads to a whole country of victims, communism, etc.

All do-gooder government agencies fall under this heading: "Life is a sort of a dreary game that goes on between all of these victimizers, who have to be stopped, and all of these victims." The government official in one of these agencies is trying to protect everybody from himself. A do-gooder gone mad has nothing but victims left. Eventually these boys have no more purpose in life, because so much is now missing from it. The way to handle this do-gooder is to sympathize with him. If you do this, he will go right out of the victim-maker valence and straight into that of a victim. He is defeated instantly.

If you like humanity, you will leave that kind of politics alone. In fact, you will leave all politics alone.

The thing that Man is tuned up to see first is enemies. When they go batty, they can see nothing but enemies everywhere. "The do-gooder never recognizes that he is a victim-maker." However, he would never give you "victim-maker as a terminal. You could ask him, "Who would have your problems?" and get terminals. [Cf. Expanded dianetics "wants handled" rundown.] "Nobody recognizes what he is being as easily as what he is facing.... Terminals are harder to pick up than oppterms at the start of a case. So you get wrong way to 'represent' lists, dead horses, and skunks, and that's the source of all of these." You want terminals, and you must phrase questions to get them.

The last rung of cases is that of PT rock slams. That would be pretty grim, because now you can't do a "represent" list.

The way to get someone to list terminals is to list, "In PT, who or what would have your problems?" or "Who or what would live the life you are living?" or "Who or what do people think you are?", or "Who is looking at me?" or "Who could be looking at me?", or some such. PCs have items stacked up in order, as well as packages stacked up in order. The majority of PCs "are a bit overwhelmed, and the first item [to come up] is an oppterm. They are being an oppterm." Other PCs, not a few, have a terminal as the first item. They need a terminal question. If you said, "Who or what are you?" as a listing question, remember that "you" is undifferentiated. So you should somehow differentiate it. If you have listed a dead horse list, ask the PC, "Who or what would oppose all those things?" and get a rockslamming list.

6301C15 SHSpec-231 R2-12 Nevers

Never represent a rockslamming item, i.e. anything that ever rockslammed, because a rockslamming item comes from some source, and if you don't know what the source is, it could be wrong. An arbitrary source is dangerous. This is the most dangerous point in R2-12. Never use an arbitrary list. Don't try to oppose some rockslamming word that just comes from nowhere.

Never abandon R2-12. Nothing else will patch up R2-12, if it gets fouled up. R2-12 is an ultimate process, i.e. a process that repairs itself. Never try to patch up R2-12 with something else, because it will fail.

Never let someone lose records or keep records inaccurately. There is a way to straighten out a case whose records are lost, however. Using the meter, find when the PC's case caved in, the session in which it occurred, and put mid-ruds in on that session. This will get the PC's memory improved to the point where he can give you data about the list, or whatever. But this is a very arduous approach.

Never attribute a violent ARC break to anything but a wrong item or an incomplete list. It is not caused by a missed withhold, except in the sense that the missed item is the withhold. This datum applies in the workaday world as well as it does in session. Somebody has missed an item on the U.S. government. Probably, the ARC break is from no-auditing and missing all their items.

Never run a PC darker and massier. He won't get lighter. Come off it at once.

Never give a PC an item and then do something else at once. This is very distracting to the PC, and if it is a wrong item, the ARC break will be compounded. You must allow a minute or two of observation. Just put the meter aside and make a little routine of it and say, "Well, apparently your item is _____ ." Watch him like a hawk. Does his face get dark? Does mass come in? If so, don't let it go any longer. Tell the PC that you want to continue listing. Never lead a PC to believe that you are giving him an item when you are not. There can be a funny condition where all the indicators look right, but after the PC cognites, the rock slam will vanish as the lock blows, after which the wrong-item indicators start to show up. So don't shift the PC's attention. This will save lots of trouble. The longer you let a PC keep a wrong item, the more trouble it will be to patch it up.

Never persist with a wrong action that is worsening the case, just because you don't know what to do. It is far better to end off or take a break to straighten things out. It is good sense to know what you are doing before you do it. This does not mean somatics. That's not a sign of the PC's getting worse at all.

Never let case errors accumulate or multiply. When you are aware of an error on the case, fix it without forgetting that it is an error to fail to complete a cycle of action on the case. But also don't interrupt a PC that is doing well. If the case isn't running OK, repair earlier mistakes.

All lists stem from some arbitrary point. It can't be helped. The three universes from which you list are:

1. The PC's PT session environment.

2. His PT non-session life and livingness environment.

3. The parts of existence.

Each of these can be listed positive or negative, oppterm (+ or -) and terminal (+ or -). Thus you have twelve sources. One way to make auditing with these less risky is, when clearing the command, to test it for rock slams. This can include testing words or segments within the command for rock slams. Never represent it if it rockslams. Clear the command and vary it around until it makes sense to the PC, until it's real to him. Never try to list a list question that the PC cannot answer, i.e. clear it with him and get his agreement to answer it.

Choosing the wrong universe to list will get you missed withhold phenomena, including ARC breaks, because the PC's attention is fixated on the universe that you are not asking him about.

Never, in your anxiety to clear someone or pacify someone, fail to get his PTP's and hidden standards out of the way. That is all, in general, that has been wrong with clearing.

6301C16 SHSpec-232 TR-0

The original TR-0 was to teach the auditor to be there and to be aware. However, in doing TR-0, students have begun to confront with that definition. The original definition and TR-0 are still valid. Additives have arisen: You can make someone confront with a professional attitude, an auditing attitude, an interested attitude. Good coaching depends on spotting what the student is doing and running it out, flunking it, without either flunking so much that the student goes into apathy, nor so little that the student never improves. The purpose of TR-O is to enable the student "to stand up to the duress of auditing."

It disturbs a PC to have an auditor whose confront is very unnatural and who shatters under an upset in session. Upsets are often assignable to faulty TR-4. An auditor who Q and A's gives PCs

withholds by not simply acknowledging. One Q and A equals one missed withhold. The PC's statement has not been acknowledged, just acknowledged. The reason some auditors take a long time to learn not to Q and A isn't really out-TR-4. It is out-TR-0. The auditor can't stand up to the session. Whenever something in the session looks odd, the Auditor retreats. TR-0 is out!

The coach must have considerable perception to coach TR-0 on a useful gradient. He has to see confront go out, look at something the student is doing, and punch the button.

LRH has noticed auditors who Q and A in the presence of an ARC break, because there is too much there to confront. This is as disastrous as it is likely to happen. A coaching gradient on this would start with the coach shaking his hand in front of the student's eyes. Somewhere on the gradient, the student will demonstrate his ability to dodge flying E-meter cans, while still confronting.

For an auditor to freeze and go totally silent is worse for the PC than auditor Q and A. It is a no-auditing situation. We should give at least fifty percent of our coaching time to the fellow who goes into wood. A good coach can recognize the difference between someone confronting and someone going into solid granite.

The next worst thing to going wooden is fleeing. This amounts to the same thing. Don't think someone is doing TR-0 because he has gone into apathy. You can add aliveness to being aware. This point is easy for a coach to miss. Someone whose TR-0 is granite won't be able to handle what comes up in a session because he is not really confronting. When you find an auditor who is having trouble with TR-0, you know what kind of response he is getting in auditing, because when something happens in session, the auditor flees.

Good auditing, as opposed to bad auditing, will show up most clearly under duress. TR-0 is the first thing to go. The auditor will start making mistakes, which is one thing you can't afford to do. If the auditor's TR-0 is poor, the auditor will make wrong judgments, no matter how well he is taught.

There is a gradient of bad TR-0, consisting of three grades:

1. TR-0 of doing the drill, not associated with anything.

2. The person who clams up and can't act.

3. Obsessive motion as a form of a and A.

All three of these must be cured with coaching.

There is something else you could do, different from TR-1 or TR-2: a talking confront. You see if the student can go on counting while you throw the cans at him, or whether he loses count.

Auditors must be trained to expect ARC breaks and to keep going, because auditors get ARC breaks, as well as getting wins and results. LRH was aware, recently, of thinking less swiftly when a pc ARC broke. He analyzed the phenomenon as his not wanting to confront it, because it was counter to his intention for the session. So he experienced a small impulse not to confront it. This gave LRH a subjective reality on how an auditor could go from there to not thinking and making a goof. R2-12 ARC breaks can be sudden, violent, and apparently inexplicable. So TR-0 must be beefed up in order to cope with this.

How much and how long should you run TR-0? Until the student comes to the independent conclusion that he can do TR-0 and has the ability to do TR-0 while doing all the other TR's, and until he can maintain TR-0 when everything is going wrong and there is lots of duress. Bad TR-0 leads to a and A, lack of comprehension of what is going on, and no-auditing for the PC.

It takes awhile for someone to learn R2-12. If he is learning his TR's at the same time, you are liable to have a mess on your hands. A co-audit with R2-10 [See p. 359, above.] can be done, but only because guidance is very stringent, And they don't have very much responsibility.

For TR-1, go get a good recording of a lion roaring and then play it, with the student putting intention into the middle of the speaker.

The degree of ARC breaks the PC will have on R2-12 is proportional to the outness of the auditor's TR's. Bad TR's lead to bad judgment. If the auditor's TR's are perfect, he will never have them tested by a violently ARC broken PC.

Psychiatrists are trying to make the third dynamic safe by protecting it from the first dynamic, i.e. from the patient. He is "curing" motion. He is totally sold on the idea that insanity equals motion. He tries to get the patient into quietness, into apathy.

6302C13 SHTVD-16; SHSpec-237 X-Unit: Ruds and Havingness

[Demo tape of ruds and havingness.]

6302C13 SHSpec-238 Discussion by LRH of X-Unit: Ruds and Havingness TVD

There are two reasons why a session doesn't start:

1. There is something wrong with the room.

2. The PC has something to say and is holding it back, waiting for the session to start so that he can say something.

6302C19 SHSpec-240 Rundown on Processes

High-toned items are oppterms. It is the low-toned item that is the terminal.

You can run the TA out of CCH's.

6302C20 SHSpec-241 Talk on TV Demo: Finding Rocket Reads

[Discussion of a TV demo that is evidently not on a SHSBC tape.]

6302C21 SHSpec-242 R2 and R3: Current Auditing Rundown

Routine 3M procedure:

1. Use R2-12 to get the PC capable of getting a rocket read or a rock slam.

2. Find a goal, using R2-12 material.

3. Or, just list goals, lots of them. List all the TA out. Watch for rocket reads.

4. Go over the PC's old goals and find the ones that have been chopped up.

This is the same as the beginning step of R3-21. Always give the PC a chance to orient an RI vis-a-vis his goal. You can reword different "oppose" questions in different ways and list the best-reading version. [R3M appears to supersede R3-21 as a goals running process. See also 6302C07 SHSpec-234-5 "R3MX", 6302C12 SHSpec-236 "Routine 3M", 6302C14 SHSpec-239 "Routine 3M", and 6303C19 SHSpec-250 "R3M: How to Find Goals". See also HCOB 22Feb63 "Routine 3-M: Rundown by Steps", which gives the procedure. A summary of the procedure is given below. Routine 3MX and Routine 3M are the same thing.]

6303C07 SHSpec-247 When Faced With the Unusual, Do the Usual.

Psychiatry never got anyplace because they never learned to do the usual when faced with the unusual. Every desperate remedy devised by Man occurred because the practitioner Q and A'd with the patient. The psychiatrist says that he practices Freudian analysis, but he does it with Adler's twists on Jung's

version as interpreted by Karen Horney -- only he does it his way! There might once have been a technology of psychiatry, but you could never find it now, under all the stress-induced Q and A and alter-is that has been added.

If you do something unusual every time you see something unusual in a PC, you will never make him clear. He will be wrapped around a telephone pole. The more precise the process and the more you figure-figure on it, the goofier it will get.

There is no constant number of items in a GPM. This makes it possible to end one GPM and go on into the next one without knowing that you are doing so, especially if the PC's ruds are out when you end the first GPM, so that there is no F/N, or it is so brief (say, 3 1/2 seconds) that you don't see it, or you miss seeing the BD. If you jam the second goal like that, you will get a high stuck TA. After awhile, no items will be findable and the goal stops rocket reading.

[More comments on specific goofs on running goals.]

If the PC gives you a goal, you always take it, but you don't necessarily do something with it.

The only time you find no item on a list is when the item has already been found.

The PC isn't different. He has the same bank, or he wouldn't be here in this time-stratum at this time.

Auditors are to be congratulated for their willingness to persist on a case, but when one persists simply because one doesn't know what else to do, one is doing the unusual. What you are trying to do, with a GPM, is to run it out, not just to find RI's. The goal built the GPM, so you have to knock out the RI's aligned to the goal, so the GPM will disappear.

The clear check procedure is given in HCOB 22Feb63 "Routine 3M -- Rundown by Steps".

6303C20 SHTVD-18; SHSpec-252 Ruds and Havingness Session

[LRH demo with Reg Sharpe. LRH does model session and beginning rudiments, then finds a suitable havingness process and runs it to a stabilization of the TA.]

Don't ever nag a PC with a dirty needle. It cleans up as the PC's confidence and ARC with the auditor comes up. Auditors who punish the PC because they can't read his needle only make the dirty needle worse. Take what the PC says and get out. The PC might have a missed withhold, but here is the test: he is not mad at the auditor, so that is not it. You don't need an axe to clean up a needle.

You may think that a needle gets cleaned up because you pick up all the thoughts of the PC. That's wrong! A needle cleans up because the PC has more ARC and more confidence in the auditor. It isn't cleaned up on the significance of what the PC says. So, in a ruds and havingness session, the primary purpose of the session is to build ARC with the PC by reason of auditing. It is not what you do, it is how you do it. You are smoothing out his needle. A PC's ARC determines his reads on the meter. It is based on smooth basic auditing.

The first requisite of all auditing is to be able to give a PC a smooth session on ruds and havingness, a session which ends up with the PC in better ARC, the needle cleaner. If you can do that, the PC will have confidence in you. The PC has to be able to confront his auditor before he can confront his bank. The effect scale is at work here. If you are a smooth basic auditor, you can run any process. Ruds and havingness aren't just practice. They raise the PC's ARC if they are done right.

6303C26 SHSpec-252 Case Repair

Worry is the occupational hazard of the auditor doing Routine 2 and 3. The time to worry is when the PC looks and feels bad. Don't plow on at that point. Find what is wrong. Case repair can become necessary, once a goal has been found and run. If the goal has not been run, all it takes is a prepcheck to straighten it out. Sometimes a goal has been found which wasn't ready to be found or run, and the auditor starts finding items that are out of another GPM. Then Routine 2G comes into case repair. [See HCOB 13Apr63 "Routine 2G ... " and 6303C21 SHSpec-251 "R2G Series"] The actions you

should take when one goal has been run and it has disappeared are resident in R2G1 or R2G2, not in R3M. You list goals against items, null old lists, run R2G1, prepcheck an old goal, etc. If you've got items from a different GPM, in order to find a goal from the items you have got, you need to use R2G. You will appreciate the fact that some Class IV has checked out a goal and verified that it rocket read, when you try to find the matching items.

Say you had an old goal, which has been listed out on 114 lines and which no longer ticks, but on which there was once an F/N. Or say someone had a wrongly worded source list, or someone made up his own line plot and got sick. The primary datum of all case repair applies to all these situations: all these weird actions are incapable of deranging a GPM. GPM's are Almost impervious to improper R3M, though the PC can be made sick and caved in.

So at any stage of case repair, anything that was done right will stay right, and anything done wrong can be corrected. R3M stops working where it is done wrong. Anything that has been found on the PC has been found, even if it is not correctly aligned as yet. That an item was found out of place doesn't alter the GPM where it belongs. R3M will still work fine.

We can call the whole bank the Goals Problem Masses and one GPM a GPM. One goal and a packet of items equals a GPM. R3M is what handles the repair of messed up GPM's.

If you want to know exactly what a GPM is and the explanation for the formation of the GPM, read DMSMH. Wherever it says "engram" in the explanation of why people have engrams, put in "item" or "GPM". It is quite interesting. There is a reason why the thetan postulated each goal. It was born out of the goal that the thetan has just survived. Only the first goal of the bank is postulated from nothing.

The only thing that can upset a GPM is the exact auditing that we give it. It hangs together by violence or lack of it, so it is accustomed to violence and mistakes. Practically no auditing goof can affect it, though you can make a PC unhappy and miserably uncomfortable. By making auditing goofs, you will upset the PC, but you won't upset his bank. However, you are not running the PC. You are running a GPM with the PC's cooperation.

The varying length of a GPM depends on how well it served the PC as a survival mechanism. That doesn't vary much, although the difference of line plots gives the appearance of more variation. This occurs because some items found are extraneous, and others are strays from other line plots.

If you can't find anything while doing R3M, you have goofed, and you are looking in the wrong place. It is not that there is nothing there or that the GPM has gotten messed up.

In case repair at any stage of auditing the GPM, find the first wrong action that you can find behind you and do it right. If a Piece or item of a GPM is missing, you can always find it and put it in. You can do a goals "oppose" list to start it and stop it. Also, don't just straighten out the PCs. Straighten out the auditor who goofed. Get him to study the bulletins and find what he didn't get. It could be that he never read them! Otherwise, he will keep making the same mistake.

Handle a case repair as though it were a clear test. Compare the goal to the line plot and see if they relate. Put in buttons on the goal. Get it to fire or at least tick. Go over your line plot and read each item against the meter. If one rockslams, even though it is from a source list and has been opposed, you know the source list was improperly handled. Any item that reads, no matter how slightly, after having itself been opposed, came off a wrongly done or handled list. That is a stable datum. If it rocket reads, you have no guarantee that there has been a wrong way oppose. The only guarantee is that the list it came from is wrong. Correct that list.

What you want is the earliest item on the line plot that now reads. Look behind it at the line plot on which it appeared, and do that list correctly. If you don't find something wrong with it, the error is earlier. Look at items that were found earlier.

What happens when you do a wrong-way oppose? It usually throws the PC out of the right GPM into another GPM and gives you a stray item that looks out of place on the plot. So, seeing a stray look at the list it came from. One test for which way to list is to call the question each way. The one that turns on more mass is the wrong one. You should get good enough to recognize it by significance, as all GPM's follow the pattern in HCOB 13Mar63.

In a case repair, having found the right item, just proceed as though the subsequent items had never been found.

Repair a case that needs repair. Don't just blunder on. If the PC ARC breaks, use the assessment bulletin [Bulletin not available, but is based on a list of fifteen causes of ARC breaks in R2 and R3, given in HCOB 14Mar63 "Urgent -- Routine 2 - Routine 3: ARC Breaks, Handling of", p. 3] to find out what was really wrong. Don't just try to spot it or guess. The cause of a rough ARC break is withheld from both the auditor and the PC.

Don't put figure-figure into what you are doing. Just be sure that you are doing R3M right.

6303C27 SHTVD-19; SHSpec-254 Sec Checking

Sec checking is an art. It consists of restimulating stuff which is to be picked up, and then picking it up. The way to do it is thoroughly. Getting through the sec check isn't the point. The point is, getting through to the PC and keying stuff in.

[There follows a TVD of Reg Sharpe sec checking Leslie van Straden.]

There is a world of difference between sec checking and mid-ruds or any ruds. Ruds are done in a perfunctory manner, just to be able to get on with auditing. Sec checking and prepchecking are auditing the PC's case. On goals running, you are using mid-ruds to brush the PC off, so that there is nothing in your road. In sec checking and prepchecking, you are pressing the question home. You are seeing to it that the PC sees how the question applies to his life: dig dig dig. You discuss and restimulate things so that you can clean them up. To be called an auditor, you must be able to do both of these things: the brush-off and the press-home. In R2G1, you have to be able to do both. It is an art. You have to be able to audit the PC in front of you. You have to work around enough to really clean things up.

R2G1 is not run on the needle. It is part of Routine 2 Pre-hav levels, which is run on the tone arm, totally. As long as there is TA, you keep persuading the PC to answer. There is R2GPM [Pre-hav], which is the original pre-hav levels applied to purposes. [S-ee HCOB 13Apr63 "Routine 2G ..." for a summary of the Routine 2G processes, including Routine 2-GPM and Routine 2-G1 to G5.] Sec check, ruds, and havingness are all processes that are run by the needle, not by the TA.

6304C18 SHSpec-258 Directive Listing [Part I]

[Details on running R3M]

Gobbledygook to comply with the form isn't right. The PC sometimes gives it, knowing that it should be such-and-such a form. Don't use it, since it will result in no rocket read. Something odd, but conceptually right, e.g. "Catholicness", is OK. It is up to the auditor to direct the PC's attention to what should be there and get him to find it.

The liabilities of getting wrong items, wrong goals, missed items, etc., are so great that you should do everything possible to prevent these things from happening. You have a bank pattern that is at least close to the perfect pattern. The upper fourteen to eighteen and the lower twelve items (omitting the two lowest oppterms, which vary on every goal) are very set and patterned. The pattern is that of LRH's fifteenth GPM. He realized that we needed the basic fundamentals of the bank, and that the PC was in a bank so far back and so beefy that it was vital to get its character and its right pattern, or get killed as a PC. There is more to the GPM than appeared earlier, because no one could confront it all until a lot of charge had been taken off. The goal of that bank is "to create". To LRH's amazement, the pattern holds true later on the track and on other PCs. If the PC isn't run closely guided to this pattern, his rocket read goes off. So the pattern has value. There will be other patterns for other types of goals, but they can be extrapolated from this one.

Directive listing has to do first with the accuracy of the pattern. When the auditor doesn't know what he is trying to do, it is not very successful. Directive listing is kind; permissive listing wastes time and PCs.

The main thing that will give you trouble is the top oppterm and the top terminal. These are characterized as the final achievement of the goal (the top oppterm) and the negation of the goal (the top terminal).

6304C30 SHSpec-261 Directive Listing [Part II]

Finding the pattern of the GPM has been pure slaughter. You have to hunt and punch around among various banks, stirring everything up. LRH was horrified in the past to find so many items. He wondered if some were locks. Now it is all shaken out. It is mysterious that the noun form declines into "-ity" forms, then the goal as an oppterm. The goal declines through the same pattern, all the way down through "absolute" and "perfect" into the "ivities". Then you get to the end of the goal, which doesn't decline, mysteriously.

Body weight and machinery get knocked around sometimes, when doing directive listing. It is the unrun items which, slamming into the body, increase the body's mass. This is one of the oldest findings in havingness processing, like mock-ups being shoved into the body increasing the body's weight. A partially-run GPM, being in restimulation, impinges on the body more than it did, so you get more body weight. Mental mass and physical mass are the same stuff, but mental mass is thinner. GPM mass looks like a steel shell, or is a sphere covered with a black or grey cloud. The mass on a half-discharged bank looks like grey cotton-wool. It has finite dimensions. The mass alternates: black banks and grey banks going back down the track. A black bank, partly discharged, turns greyish and murky-brown while there are still some items. It shakes and shivers and tries to fall apart. The best items are those that turn on a little mass. The first items off take off proportionally more charge than the later ones. However, leaving lower RI's undischarged is dangerous, because the lower items hold it all together, and it will charge up again. The top items are uncomfortable and upsetting, but not that important. The lowest oppterm is the keystone that keeps the bank in its channel, because it is a cross between the failed goal of the next GPM down and the one you are in. That is how the goals stay in sequence. What keeps the bank charged up is the goal. When you reach the goal as an RI, you can't just leave it. You have to list what would oppose it. But don't let the PC start to run what comes up as the item, because it is the next bank, and before going into it, the PC has to come up to PT. Acknowledge it very thoroughly. Don't null the list. Go back to the top of the first bank you ran, and find its goal, find the opposite "oppose", and go on to PT. It is always harder to go the other way, going later, rather than earlier, but that is the way to do it.

The reason is that you are trying to clear the PC by obtaining for the PC the greatest possible auditing gains per unit of time. It is mechanically true that the more items you get off, the more banks you run, the more charge you discharge, the more the PC will cognite. But we are running the PC under special conditions that you, as a scientologist recognize as special, but that no one else would see as out of the ordinary. You are running a thetan in a body. That just about ruins ninety percent of the things you could do. You are auditing a bank with a frail human body interposed between the bank and the PC, but you need the PC's body to hold onto the cans. That is what has given LRH trouble in research. The PC is put into danger, in that you can't audit a dead body, end if the PC dropped his body half way through a bank, he would probably be sufficiently restimulated so that he would have trouble picking up a new body. He would key-out, but he would feel betrayed, because the hope factor was 'way up. So auditing is monitored by the consideration of what gains you can achieve in spite of the fact that the PC has a body between himself and the bank. This is a real problem.

The bank is capable of influencing the body. That is why the E-meter can be used. The E-meter is not connected up to the auditor, but the auditor can, accidentally, start looking at or into his own bank to figure out the PC, and kick in some restimulation. The auditor's bank and the PC's are on different wavelengths, so they don't collide. MEST has wavelengths, also. Someone whose wavelength is near to yours is someone you feel very close to [-- a soul-mate]. You can influence each other more than average, being both more pleasing and more irritating. There is also the possibility of having known the other person before.

So there is a thetan plus a body plus a bank. The bank consists of free track that hasn't been drawn into the GPM's, all the goals, all the GPM's, all the locks, secondaries, engrams, and circuits. Then there is the thetan, the body, and the physical universe, with all its PTP's. So, in a sense, in auditing the PC, you are auditing the whole Physical universe and everything in it. It is seldom necessary for the auditor to handle the PC's environment, except when handling a very neurotic or psychotic PC, or a PC with a psychotic family.

296

If you were auditing a thetan with no body, you could run him back to his earliest bank, knock it out, and then run off the later ones more easily. The body gets in the way of this, because when the thetan made his earliest bank, he didn't have a body, and his adventures were more strenuous than a body could take. So you can make someone quite ill by chasing them down into early banks and badly handling them. The body is a useful adjunct, though a nuisance, in some ways. So you should safeguard it by staying with standard procedures. Whatever you come up with to run, run it well, with a minimum of stress on the body.

What could you do to overstress the body? You could fail to clear the bank you are working on and go off into other banks. You could not run banks closer to PT before going earlier. You could not try, as far as possible, to run a bank from its extreme top to the bottom. You could keep auditing the PC over and over, finding nothing and not discharging the bank. You could find wrong items and run wrong goals. You could fail to follow the pattern, but assume that your PC is different. Your PC simply won't rocket read well on some parts of the GPM. It is just charge that prevents the right item from firing.

Just as the PC has many goals and many banks, he has many RI's in one GPM. Instead of worrying about all the GPM's there are to run, you should be worrying about cleaning up the RI's you have your hands on. Just as if you half-ran half of the PC's banks, so if you half-run half the RI's in a bank, the PC will sooner or later feel queasy. The monitoring consideration is that you should audit what you have your hands on. Don't "run R3 on a PC". Audit the PC with R3! That goes for every auditing skill we have. "I never sec check a PC. I audit the PC with sec checking. I don't find goals on a PC. I audit a PC with goals finding." If you keep that frame of reference, you will win all the way.

With Routine 3, it is almost possible to audit the PC with scarcely a somatic, if you use everything you are doing, at the moment you are doing it, to clear the PC of what you have your hands on. It will go something like this: The first RI takes 2 1/2 hours; the next thirty RI's take half an hour apiece; the next thirty RI's take twenty minutes apiece; the next thirty take fifteen minutes apiece. The next bank takes you 45 minutes to get your first Rl, half an hour each for the next half-dozen, fifteen minutes each for the next thirty, etc., etc. This happens because you are building, on a gradient scale, the thetan's confidence, and leaving nothing behind you to worry about. This state of affairs is attainable, if you follow some rules. Say you have spent two sessions trying to get the top oppterm to fire. You've still got the whole bottom of the GPM and various points to cut in, where the PC can get rocket reads. By auditing the lower parts of the GPM, you could unburden the case and then progress forward. You should be aware that you can always go down in a bank, no matter how hard you try to list upward. Your first interest is to get charge off. If you get charge off, the PC can confront more. Now he can find that missing top oppterm.

You've got countless locks, which will fire when you first enter a bank. Any part of the goal, anything will fire, because you are looking at the whole mass, and it is so cross-charged that anything will fire. That makes the top oppterm the hardest to find. After you have taken some charge off, all these weird combinations don't fire. The more bank, the more things will fire, and the more restimulated the PC will be in life.

[Details on directive listing procedure.]

Some PCs will have to be taught the language, if they don't understand the words in the pattern. Eventually they will get the words.

6305C16 SHSpec-265 The Time Track

[Some of the data in this tape is contained in HCOB 15May63 "The Time Track and Engram Rum ing by Chains: Bulletin I" and HCOB 8Jun63" ... Bulletin II -- Handling the Time Track".]

One basic tenet has never changed: you have never successfully audited anything but the time track. There is nothing to audit but the time track. There is no grand key to the release of things but the time track. Locks, valences, machinery, etc., are all phenomena of the time track.

The time track is the continuous record of time of the individual, from the first moment he began to experience, on through until now, an interrupted three-D fifty-two perception movie. Things happen

to that movie. It gets grouped and becomes unavailable to the PC for various reasons, e.g. his inability to confront the fact that it can get grouped, etc. All that auditing ever does is to straighten out the time track, make it available, and as-is it. The track gets collapsed and looped by chains, which consist of related incidents, until you get a solid wad of experience which is unavailable to the PC and thus has command value over him. There are only two classes of things involved in the time track:

1. The mechanical things. The matter, energy, space, and time that is the time track.

2. The significance of it. People who can't confront the track at all, e.g. psychologists and psychiatrists, conceive it to consist of thought only. The time track is not imaginary and shouldn't be treated as imaginary. It has mass.

In the physical universe, a brick wall is the product of various people and forces. Where it all come from needn't be investigated, for practical purposes. The time track has remained undiscovered and undescribed by mental health practitioners, because they have lacked the confront to get past certain mechanisms that make it unavailable.

Nothing is holy, to a scientologist. There is nothing that should not be investigated. Nothing is unavailable, although psychiatrists think so. They don't know that the time track is real. They have fallen for the first trick that the time track employs to make itself unavailable: the idea that there is "nothing in the mind but thought". That is a trick of debarment. The consideration is, "Anybody who says that he is looking at a brick building in the mind ... isn't looking as a brick building, and it must therefore be imaginary, so therefore he is living in the field of illusion or delusion, so therefore he must be slightly mad...." "Insane people must be mad because they are seeing things," says the psychiatrist. Then he compounds the insanity by saying, "No, you are not seeing these things." He makes the time track less available.

"The direction of sanity lies in the capability of confronting the time track and the PT environment." For any individual, "existence consists of the physical universe, PT and everything that is in it at this exact, precise PT instant, and the time track, which consists of everything that has been, and that is the total isness, as far as this thing called 'reality' is concerned."

Archeology studies "a suppositional reality", but it is not outlawed for that reason. You can take some ruin and say, "What has it been?" But that is not the isness. It is a suppositional reality, subject to error. However, archeology is not outlawed as a science for that reason. Furthermore, all futures are suppositional. If they are suppositional enough, they come true. LRH used to tell fortunes by looking at a person's facsimiles and mocking something up. The future is always enforceable with altitude and authority. This is just a trick method of making a postulate stick. It is still a suppositional reality. There is isness, and there is suppositional isness. "The time track often gives people the feeling that the 'was' can return." It can be quite solid, when there is extra awareness jammed into a particular moment.

You also have to look at a borderline phenomenon: creating. Someone says he will build a building, and he does. His saying he will nearly puts it there. But a creation is a suppositional reality until it is actually created, at which point it becomes an isness, and remains an isness for whatever period of time it endures.

Part of the thought of reality is the adjudication of whether it is good, bad, or whatever. Thought is not separate from reality. It is woven solidly into reality and is part of the isness of reality. One can establish the isness of a reality at time by asking about it. Some people can't even confront that. [Here, LRH recounts an anecdote about the CIA or the police following students and PCs around for weeks, as they ran "Union Station", an outdoor objective process. (Command was, "You invent a way of destroying that (indicated person)." See HCOB 6Feb58 "HGC Clear Procedure Outline of February 6". The process was done to take over destructive automaticities.) They were trying to find out what the scientologists were doing without ever taking the trouble to ask.] "It never occurred to them to establish an isness.... They couldn't even view the thought in the isness." This is even worse than only being able to view the thought in the isness. So there is a descending gradient of ability to confront an isness:

1. Able to confront or view an isness.

2. Able to confront or view only the thought in an isness.

3. Unable to confront or view the thought in an isness, or even to ask about it.

Opinions are. There are thoughts and opinions abroad in the world that we may not agree with, but which are part of the isness. A wrought iron fence is a thought woven into the physical universe, as, to some degree, is all else. When someone creates something in the physical universe, part of its isness is the expression of his thought. Thought is expressed by the formation of the MEST. So thought is, to some degree, part of the physical universe. Likewise, the time track is composed of matter, energy, space, time, and thought. So both the physical universe and the time track are composed of MEST and thought. Added onto these are many complexities such as suppositional isnesses, befores and afters, purposes, and aesthetics.

"The degree that [an individual] is on a suppositional kick measures directly his confrontingness." How much suppositional isness is added to actual isness? A critic says, "The artist should have...." The "should have" measures the amount of non-confront the critic is doing. This is also true of PCs, who typically say, "Well, it looks as if there might have been... there could possibly have been ... a wreck of some kind here at one time or another. Maybe. I think it was an airplane." (It turns out that it was a building.) The PC is very suppositional. He doesn't give the isness of it.

Someone who criticizes anything is doing a supposition about how something should be. They are not confronting the isness. "The time track straightens out and erases in direct ratio to the amount of isness confronted by the PC, and that is how sane and capable [he] gets. [It is] measured directly by the amount of isness the individual is [able to] confront."

In view of the fact that he PC's track is in terrible condition, there are two factors at work:

1. The PC's own feelings of incompetence.

2. The unrecognizableness of the track.

These combine to give you a cat's breakfast. An extreme form of this problem is seen in the PC who supposes all sorts of horrible things, who thinks it is so uncomfortable that he doesn't even show up for session.

A thetan's state is not really pinned mechanically by anything. He is not made less of a thetan or more by MEST. But when you surround him as intimately as the time track does with a tremendous amount of suppositional unconfrontability, he is enforced into a state of low morale, where he doesn't think that he can do anything. And the isness, then, is that he can't. The PC supposes that the time track is not confrontable, that the auditor is not going to be able to do anything for it, that he won't be able to handle it, etc. "All the time he's supposing, he's not confronting." He knows what will happen. He has had all these unconfrontable experiences, and his attention is still fixed on something, and he knows he mustn't take his attention off of it. He also knows that if he doesn't take his attention off of it, he will go to pieces. Then he has forgotten that he has his attention on it. He feels degraded by all this. In addition, the state of his track is horrible. It is scrambled, shredded, snarled up. The thetan, in the middle of it all, is convinced that if he moves or looks at any of it, something horrible will happen. All of it has command value over him. Yet, at the same time, it is valuable to him. It has become his havingness. "It's all the old tin cans he's got. It's all his knowingness.... He's like somebody who has become totally dependent on the record department, and then the record department has been bombed. He can't even find out his own name, rank, and serial number without [it]." That dependency and the why of it is also in the record department.

The great savants who have remained ignorant of the time track have just Q and A'd with its unconsciousness by remaining unconscious of it and unwilling to approach its pain. The time track is unavailable to the being, so the savant supposes that it is unavailable to him. But the auditor mustn't do this Q and A.

"The only real tragedy of life, I suppose, is that absolute unconsciousness and absolute unknowingness are unobtainable." The fact that a thetan can't remember, at first, what happened in an engram doesn't mean that he was unconscious at the time. If absolute unconsciousness and unknowingness were possible, we would probably be all right.

Don't underestimate the violence that is there on the time track, and don't force the PC into it. But if you get the earliest moment of the earliest GPM, it runs like hot butter, even though there's as much

charge on it as there is on a later one. The difficulty you hit with the later one is that it has the charge of all the earlier ones, in addition to its own, so it is far harder for the PC to confront.

It is important not to give the PC loses, early on. You should know the mechanics of engrams and the time track. Be sure your commands mean what you intend them to mean. "Through the incident" does not mean "through the incident to the end," and if you just say, "Move to the end," the PC won't go through the incident. The bank follows the "You think you are there, so you are there" mechanism of the thetan, so the difference between "to" and "through" is very important. Use "to" in scouting and "through" in running engrams, and don't mix them up.

LRH found that some PCs can't run GPM's until they have run an early engram. Also, if you can run the overt engram that relates to these GPM's, as an engram, a fantastic amount of charge will come off the implants themselves, and they will run like hot butter.

Here is a datum: That particular implanting outfit was located down towards the center of this galaxy and was founded 52,863,010, 654,079 years ago. It was destroyed 38,932,690,862,933 years ago by the 79th wing of the 43rd Battle Squadron of the Galactic Fleet. It was a wildcat activity. They used to drag Magellanic clouds out of the center hub of the galaxy, let them follow lines of force and come over a system, and then send planes in with speakers. The place would be caved in for thousands of years as a result of radioactive clouds. You are not likely to find any implant earlier then or even near 52 trillion years ago, or closer to PT than 35.9 trillion years ago. Any other kind of implant is a different kind or a dramatization of it someplace else. The Helatrobus implanter had the dream of everyone in the universe being good. They used the Ice Cube. [See A History of Man, pp. 64-5.] This is the implant that really keyed in the time track.

6305C23 SHSpec-268 State of OT

There isn't a government on earth that has the right to "permit" our survival as an organization. [Cognition: The only reason you have a present time problem is that you don't have enough time.]

The Helatrobus implants -- you can call them the "heaven" implants -- had a big effect on thetans, with their cold energy, or frozen energy. The Helatrobus government had gold crosses on their aircraft. No one could find out who "they" were. They couldn't find out who was behind and actually doing the implanting. The implants were based on cold energy with significance placed in it. The implants tended to talk. The Helatrobites had figured out something that looked to everyone else like a natural phenomenon: the Magellanic (radioactive) clouds, with which they surrounded planetary systems.

The stars in a galaxy tend to be collected towards the center of the galactic wheel. When you look at the Milky Way, you are looking towards the center of this galaxy. In the opposite direction, you see other galaxies. We are awfully far out from the center of this galaxy. Our sun is a "rim star". Galaxies are condensations of radioactive clouds into suns and planets. Planets sometimes shatter, to become a belt of asteroids. Suns range from "dead" suns, to red, yellow, white, and blue suns, as they get hotter and brighter. Bodies could exist that are suited for conditions on other planets.

Some science fiction writers have very good memories but have fallen victim to the implants that reverse time, such that the past equals the future. The "boogie man" is a standard mechanism for keeping people from going places and looking at things, confronting. For instance, the Phoenicians spread sea-monster rumors to prevent competition with England in the tin trade. Scare stories about terrible beings are quite standard. They are used to keep people out of things that others want to keep hidden. Most planets run by animal forms have classifiable types of forms, similar from system to system, depending on the environment. Someone built for Jupiter-type conditions would look, perhaps, Eskimo-ish.

You could become very disheartened and caved in about this universe and see it as a trap, until you recognize that the thetan is helped all the time by MEST. It gives him location, consecutive scenery, and persistent structure of matter. This universe has solved a lot of problems for the thetan. When he gets too far down on the tone scale, therefore, he gets on a stuck one-way help flow, with respect to the physical universe. The thetan doesn't help the universe. You could run him on, "How could you help the physical universe?", and he would feel better about it.

Degraded beings come to the conclusion, because of the above situation, that the trouble with this universe is that it has free beings in it. They feel that the universe is too good for free beings, so every now and then, someone decides to make it evil. If a thetan is that degraded, what he sees as wrong with the physical universe is that it has free beings in it, so he tries to make them unfree.

The origin of the physical universe in the first place is probably a collision of home universes. The problem of why everybody stays in a single present time was one of the more fantastic problems. The "why" is a response to a vibration. There is one underlying vibration that the universe, your bank, and you are vibrating at. The only variation in that vibration relates to the progression of time. Therefore, you can move someone on the time track. One overwhelmed others with vibration, a very minute vibration the size of the vibration of a light particle.

The time track is formed by an involuntary intention. In studying the power of an operating thetan, LRH has had pauses in thinking, although intellectually such power is conceivable. Recently, LRH has been exploring the actual potentialities of an OT. The problem of an OT may be analogous to the problem that one encounters if one tries to pick up the cellophane wrapper from a pack of cigarettes, without denting it at all. You could only do this if you could estimate or measure the exact force necessary to pick it up without denting it. This is probably the basic problem of an OT, and it may give him his time track.

The power of a thetan is such that if he were to pick up a steel cylinder capable of resisting a pressure of several thousand pounds per square inch, it would be like you with the cellophane wrapper. The problem is -- how to touch something without crushing it. The thetan is "being careful" in handling MEST. He seeks another method of handling. He feels that he is quite destructive. People who have lost their OT abilities and strength will try, and did try on the time track, to convince free thetans that they were dangerous. People who haven't that level of action would believe that a free thetan was destructive and would trap him with the idea by causing him to use a new trick: doing things by intention, instead of directly. We have always thought of intention as primary, but it is secondary. The postulate, and action through postulates, is secondary to action through energy. You should be able to do both, but it is more natural for a thetan to just pick something up, than to pick it up by an intention or postulate that it be up. It is a great downgrade. Intention is unnatural. It would be natural to just move things. However, this is hard to do if the thetan is afraid that he will destroy the thing in the process. Instead, he develops the safer method of operation by intention alone. He can do this, but it enforces a great restraint on him. It is like putting yourself on a terrific withhold of self.

The thetan trains intention to become involuntary. It is not imaginary. It is like involuntary nerves or muscles that work automatically. MEST is fragile. Recently, in New York or Melbourne, when they started running the goal "to forget" in a co-audit, the E-meter got fused. The PC melted the lines. Some involuntary intention was triggered in him, and "Zap!"

Unless you understand this as too great power, within the ethical limits of the individual, you won't understand the problems of an OT. A thetan is stronger than the fragility with which he is surrounded, and he compensates by reducing his power. This was the wrong solution. He developed an automatic action. E.g. the phone rings. He doesn't touch it. It springs into the air, and he talks. The postulate does things without his having to intend them. There is "no difference between an involuntary intention to act and an involuntary intention to duplicate and an involuntary intention to create, and that's where the time track comes from." This is an hypothesis to account for the time track.

Then someone gives the thetan things for the automatic machinery to mock up which would be bad for the thetan. Or someone jams the machinery and makes the thetan fight his own automatic intention. The next thing you know, he has a messed-up time track. He goes solid. He picks up a meat body. The withhold begins with the steel cellophane.

A rational solution would have been not to make everything so damned fragile. Withholding all the time has all sorts of ill effects, including putting engrams on your track.

These matters have a lot to do with scientology organizations. Seeing the character of an OT, we see that these matters could be upsetting in various directions. We have some responsibilities to start things out right, if we are going to make OT's.

Early on, conceiving that free thetans were very dangerous and should be shot down, people like the Helatrobites started laying in implants and weakening people, working with great industry. Before

these implants, planets were suddenly surrounded with radioactive cloud masses from the center of the galaxy. Waves of black and grey clouds would sweep over the planet, engulfing it in radioactivity. The dark horse nebula in Orion is one huge radioactive cloud like this. This could go on for a million years. Universes have lines of force -- vectors, like spokes -- which were used by the Helatrobus group, to move Magellanic clouds. They just set them loose. No one found out that it was being done by someone. It was all explained as a natural phenomenon. Because of these theories, no one thought to look for anyone doing it.

At least a hundred years after a system had been engulfed, Helatrobus would send capturing troops in ships with little orange-colored electronic bombs that would talk. Speech was frozen into electronic capsules. The clouds would talk, "Hark! Hark! Look out!", etc. It sounded like a fun house. Its unbelievability made detection of its origin all but impossible. It confused the thetans all to Hell. For some reason, the symbol of airplanes goes through this. This symbol goes earlier, to implants at 80 trillion years ago, where aircraft symbolized needing a machine to get you off a planet.

So for some years, after years of radioactivity, the clouds were there with speech in them, containing contradictory commands, like "come here -- can't come", "go -- mustn't go". It was doubletalk. The Helatrobites put traction beams on thetans. Eventually, after many incidents of resisting it, the thetan got sucked up into small capsules via bubbles and thence into spaceships. "All of this assaulted his credulity. He couldn't understand what was going on." This had never happened before.

Then, in one to six months, the Helatrobites would get him into an "implant area, fix him on a post, wobbled him around, ran him through an implant of goals on a little mono-wheel pole trap with the effigy of a body on it." He had no body at that time. Eventually he would get home. Then he would get picked up again and put through more series of implants. Probably the Helatrobites Knew who had been implanted already, because we find implants in pairs of two and four, never three or one. Once this started, the planet would be in turmoil and revolt, and things got very insane. The heaven implants, then, were preceded by tremendous periods of unrest, with radioactive clouds, orange bombs, warfare, wild anarchy, etc. It was chaos -- rather like twentieth century earth. It was Hitler-like stuff. It got more and more crazy and out of control. They were very worried thetans.

Before the clouds came, there would be occasional theta-trapping, etc., but things were generally pretty peaceful. It was only when the free thetans were threatened that they became restive and ungovernable. Free thetans in themselves are easy to put up with. In PI, radioactive fallout is a key restimulator of this whole scene. But how does a partly-freed thetan feel, when he sees the old situation seeming to repeat itself, with all the symbols from the track? It makes him mad at fallout, government, wars, etc.

Earth is in for a period of chaos, which scientology can render less extreme than it would otherwise be. But we can't entirely eliminate the chaos, since some earlier chaos will be restimulated. But the planet is doomed if we don't operate. LRH's attention is, therefore, on organizational concerns. How do we move through such a period? The scientology organization is set up to handle this period of chaos.

As long as thetans have rage in their hearts about the situation, their power is curtailed. This is a safety factor. If we just let chaos happen, we will slow our forward progress. Sooner or later, there will be the rest of the galaxy to deal with. Earth has already blasted off into meat-body space opera, which may not be appreciated by someone out there. Earth people get hysterical when they think that there is an invasion from space, so it represents a real threat, not something people think is unreal or impossible. Orson Wells' radio broadcast of The War of the Worlds resulted, in Ecuador, in the radio station that broadcast it being torn down by enraged Ecuadorians. They knew about space opera, even though they didn't have science fiction to educate them.

With things as they are, several factors confront us. If we handle things as they are, we may be able to have things as we would like to have them.

6305C25 SHSpec-269 Handling ARC Breaks

[Some of the data in this tape is contained in HCOB 27May63 " ... Cause of ARC Breaks".]

LRH has discovered the common denominator to all ARC breaks: by-passed charge. An ARC break is defined as "the PC's transfer of attention from the bank to the auditor and a dramatization of the bank directed at the auditor." Charge that has been restimulated in session may provide a background booster for a session upset. When you drag the PC's attention to the auditor, the charge that has been deliberately restimulated in the session doesn't get as-ised, and the PC ARC breaks. Thus, something that, outside the session, could not cause an ARC break, may and will cause an ARC break if it happens in session. The ARC break is not caused by a social faux pas. It is caused by the sudden shift of attention, the unleashing of charge that was held back by the fact that the PC's attention was on it. As long as the PC has his attention on the bank, he is cause over its charge. "The moment his attention is flicked off of it he is ... the effect of that charge ... and the PC then dramatizes [it]."

Any tone level or know-to-mystery scale level that is higher than the chronic tone of the PC, being higher than the PC, is cause over the PC and is therefore dramatized. It should be noted that apathy is a high tone for a PC. The tone level contained in the incident is what the PC, unintentionally, dramatizes. He could dramatize anything, e.g. boredom, effort (e.g. breaking a chair), or a manic. And the auditor is a good target. The PC himself is helpless to restrain himself from dramatizing. He will be surprised at himself, amazed to react that way, etc.

An ARC break comes about whenever charge is bypassed that then puts the PC at its effect point. The PC dramatizes the charge that has been bypassed. [This charge is unknown to him and can therefore affect him adversely.] The remedy is to locate and indicate the exact bypassed charge, at which point the ARC break ceases. That is the mechanics of it. You don't have to go into a "do" and run the ARC break and run all engrams connected with it, etc. No. You only have to indicate bypassed charge. The remedy is not continuous auditing.

You know now how to turn off someone's anger by saying that someone missed his withholds. That often works, but when it doesn't, it is because you indicated the wrong bypassed charge. You could assess a number of possibilities, e.g. "missed GPM", "missed goal", "missed RI". He will stop being ARC broken when you get the right one. In session, only a few charges can be missed: goals, RI's. engrams, refutation of reality, rejection of affinity, more basic incident, failure to acknowledge. That pretty well covers it.

These things occur in life also. "Rage is an automaticity... in such a delicate balance that almost anything can make it slip." A neurosis is actually hard to maintain. That explains the simple effectiveness of correctly locating and indicating bypassed charge. The psychiatrist's failure comes about from two sources:

1. Lack of technology.

2. An interest in insanity's being very hard to solve.

ARC breaks are not hard to handle if you know the cause and handling of them. Don't back off or fear them. Just develop the skill to find and indicate the right BPC, or you will get loses in auditing and eventually give up. "Temporary or permanent conditions of misemotional stress are something that you have to face up to as an auditor, ... 0r just get out of the auditing chair. [So] I want you to get confidence that ... you can find the BPC, ... and then, by indicating it to the PC, realize the tool that is in your power!" That a PC ARC breaks is no guarantee that the PC is in poor case shape or difficult to get gains on. Just indicating the correct BPC turns off the ARC break.

You may find that the charge was bypassed two sessions ago, or the ARC break doesn't get handled because you can't find what it was until somewhat later. Then, when you indicate it, the PC calms down. But "you shouldn't let an ARC break last more than two or three minutes," because ARC breaks multiply on a steep curve.

Governments these days are run by riot, because they are so scared of ARC breaks. England's matter-of-fact handling of the "ban the bomb" movement is an exception to this rule, like an auditor who doesn't get thrown by or governed by ARC breaks. Governments have also been run by fear of assassination. This is just a dramatization of the Helatrobus implants. You, as an auditor, could be governed by ARC breaks if you can't handle them. "You are never governed by that which you can handle with ease." So learn to handle ARC breaks until ARC breaks become just another phenomenon, like a runny nose. "Your attitude on ... ARC breaks must never be one whereby you are driven by the ARC break, because you will be driven, then, into not getting the items clean, ... into taking the PC's

orders, ... [which] are the direct result of dramatizations. The orders are the significance contained in what you just put him at the effect of:" the BPC.

Don't, for instance as a registrar, get reasonable in the face of dramatization. Hunt and peck around for bypassed charge. The rage is an automaticity. Psychosis is very tenuous and easy to break.

Number of ARC breaks is not correlated with the success of auditing. ARC breaks multiply as the square of time. The greater the facility with which you handle ARC breaks, the less you are governed by them.

PC's who are continually ARC broken in session can be run on the three-way ARC break process. This process, however, is not for use every time the PC ARC breaks. For instance, for an auditor messed up with ARC breaky PCs, you could run the following:

"In auditing, what attitude has been refused?"

"In auditing, what reality has been rejected?"

"In auditing, what communication has not been acknowledged?"

This works better than mid-ruds. It is the successor to ARC break straightwire, which, in 1958, could go into engrams and even implants. It works, because what it does is directly to locate and indicate BPC.

If you let the ARC broken PC control you, you will be taking his orders, because he is dramatizing not only the emotion but also the significance contained in the BPC. This is dangerous to the PC. So you should:

1. Learn to handle ARC breaks.

2. Be good enough as an auditor never to bypass charge.

You can bypass charge by not finding any. You press on with the session in the teeth of a PC who is dramatizing apathy. Then the PC gives you a wrong goal and you take it, thereby bypassing more charge. "The harder you are driven [by ARC breaks] into doing a bad job, the more charge you bypass." It won't run well.

Bypassed charge is always prior to the charge on what you are doing. So the ARC break is a blessing in disguise, since it tells you that there is more charge, which you have bypassed. It is more accurate than the meter, in this case. ARC breaks are cumulative in their effects. You do still have to peel enough charge from later incidents to get to the earlier ones, but the PC won't ARC break if you indicate to the PC, as an R-factor, what you are doing. If you tell the PC that there is a basic on the chain, he won't ARC break, even if you don't run the basic, because you have indicated the earlier charge. Indicating that there is earlier charge also makes it possible for the PC to run the later stuff.

The PC can ARC break in the rudiments because he has out-ruds in the incident. That is just BPC, and you can indicate it. So when you chicken out of cleaning an Rl because the PC is protesty and ARC broken, you have set yourself up for more ARC breaks on subsequent items. Don't buy an RI that doesn't rocket read a full dial. If it won't, there is BPC to clean up.

Bypass the charge? ... Keep it a secret? ... You will get an ARC break. Don't bypass charge!

6305C29 SHSpec-270 Programming Cases [Part 1]

The subject of programming cases is almost as old as the discovery of the engram. "Programming is the overall action taken to resolve the case, regulated by the state of the case and the necessary steps." If a guy stubs his toe and you decide to give him an assist, that is programming. The assist is auditing. The two are not the same.

These are the things to be adjudicated in programming:

1. Time. How much is available?

2. What will the case accept, stand for, or tolerate as auditing?

3. What will the case progress on as auditing?

4. Order of actions. This comes back to time, (1).

5. When you will start auditing.

You can't leave out any of these adjudications.

You need a good grip on programming before you can actually make clears, even if you have a technique that works on everybody. Because programming is easy to do, LRH has never put it out as itself, so it has been missed as a factor in getting all cases to run well. Programming is easy, unless you don't do it.

Programming is based on some fundamental principles. It is based on:

1. The behavior of the time track.

2. The abilities and disabilities of the PC, related to the time track.

The time track is the world's longest movie, in 3D. Included in the movie are things which apparently destroy some of the movie. So between, say, reel 16 and reel 80, everything is missing. With improper programming, you will never find that section. And you can audit reel 80 and reel 16 and everything beyond reel 80, and though the PC gets lots of auditing, nothing happens to his case, because what is wrong with him is what is between reel 16 and reel 80.

This film has a total effect on the PC. He lives it as you run it. You can only be effective if you run the parts that are personal to the PC. That is running the reality of the PC. There are things you can run that are unreal to him, but that nevertheless affect him, e.g. the Helatrobus implant. But don't exceed the PC's reality by too much. The program is not monitored by what the PC has a reality on before you audit him. It is monitored by what the PC can obtain reality on during auditing. After all, you want to increase his reality. Don't omit PC change and volition in your calculations. And remember: his reality might exceed yours! If you don't try to increase the PC's reality, you neglect his capacity to change. It does the PC no good to audit him no farther than where he is at. Yesterday's mental sciences made this mistake continually. They treated patients only from and on the viewpoint of their own reality, then denied the patient's capacity to change.

Programming is based 100% on the following:

1. The capability of the auditor.

2. The capability of the PC to receive auditing.

3. The amount of time available.

4. The maximum result to be obtained, given these limits, in terms of increase of A, R, C.

The increase in affinity can be seen in the person's change in position on the know-to-mystery scale, of which the tone scale is the middle guts. A person has no personal reality, except for a possible intellectual reality, on those tones that lie above his position on this scale. He only has reality on those tones that lie below his chronic tone. His chronic tone can be the tone of the body plus thetan or a chronic tone as a thetan. The body plus thetan tone can be considerably higher than his tone as a thetan. The chronic tone of the body plus thetan combination can be at 4.0, while the level of the thetan is at "unconscious". "Any level above the chronic tone is susceptible [of] being dramatized.... Dramatization is a thetan -- or thetan plus body -- performing evolutions not under the thetan -- or thetan plus body's -- control: non-volitional actions." Old mental studies fixated on these and believed that there is nothing else, but there are volitional actions. "They lie below the chronic tone of the individual on the tone scale."

There are two chronic tones: that of the thetan and that of the thetan plus body combination. The body plus thetan can dramatize any tone above the chronic tone, but most likely it will be the half tone above the chronic tone.

The above is A, of ARC. Therefore, increasing affinity is making the PC less susceptible to dramatization, and gives the PC reality on more tones that are now below him. You have added levels on which he has reality and subtracted levels which he may dramatize. Previously, as a certain tone was above him, he was the effect of it. Now, being above that tone, he has reality on it and he is no longer the effect of it.

The body plus thetan tone is an apparent tone, and it never goes above 4.0. So you could have a PC flying along at 4.0, enthusiastic, and the next day you will get the thetan alone, and he drops from 4.0 to zilch. He has come up to degradation as a thetan! He feels awful for no apparent reason, because you are now seeing the thetan, who has come up above unconsciousness to degradation as a thetan for the first time. This is case gain, in terms of affinity. To go somewhere by Route One, you have to get the thetan's chronic tone level upscale enough to do it. Reality

You can measure a person's reality by measuring significance, since reality is matter, energy, space, time, and significance, the five parts of a universe. Psychological testing measures reality on significances. You can test reality by solution of problems. If a person's conversation is full of "can't understand" and he gets very reasonable about unreasonable things and he can assume no viewpoint but his own?, while he doesn't really have one, his reality level is low. He may demonstrate this by the fact that, as the PC comes to others' viewpoints, he begins to recognize his own overts and to suffer on that account. That is a big reality increase and occurs because understanding more, and being more able to take other viewpoints, the PC becomes more responsible. He cognites. "Cognition is actually the process of a changing reality of significance." It is necessary to case gain. Cognition = more understanding = case gain.

A PC saying that the session was wonderful has not necessarily had any case gain. He may have been beaten into propitiation. But if he says, "You know ... My Mom must have had quite a hard time!." That is a cognition. If the PC is able to assume a new viewpoint (in this case, that of his mother), he has had case gain. Getting the PC's goals and gains at the end of the session is a little psychometric test, a measure of case gain. Communication

There is obvious gain when the PC is more willing to talk to people, but his increased perception of walls, etc., isn't really changed reality so much as it is increased communication. Reach and withdraw, willingness to receive, etc., is what is involved, here. Even if the case is delusory and sees the room as full of polar bears, it would be case gain at the end of the session if he could see the polar bears better. If you are operating from the platform of the reality that the room is not full of polar bears and that you must therefore get rid of the polar bears, you will have dropped the PC's communication. This was one of Freud's errors. "He can't communicate with you, but he can communicate with these polar bears. If he could communicate with the polar bears well enough, he wouldn't have to communicate with them, and they would depart. That's the way to get rid of polar bears!"
Psychiatrists try to convince the patient that he doesn't have any bugs crawling on him. This is the same as saying, "There must only be this one reality, and unless we can hold the status quo of this reality, we have lost." This "has been the criterion in all mental activities for the many trillenia, and an auditor may be holding onto it with both fists and not realize it." This consideration is that our only gain would be from the platform of where we are. If we could continue the alteration to making things more like they are here and now, we we would get case gain. This consideration is a way to clobber people by holding them on the time track.

These are the technical data underlying programming. Auditing is done by:

1. Unburdening basics.

2. Discovering what basics there are.

3. Disentangling them so as to erase basics.

This includes CCH's. It includes all processing. Discovery of basics end eradication of basics is done by discovering what basics can be found before the basic that disentangles the basic that you are trying to untangle. A basic will almost blow by inspection, unless there is a more basic one holding it in.

However, "basic" on a chain contains elements that are not basic to the basic. Say you have the basic on the chain of some somatic. It is basic on the chain you are running, but it has something in it that comes from a more basic chain on another subject. When this happens, you can slip the basic out from under the earlier basics by finding the basics of remaining elements in the basic of the original chain. Frequently this can be done by dating. By the time you are through, you have practically cleared somebody. If you can keep track of what you are doing, you will be very successful. If not, the whole track collapses, and the PC goes under.

The first action you should undertake on a case is the most advanced action that can be undertaken, in your estimation. Always enter a case more boldly than you think is wise and you will usually be right. If you don't, you will never find the ceiling at which the PC can operate. If you get away with it, you are all set. You have saved time. That is what you are doing with the Helatrobus implants. If the PC can't manage it, pull back.

So all there is to auditing is "unburdening, finding a chain, finding the basic on the chain, and taking apart the basic. I don't care what process you are using." Running a chain back is unburdening it. "It's taking off charge ... so that you can lay your paws on basic." You are after the first GPM, and if the PC can't recall what he had for breakfast this morning, you have to unburden the case. How long should you continue unburdening the case? "Until you can get your hands on an implant; not one second longer. That you run the charge off of, at least one dial-wide disintegrating rocket read per item. If and when you get stuck, you probably have too early an implant, one that is too close to Basic. Remember: you are trying to unburden. Pick up the last incident in the second chain, if you know what it is, and run that one with a fast pass. Or lets use straightwire to give him some locks, or find overts on this. Let's see if we can chase him earlier and find the first. It is all unburdening, you see. Let's run the three-command process for awhile. We are just trying to get our hands on an implant so we can run some charge off of it and find an earlier implant so that we can get to the basic implant.

You have to go later and unburden the basic implant, because you are asking the PC to walk through a wall of fire. Between PT and basic, there is a wall of fire. You can't push the PC through the wall of fire. You have to get him through. To get the PC through it, you have to put some fire out on a gradient. That is done by programming.

6305C30 SHSpec-271 Programming Cases (Part II)

[Some of the data in this tape is contained in HCOB 8Jun63 "The Time Track and Engram Running by Chains -- Bulletin 2: Handling the Time Track". In particular, p.3 of this bulletin contains a Scale of Case States that is relevant to this tape.]

There is a gradient scale of cases. It is not complete. There are interim points that are not shown on this scale. The lowest level on the scale, Level 8, is that of total unconsciousness. The next one up, Level 7, is awareness of own evaluations. This is where the "mental sciences" are at. A psychiatrist listens to someone chatter and becomes aware of his own? evaluation of the person as crazy. What he perceives is his own evaluation of what he perceives, or of what is there to be perceived. "It's an incapability of observation, because it's an observation of own evaluation.... You see it most flagrantly in the fields of arts and aesthetics.... The less that is known of a subject, the more [it] has authority or evaluation as its sole reality or adjudication." This is where most anti-scientology wogs lie. "I had an uncle who said you shouldn't mess with the mind." That uncle is perceiving, not scientology, but his evaluation or another's evaluation of it.

The next level up, Level 6, is dub-in of dub-in. Here, a person has dub-in of his own? nightmares. That is all he sees. It is someone forming his opinion on newspaper articles. Actually, that is dub-in (the reader's) of dub-in (the reporter's) of dub-in (the source's). This level is below, but approaching, unconsciousness, as a thetan manifestation. The body plus thetan can go lower scale than a thetan, whose unconsciousness lies just above this level of dub-in of dub-in. Body plus thetan can apparently stay conscious longer than the thetan can, as far as awareness of being a thetan is concerned. A lot of boil-off occurs above Level 6.

Level 5 is dub-in of the time track. The facsimile does exist, but what the person or PC sees is a dub-in of the facsimile that is there: a second facsimile.

Above this, at Level 4, is non-perception, where the PC gets blackness, invisibility, small rockets, etc. It is a non-visibility. What used to be called the Black V is at this level.

Above this, at Level 3, is spotty, partial-perceptic glimpses of the time track, with only some visio, no sonic or tactile, etc.

Then, at Level 2, there is a totally visible time track with no interruptions. There is no blackness in this track unless the blackness was really there in an incident. A fifty- or sixty-goal clear would be in this condition; he could monitor the time track the way one monitors the physical environment.

Above this, at Level 1, there is no time track. The lowest two levels are gross lower scale harmonics of Level 1.

The above is "a Scale of Perception of the Time Track." It is what makes cases different. Auditing time estimates should be based on PCs' location on this scale. You could probably use the physical universe to test where a PC is on this scale. For instance you could have him look at a wall with a picture on it, close his eyes, and tell you what he gets. The result will be about half a tone or a tone higher than where he really is. E.g. if he can't see it: "What wall?", he is at Level 4, above, though actually he will tend towards Level 5 in running track. There is a tendency to slip one level.

The only levels that are fairly serious are Levels 7 and 8, because it is very hard to get into communication with those cases. But establishing communication at one level moves the person up to the next level, and so on up to the top, ultimately. Don't expect this to be done swiftly and accurately, however.

Most of the cases that you will be dealing with will have invisibility and sporadic track. If you consider the amount of auditing necessary to audit a sporadic track case as one unit of time, invisibility would take two units; dub-in of track would take four units of time, etc. I.e. the time required to get a given auditing result doubles at each level, as you go down the scale. For instance, if it took one hour to audit out one engram on a PC with sporadic track, it would take thirty-two hours to audit out an engram in an unconscious case. Actually, that is optimistic at both ends.

The case result that we are interested in is OT. We already have the fait accompli of clearing, so we are going beyond it. Any effort to get an ultimate result in processing leads to OT. That upgrades the number of hours to OT to, say, 500 hours to OT for the sporadic track case.

Insanity, neurosis, or ability to respond to a communication play no part in that scale of cases, because those conditions are found only at one level of the scale, the "own evaluations" level: Level 7.

Any "objective" test of case state that has a human observer adjudicating pass or fail works out poorly where the observer is, himself, at Case Level 7. Have you ever been flunked on TR-1 by a coach that couldn't coach?

The concepts of "insanity" or "neurosis" are contained as goals in the Helatrobus implants. Therefore, they cannot be used to evaluate state of case. "Wisdom" based on the Helatrobus implants is nuts. Other goals from that implant include, "to die", "to be sick", "to move", "to escape", "to 'get it' " (i.e. to get a sickness, etc.), etc. Almost any one of these goals has been the source of learned treatises dramatizing them, to "explain all of Man's ills", e.g. treatises on "escapism". The History of Man contains references to a few implants. It remains valid, though, and the engrams described in it did exist. They just got collected together during implants.

What causes different people to be at different positions on this scale? It could be the length of time that they have spent in this universe. This implies a universe that accumulated from the successive collisions of home universes with it. The MEST universe picks up different home universes at different points on the track. "Older" thetans are in worse shape. State of case, then, would be monitored by number of overts, different statuses of thetans at the time of entry, etc. The why doesn't need to be known? to solve the situation. How these thetans came to be there in this universe can be stated easily: charge. This is a quantitative matter. You pump charge into a case when the eighteen (prepcheck) buttons go out, i.e. inval, eval, etc. If there were no thought involved, you could probably short-circuit it all. But there is also thought, which includes volition. As the universe pumps charge into a thetan, he pumps it into other thetans and other things. Then he inhibits himself from doing so. The result is overts and withholds. The charge gets encysted as a composite picture of the

number of things done to the being, held in place by the number of things done by the being. This produces X amount of charge on the case that, in the absence of auditing, just keeps on growing. The thetan gets a lot more or a little more in a given lifetime, but it is always additive. That is what makes the universe a trap. If charge didn't keep accumulating, the universe would be therapeutic instead of aberrative. You can have an attitude about the charge, too. The attitude doesn't alter the charge, but it can affect how you feel about it.

In view of the fact that an OT has fantastic power, it is funny that charge would bother him, until we figure out the basic overt of the thetan. "Any overt a thetan commits is also mixed up with the energy a thetan is emitting.... All of his overts have particles connected with [them]. So the only way to really get him is to hit him with particles, [because that is] the path of his overts. So most implants are mainly connected with particle flows of various types."

People, therefore, have different amounts of charge. One person has quantity A of charge; another person has quantity B, etc. The more charge a person has, the more difficult it is to release it. That is why it takes so much longer to get results on the unconscious case. This depends, to a degree, on whether the case condition is chronic (i.e. lasting more than a lifetime) or acute (temporary -- one lifetime or less). E.g. the PC may be spastic now as an acute condition relating to his body. The question is whether he is always going to be that way, no matter what body he picks up (chronic). If a condition is chronic, it will add a lot of time to auditing. You could put a deaf man on a meter and ask him whether he was deaf last lifetime and the one before that. If he was, you have a deaf thetan on your hands, not a deaf body, and it will take time to fix.

Charge is what causes a case to be the way it is. Just because a thetan plus body is low on the state of case scale, the thetan itself is not necessarily low on that scale. Environmental factors can also make someone look downscale when they are not. [LRH relates an anecdote of a time when he audited a girl who was acting very nutty and brought her through in a short space of time.] You have to estimate this to program someone's case. What you are going to program is the person's case, so you have to estimate the case to determine how to get the charge off the case. "A case is programmed in relation to the amount of charge on the case." That is what determines how you are going to take the charge off the case. Since auditing requires the cooperation of the being, you have to estimate his cooperativeness, his ability, etc. This does affect the ease of auditing and the speed of auditing.

Sample program: The case dubs in track. Charge can be run off. We get dial-wide rocket reads on Helatrobus implants. If the PC can run it, run it! It is dicey, because the case can easily go to smithereens. It is better to pull overts on this lifetime and run any stretch of track on which the PC has reality. Be very sure that the case has no withholds from the auditor, especially this-lifetime ones. Muzzle the auditing. Don't force this PC. Run rocket reading implants as long as they run easily. "When things get difficult, fall back swiftly to patching up roughed-up track. Return to an ARC-type process if the going gets too rough on RI's. Tunning RI's is dangerous. That would be a very extreme and daring programming for this case. It is quick, but dicey. The safe way is using straightwire, havingness, withholds, etc. An alternate approach is: if you got a goal, run all the charge off the goal. Never look for earlier goals when you have found one. Don't try pushing the case to get all the charge off of an implant.

Take a case with sporadic track: You can run it pretty hard. You can move around on the track from one GPM to another without messing things up much. This level of case (Level 3) could even stand leaving goals without running them. He may ARC break, but you can do it. The case can be pushed hard.

The invisibility case (Level 4) can be pushed a bit, but not as hard as the sporadic track case.

With the dub-in case (Level 5), you need lots of track repair, O/W running, havingness. You must readily cut and run if implants get rough.

With the dub-in of dub-in case, don't let him near implants. This isn't a common case (Level 6). Use straightwire and ARC break processes. Run the case lightly for wins every session. You are running the case too steep if you are not getting session wins. Unless this case is aware of having regular wins in session, the case's reality is not coming up.

The aware of own evaluations case (Level 7) is suited only for havingness and CCH's -- room processes, contacting PT processes. This case can't detect an overt as such. He has no responsibility. He will tell things to you, but not as overts. To get daring with this case, run straightwire!

With the unconscious case (Level 8), establish communication. Animal processing is the same sort of thing: establish comm; get the animal to reach.

Always be a little optimistic in estimating where someone is on the scale. Then program to get as much charge off as you can, with the PC winning. How much charge is being gotten off is measured by the TA and needle action. Charge is important because "it's what restimulates when he tries to outflow and ... prevents his outflow.... It's what educates him not to reach." In getting off charge, processing lets him reach and do.

Total self-determinism is only possible at the highest level given above (Level 1). There there are no automaticities, no time track, no charge on the case. The result is unlimited reach.

6306C11 SHSpec-272 Engram Chain Running

"I finally found out why you can't run engrams.... I found out you've been trying to run engrams and you never run engrams. You run chains of engrams.... This is the way I ran engrams in 1949." This got crossed up with repetitive processing. "Flatten the process" became "Flatten the engram", when it should have been "Flatten the chain." You flatten the chain by getting the basic. Engrams never exist all by themselves. There is always a chain.

An engram is only part of a chain of similar incidents, which, in turn, is part of a time track. You are essentially running a time track. You never handle an engram all by itself, because it is too closely related to the rest of the track to be treated that way.

If you are a skilled auditor, you can quickly pick up BPC when the PC ARC breaks, indicate it, and have the ARC break disappear. Until you can do this, you will have rough sessions. In engram running, the BPC is always the earlier incident on the engram chain.

Charge is able to make the PC feel worse or better, depending on whether it gets restimulated and encysted or blows. You can let the PC learn more by entering a lot of engrams and not finding basic. The result is that the PC knows more but feels worse, because you haven't erased basic on the chain. Running a chain of engrams is not the same as finding out about a lot of incidents.

Every time you run an engram, you open up a valve into the next earlier engram, letting its charge get restimulated and partially leak into the one you are running. If you continue to run the later engram, it gets sticky, TA ceases, and it gets solid and will eventually collapse on the PC. The BPC from the earlier engram causes the PC to ARC break. Moving back to the earlier one blows some of the charge. Charge always flows later, from its source, not earlier. We can only find the earlier engram because the later one was run. As we go back on the chain, each incident seems to be the earliest incident, when it is actually just the earliest available incident.

If two engrams or any two pictures collapse, the cause is BPC, and the PC will, very shortly, ARC break. The converse is also true: if the PC has BPC and is ARC breaky, you have two pictures collapsed. Out-of-valenceness -- "that's me over there" -- is also a problem of BPC. If an earlier engram is tapped, it will bleed charge into the one you are running; the somatic will strengthen. But this phenomenon won't cause out-of-valenceness. An out-of-valenceness is caused by an earlier portion of the same engram that you are working on, that hasn't been seen. It is assisted by charge bleeding from an earlier incident. You could even run a dub-in case and get him earlier than the dub-in. However, it is safer to use straightwire or MEST processes.

Suppose you are running an engram where the PC hit his head and, when the PC goes through the incident, the part where he actually hits his head gets skipped. This indicates that the engram is part of a chain of "hit head". So we work our way back through earlier incidents. As he gets back to basic, he gets full perceptics. When we get to basic, we run it over and over, and his somatic blows. If we came back up through the chain, you could send the PC through each engram on the chain and now he would get the somatic each time.

The only way to flatten an engram is to flatten a chain of engrams. Chains of overts follow the same principle, as was done in sec checking. [This involved the withhold system, used in prepchecking, old style. See HCOB 1Mar62 "Prepchecking (A Class II Skill)" and pp. 208-209, above.] These also go much earlier than this life. Chains of overts include overt engrams. It doesn't matter which you run, because the overt-motivator sequence is an installed mechanism. It is very old. It is not as deeply laid in as obsessive create, but it is equally implanted and engramic. Either overt chains or motivator chains can be run. They rarely entwine. Sometimes the PC will jump chains from motivator to overt. When that happens, you should follow it down to the basic overt, but you should then also pick up and complete the motivator chain.

Running engrams is very simple. Here is how LRH would do it: Get a crude date, e.g. 89 trillion years ago. Get the PC to return to this incident. Ask him what he is looking at. Ask, "How long is this incident?" Get the duration by meter. Get the PC to move on through the incident to the end. There will be a long pause. The PC says, "I did." Ask him what it is all about. The PC tells you. Ask for an earlier beginning. Get when it was. Send the PC to the earlier beginning, then through the incident. The PC goes through the incident and tells you about it. PC has a somatic. LRH dates, with the meter, an earlier incident with the same somatic. He sends the PC through that incident. You go earlier; date it, etc. If you don't complete the chain in one session and the PC doesn't get the picture, run a few commands of, "Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you were unwilling to duplicate?" Run this to a clean needle. The picture will now be on. Don't harass the PC to find all the unknowns in the incident. It is not necessary to do this. When you have had a rough session, try "Since (the day before that session occurred), what have you been unwilling/willing to duplicate?" Alternate these commands.

If the PC can't run engrams, it is because he is at the wrong place on the scale of case levels to be able to confront it. Even a dub-in case can run earlier than the dub-in, but it is dangerous.

Engram running is important, because you won't make OT's without it. All the fancy stuff was developed to handle cases that were too heavily charged to run real track. The least common denominator of the case scale is no-duplicate, which is right in the middle of the communication formula. "The swan song of this universe [is] that that which you are unwilling to duplicate tends to go on automatic." An ARC break is an unwillingness to duplicate. If you show students a bad TVD, they will flub the first five minutes of their next session, because they were unwilling to duplicate the bad TVD and therefore it went on automatic in their next session. This is what happens when you show a bad example. You could clean up earlier bad auditing by running, "Since (a few days before the bad auditing), what have you been unwilling/willing to duplicate?" It will clean up.

"Resistance to duplication can be caved in." One can become what one resists or the effect of what one resists. "A person's ability to duplicate is what determines [his] ability to run engrams, because the engram itself is a duplication of the actual event." The PC duplicates the event, but if the picture he is running is an altered copy of the original, it is dub-in. All engrams have some dub-in in them and develop new material. You can get some surprising changes. One is particularly unwilling to duplicate dangerous things. So one then gets lots of them.

The person who is totally unaware has tried to whip the mechanism of obsessively duplicating everything. The trouble with this strategy is that his duplication goes on total automatic. Some people have very heavy engrams indeed, over which they have no control. These engrams are very inaccurate. They stub their toe and have a picture of being run over by a truck. That is all they run, if anything. Since there are very incredible things on the track anyway, such as the Helatrobus implants, it would be very inaccurate and dangerous to determine whether or not a PC can run engrams by looking for factualness. For instance, basic on prenatals is an incident from the Helatrobus implant, in which the thetan, on a pole, is tumbled through a series of tubes, all curled up.

One way to see if a guy can run engrams is to try him out. If it is no go, you can get out the ARC triangle in a hurry. A better test is simple duplication. For instance, you can call off a series of numbers: "3, 6, 2, 9, 7" to a person and ask him what you said. If the PC didn't duplicate you, you can forget about running engrams. Or you can go by the Chart of Attitudes, or any test of duplication. But you shouldn't go by the material he runs.

You can use an ARC process to improve someone's reality. All sorts of other processes will also do this. The duplication process [See p. 414, below] also works well. CCH's are effective, when rightly

used to show the PC that it is safe to duplicate. If the case cannot run engrams, and if you are running them correctly, engram running is probably too steep a gradient for the PC.

The reason these data on engrams is important is that the Helatrobus implants are a long chain of engrams, each one with a basic, and they tend to bunch the whole track. On some cases, you can only run six GPM's before the rocket read shuts off, and at this point, you have to start running engrams.

When do you go earlier? Whenever the PC recognizes that there is something earlier, however he states it. He may say so directly or he may say something that shows that he is looking for something earlier. If the PC sees something earlier, you go earlier. Never ignore this. If you ignore the indication that an earlier incident is available, the one you are running will get harder to run. Besides, you risk an ARC break.

Charge is registered on the E-meter by needle and TA motion. You must get TA action, or you are just restimulating the case without blowing anything.

There is no absolute basic on engram chains. When you get to basic on a chain, there may be portions of it that, themselves, have earlier basics. Go ahead and run those out, too. There is only one basic basic. It contains those impulses which eventually became aberration.

There are two things you can do with dating:

1. Relieve charge.

2. Identify something.

If you do a total dating, it goes down to the second. You get the exact number of years, plus days, minutes, seconds ago. Get the date accurately, and the incident gets placed right where it should be on the track, thus relieving charge. Dating also contains identification. You can use rough dates for this purpose, e.g. 89 billion or 450 million, as long as you don't have a bunch of incidents close together in a row.

"Blocking out" an incident has these steps:

1. Get an approximate date.

2. Move the time track to that date.

3. Ask the PC what is there. Accept whatever he gives you in every case.

4. Find its duration fairly accurately. If it is "days", get the number.

5. Move the PC through it, not "to the end."

6. Then establish what was there.

7. Move the PC to the beginning and send him through again.

Don't vary the routine and don't Q and A with the PC's unknownness. If the PC keeps saying, "I'm stuck," forget about holders and denyers. He has just gotten in over his head. Bail him out and revert to lighter processes.

Always suspect that there is something a bit earlier. Ask for it. "Blocking it out" is done by going through it once. After that, the PC may be expected to tell you if there is something earlier. Generally, run the PC through the incident twice. Once through is plenty if it is gummy. Having to go through an incident more than twice is suspect. Don't try to keep getting more out of it. It is OK to keep running an incident, as long as we are getting motion on the meter, but don't strain to get more perceptics out of the incident. More will turn up as you go earlier. You can keep running an engram as long as the PC is interested in it and finding out more, but the instant he says there may be something earlier, go earlier, or you will stick him in the later incident. If you don't go for earlier incidents, you blunt the PC's ability to go earlier and stick him where he is. But don't force him earlier. If he is starting to bounce up to PT, let him, and run ARC processes.

Basic isn't generally the more powerful incident. It is just the first incident. It seems so unimportant to the PC, yet later incidents built up on it, bigger and bigger. Basic is the shorter, lighter incident.

Theoretically, you could run back to basic-basic. If you found and erased this, the PC would then have no pictures and no track.

If a PC seems to be trying to escape running engrams by going earlier, he is over his head and needs more preparation. If you get the PC fully interiorized into the engram, say by putting his attention on a large object in the incident, he will get it all fully charged up, in 3D. This is not what you want. You will never get him out of the universe that you are packing around him.

6306C12 SHSpec-273 ARC Straightwire

ARC straightwire is the oldest broad-nature repetitive process. It is possibly the first repetitive process. The ARC triangle was originated in July, 1950 in Elizabeth, N.J. It was expanded in September or November of 1950 at the Hubbard Dianetic Research Foundation in Los Angeles. It was an important tool for understanding the mind. It is best described in Notes on the Lectures [See pp. 9-16].

The ARC triangle is the most fundamental statement of significance, although it also embraces MEST. When a prime postulate impinges on MEST, it becomes involved with ARC. The MEST can be in the physical universe or in the time track.

Affinity is so much itself and so relative that we get into difficulties trying to interpret it in an auditing command. "Affinity embraces everything from the know-to-mystery scale." It is "feeling for", or "feeling with", or lack of those. It has connotations of "feeling about". It is not enough to say "emotional response". Sympathy and empathy come into it. It is a very broad and new concept. If you will substitute the know-to-mystery scale for "affinity", and use the words "emotion" and "misemotion", PCs will respond to it. The emotions scale, being just a part of the know-to-mystery scale, is included in "affinity". The word "affinity" is really inadequate to embrace the whole concept, because the concept has not been expressed in any language. How many words can be used in a command to express the concept of affinity? Lots! Everything on the know-to-mystery scale can be used, including the whole tone scale. We find the PC chronically situated at one of these levels, and that is the level to which he will respond in processing.

"Reality" could pertain to significance alone, as in "His reality is poor," or to actual chunks of matter. Reality is normally considered to consist of considerations about something or someone, on up to the more solid concepts of matter, energy, space, and time. In clearing this word, you will have less trouble than in clearing "affinity", unless the PC is really in "thought". But if you bad to vary it, you would have a harder task on your hands. You would have to specify which part of MEST you meant, or which consideration.

Communication is anything that fits under the communication formula. It involves cause, effect, duplication, etc. In clearing "communication", you could specify which type or kind you meant. You could use various parts of the communication formula in the third ("C") command of ARC straightwire.

Clearing commands doesn't just mean, "Can the PC define the word?" It is a matter of substituting words in the command so that the PC's level of reality is met by the command. The question we should ask is, "which word communicates to the PC what we are trying to communicate to him?"

A, R, and C make understanding, when combined. This was worked out mathematically in the fall of 1950. They actually compute mathematically. When the PC cognites, he has reached a point of ARC, expressed as a new understanding. You won't get a cognition if you omit one of the legs of the ARC triangle. If you run only R and C and not A, you don't get cogs. If you wish to raise any one point that is low, you can and should work on the other two points. That is a terribly valuable datum that must be observed in any ARC process. Any point that is overrun or more difficult will give you trouble, unless you preserve the balance amongst the three. No one leg will ever flatten by itself. It is the three that you are trying to flatten. So flatten all three.

In flattening a process, you can run it to:

1. Three equal comm lags.

2. A cognition. Leave the process right there! Don't ever overrun a cog. For instance, don't put in the last mid-rud if the PC cognites on the next-to-last. The ARC processes unflatten easily, so if you go past a cognition, the process will be unflat.

3. TA motion runs out. For ARC processes, this is the least reliable and the most desirable. You can run by blowdown, but you can't depend on

TA motion to run out at the same time on each leg. The way to flatten one leg is to give equal time to the other legs, not to beat the slow one to death.

The first thing that ARC straightwire was found to do was to break neurosis. If it is going to have that effect, it will work fairly fast. The only difficult cases on the 1950 positive process are the ones who ground down to a finite number of answers and gave those over and over without ever cogniting. The reason for this is that their positive ARC moments are quite few, and they run out quickly. They are pleasure moments and won't flatten. You have to run the reverse side of it.

Around 1958, LRH started running a lot of reach and withdraw. The way I.Q. was being raised was to run, "What could you withhold?" on someone, a funny phenomenon. Or you could plunge people into an engram and run it half way. That will also raise I.Q. scores, as a person who needs mass to think gets more mass to think with. The upsets you run into on a case are not the case's pleasure moments. They are times of separation and individuation. The most fundamental forms of ARC breaks are:

1. Times when the PC was knocked away from being part of things.

2. Times when the PC was forced to part of things that he wanted nothing to do with.

His power of choice to connect or disconnect was overthrown. This gives an ARC break. He was there but didn't want to be there, or he wanted to be there but couldn't be there. An implant is the biggest kind of ARC break. You can run, "Recall an ARC break" on someone, and it will run him into implants, into times when he was held in a place where he didn't want to be and told things that he didn't want to hear, a fundamental overthrow of his power of choice.

The ARC straightwire processes were revised to saw out pieces of implants, in order to help handle the Helatrobus implants. LRH discovered that the big mid-ruds [See HCOB 8Mar63 "Use of the Big Middle Rudiments] or the 18-button prepcheck mush an engram. They mess it up, spoiling the record. The engram frays around the edges. It turns into pure energy, without giving the PC any memory of what happened in the incident. This showed that. if you were going to use big mid ruds and big prepchecks on PC's stuck in engrams, you weren't going to unstick them. You need a steam shovel, not a hand shovel. Thus the negative ARC processes were invented. Negative ARC processes do handle implants.

LRH also discovered that a PC is operating on entanglements with the physical universe. It is one thing to bail him out of this and another thing to get him to look at his considerations about being entangled. It's not what happens to a person that is important; it is his considerations about it that count. People, especially sociologists, get caught up in the idea that the environment determines people's states of mind. This is the philosophy on which foreign aid is based. Power of choice is senior to this by miles. It has to do intimately with A, R, and C. Enforced R, or A, or C, will wreck the triangle. But given the same environment and predicament, two people can have quite different reactions. The goodness or badness of the surroundings doesn't necessarily reflect in the happiness or unhappiness of the inhabitants. This messes up social planning because the happiness of the individual involves his preferences and his considerations about his surroundings -- whether or not he has ARC for them. The PC has had all these preferences and considerations present with regard to all his circumstances all up and down the track. That is an adequate statement of power of choice.

This raises the question of whether there is such a thing as an ideal state or condition. In scientology, the possibility of such a state exists as it has never existed before in the universe. An ideal state is a state that someone wanted to be in, over which he had full power of choice.

The attainment of happiness for a PC is parallel to attaining clear. The two factors are:

1. The environmental conditions of the PC.

2. The PC's A, R, and C with regard to the matter, energy, space, time, and postulates of his condition. This is a channel that has remained fundamentally unknown to this universe.

These are born out of an interplay between the PC's postulates and the experiences he has netted. We are still on an interactive basis between postulates and conditions of experience. The person's power of choice is his affinity, reality, and communication with regard to a set of circumstances, existences, or environments. We should give this fact more attention in processing.

We needed a process that could easily be ground out by the hour by any old auditor, but which would give fantastic results. ARC straightwire approaches this ideal as a process, though it does require some skill, and it can be done very wrong. ARC straightwire does give fantastic results, although unfortunately it does not go the whole route, because it doesn't actually handle the conditions of existence. It only handles a PC's attitudes, reality, and power of communication, relative to these conditions. But it handles enough to cut away lower levels of case, especially Levels 4, 5, and 6. [See] p. 402-405, above for a description of the eight levels of cases.] At Level 7, its usefulness is doubtful. At Level 8 it is useless. It brings cases upscale to where they have their own time track to run and are able to run it. At that point, power of choice is less our concern, because the PC believes now that his power of choice is alterable and that he can do something about his conditions. Now he can handle the real stuff that has aberrated him. Sooner or later, too, one has to actually handle the conditions of existence.

Auditors who don't understand ARC straightwire can dream up all sorts of wrong ways to do it. For instance, they skimp on one leg because the PC has trouble with it. Although cases at Level 3 can run the process commands in the order: 1, 2, 3 / 1, 2, 3 /, you will get more TA with the order: 1, 1, 1, 1, 1 / 2, 2, 2, 2, 2 / 3, 3, 3, 3, 3 /. That is the only way it will run on lower level cases, so you might as well run it that way, with equal time on each leg until flat. Or, run an equal number of questions on each leg, to get over the fact that the PC may have long comm lags on one leg. You are after a similar amount of run for each. You depend on the other two legs to fix up the tougher one. Letting them get out of balance defeats the process. How long you should spend on each leg depends on the PC and how long he takes to flatten something. Listen for a cog to end off on.

The number of variations that there could be is great. Always try to get the PC to run the simplest, most fundamental version -- the one that is closest to pure A, R, and C. The less you change the command, the happier the PC will be, since this produces the minimal change of process. If you find the PC struggling with a wording, get it changed early, if you are going to change it at all. A good question for affinity is, "What attitude has been rejected?" Don't change the question too much. Settle down for the long run. Make sure the PC has a question he can run.

Another keynote of ARC straightwire is that it is always run muzzled. The auditor's sole concern is understanding and acknowledging what the PC says. It is true that sometimes the PC will ARC break if you don't talk with him, but don't Q and A or change from an unflat process. Only talk with the PC to avoid ARC breaks, and don't violate the Auditor's Code.

If you run into trouble, you can put big mid ruds in on the ARC process. This won't mush an engram. It takes chunks out of parts of the engram chain. It picks up parts of the engram chain that belong to other chains anyhow. Don't try to run ARC straightwire as a cyclic process, cycling to PT on every leg. He hasn't been in PT for trillenia! You can get him to PT any time by giving him the command, "Move to (PT date)." Theoretically, he will only get to PT when the process is flat. The process is flat when all ruds are in on the process, and it produces no departure from the PC's clear read on any leg. You are not really after this flat point with the process. You are only trying to get part of the charge off, so that the PC can run engrams. Remember that can unmoving tone arm early on in the process is meaningless. TA has to be run in before it is run out. During the course of running this process, the TA may well go up and stick on each leg.

Your main concern is, "Is the PC answering the auditing command? Does he understand it? Can we keep it balanced so that we can bring him through it?" You can ask the PC, "Is there any question or command you haven't answered?"

The process can be prefixed with any combination of words, e.g. "In auditing", "On your job", or "In marriage". This makes it more powerful than a Problems Intensive, especially if it is assessed against the problem areas of the person's life, taking an area that reads well.

The Helatrobus implants contain words like "remember" and "think", so you avoid these in auditing commands as much as possible.

Rougher cases will be happy to run this. There are cases that cannot recall or remember: Levels 7 and 8. They need reach/ withdraw and CCH's. You can use these principles in discussing whether or not they wish to be here, whether they like you, whether they wish to talk to you. Using the above prefixes, you can run ARC straightwire as a PT 2WC process.

6306C13 SHSpec-274 Levels of Case

Here is where we are at, technically: We are developing dianometry to a point where one can give a series of tests and decide what you need to do with a case. There are six types of processes that are learnable and workable. Direct processing of postulates is not included, although rising scale processes do sometimes work, especially on Level 1 cases.

The scale of Case Levels is invaluable, and the six types of processes handle all levels. The six processes are the only ones that raise a case up the levels. The only problem lies in how well they are known? and how reliably they are executed. We are working on how you can tell where a PC is so you can tell what to use on him. Lacking this data, you can just process the PC and go up or fall back to hit his level.

Here are the case levels:

1. OT. No track. You can even go higher than Level 1. For instance, you can tell the thetan how to handle a theta trap. You can also teach him how to maintain a game, so he won't have to go downscale to have one. What you can do with this level consists of education and practice only.

2. This is a theoretical state. Usually parts of the time track are missing, and those parts that are there are under handling, although the thetan at this case level is theoretically supposed to have total access to his time track with nothing aberrative on it. The perfect time track is unobtainable. It would fold up before it got there. At this level, we work to get the person over the idea that he has to have a time track by handling engrams. The thetan learns to block out facsimiles. No special process is used here.

3. At this level, the PC has a partly visible time track that is, however, very aberrative. He has lots of engrams, but he can run them. At this level, you would use engram running by chains -- blocking that sort of thing out.

4. This is an occluded case, with a black, invisible, and/or spotted field. Lower levels can also have such fields, so be careful. At this level, you can still run engrams, if you have made sure that you are not actually dealing with a Level 7 or 8. You can run him on R3N. [R3N is a stripped-down directive Routine 3 which uses line plots. It has to do with Implant GPM's. R3N2 is an abbreviated form of R3N. See 6305C14 SHSpec-263 "Implant GPM's" and 6305C21 SHSpec-266 "The Helatrobus Implants".

5. Dub-in case. Easy to restimulate. This case should be run on ARC break straightwire, Duplication ("What There are processes that produce change in the PC, without necessarily giving a change in case level. Processes can be powerful enough to overwhelm the PC's power of choice. So you can change the case, but the PC may not recognize it, so his reality and confront haven't improved. That is what occurs when you run a higher-level process on a lower-level case. That is why it is idiocy just to cure someone of an illness. He will just get sick again. You have just worked directly against his hidden standard. Your real object is to advance the case up the reality scale, so you had better use the process that corresponds to the PC's case or reality level. You should see improvement, both directly in terms of upgrade of case level, attitude towards existence, etc., and indirectly by seeing TA motion. If there is no TA, the PC is not improving, with regard to his viewpoint of existence, level of communication, etc. Level 4 or 3 cases can also be run on ARC break straightwire, for repair or a boost.

6. Dub-in of dub-in. This case is distinguished from a Level 5 by the degree of franticness and the terrible automaticity of the bank. It is not a common type of case, but it is a struggle to audit because the track won't hold still to be looked at. Nothing bites because of this constant motion of the time track. The Level 6 case no longer has the power of stopping motion. You could call this type of case the grouped automatic time track or the moving time track case. You can't run straightwire on him because of the constant motion of the track. Such cases should be run on CCH's. Repetitive processes work, as do sec checks and, to a lesser degree, prepchecks. So does general O/W, done as an excuse for sec checks and prepchecks. It is not done as a strictly repetitive process. The overts you get are very light and feathery. That is OK. The bottom rung on Level 6 has passed beyond the ability to run bank.

7. This case can only confront his own evaluations. These cases can get enormously interested in CCH's, because that stuff is dangerous to them. They can't run the bank. It is not there to be run. It is utterly unconfrontable.

8. The unawareness case. This case can only be run on reach and withdraw, being virtually or actually unconscious. If you have someone who is in a coma, take his hand, and, with commands, have him touch the blanket, touch the sheet, etc. The perpetual boil-off case needs reach and withdraw, just like the guy in the coma. Reach and withdraw runs several levels above Level 8, for instance, it runs up to Levels 5 and 6. But here, on Level 7, you must flatten CCH's, or you will leave the PC parked. The PC at this level will run heavily on these processes.

You can run processes at levels higher than the case level for which they are primarily intended. They don't do much damage if left unflat, if the case level is several levels higher than that of the process. But don't overestimate the case level and get loses.

The six types of processing are:

1. Reach and withdraw.

2. CCH's

3. Sec check

4. Repetitive processes

5. R3N (implants).

6. R3R. Route 1 could be added as a way of handling a Level 7 case.

Almost any case reacts to almost any of these processes, but what you want to do is to improve the level of the case, with economy of time. There are certain processes that will do it fastest and a host of others that don't fit the PC's case level. The fastest process is the one that we are after. For instance, we just run enough R3N to clear off implants so that we can get at other parts of the track. You can run someone on implants for a long time, but what you are after is unburdening the track enough so that you can run GPM's.

There are more implants per unit time in the PT area, i.e. the last 5000 years then there were earlier but the only really thorough, workmanlike job that was done was in the Helatrobus implant. Darwin's theory of evolution came from one implant.

Case level improves to the degree that charge is removed. Case level is determined by the amount of encysted and unreleased charge, not by the inherent power of the thetan concerned. Different cases may have different tolerance of charge, but the levels will still be determined by the amount of charge. The auditor's sole interest is to relieve charge in order to change case manifestations. The index of charge off is amount of TA, or dial-wide rocket reads that start out like mad and turn into a fall. If you are running engrams without getting TA, watch it. You are just stirring up the bank and not discharging anything. The PC will get unhappy with you. Just give the PC the R-factor that you are going to run more implants to get them out of the road, so we can get this earlier material discharged. Let the TA run into the case on ARC break straightwire. This may take two sessions. If necessary, you can drop back to CCH's and sec checking, or even reach and withdraw.

It is better to start low and run high. Underestimate the PC's ability, so as to avoid giving the PC loses and keep his confidence and hope factor up. The variable is the ability of the case to rise up the scale. Of course, the lower the case level, the slower charge blows. Level 5 and 6 cases will get into rows about being under-run, but when the case is being run in the direction of up, the case will forgive you almost anything. The lower the case, the more they estimate their ability to be. [They don't feel confident enough to see their limits.] Such people do take social pride in their case level. There is a status-seeking in auditing, God forbid! Let TA motion be there instead, and we will all have won!.

6306C18 SHSpec-275 Beingness

The overt-motivator sequence is about a trillion trillion trillion [1036] years old, minus a hundred thousand trillion. It is a long track, but we have the process to take it apart. The main difficulty with the time track and its use in auditing is that there are so many cases that can't confront a time track or any part of it, so you get loses trying to run engrams. We have been accumulating processes that can bring someone upscale to where they can view the time track. A great number of processes have been accumulated and, recently, codified, as we looked at the fundamental of what we are trying to do with a case.

The ultimate procedure is rote engram running, but not everybody could do it. So the subject has had to be wrapped up in such a way that it could be done by all. Current rote engram running is superior to and different from earlier engram running. We are running engrams by chains, to open up and smooth out the time track. The only reason we are doing anything about engrams at all is that those are the parts of the time track that are least confrontable. If you get rid of those stretches, the PC has a time track. The worst part of the time track denies anyone the best part. Unless you get rid of the engrams, you haven't got any time track, because the PC can't confront it.

This sets up innumerable problems. The more heavily charged the track is, the less the PC can confront it, and there is a point where the PC moves out of any confrontability of the engram, and now there is nothing to confront at all. This gives you the scale of cases: OT to unaware. Awareness of the physical universe also diminishes as you go downscale.

If each case level were to be divided from the others, it would be divided by layers of anaten. Anyone at Level 8 would have to go through layers of anaten to get to Level 7, awareness of own evaluations. As one goes upscale, the layers of anaten seem thinner and are thinner, because the more aware one is, the less one minds unawareness.

The lowest conscious level of unawareness would be catalepsy or amnesia. But even a man thinking that he has only lived once has a lot of automatic unawareness of the time track. When you throw into his lap the idea of having lived before, you will get a confrontation of his opinions about it, e.g. "What would that do to old age pensions?", and this will make him pretty groggy. If you push him up the line, his suppositional actions will occur. In the absence of processing, as he goes from Level 7 to Level 6, he will get wild ideas, after going dopey. He gets dub-in of dub-in lots of suppositional reality. For instance, he may think he is Tutankhamen. If you could get him to discuss it more intimately, he would get pictures of pictures. Then, as the PC reaches Level 4, it all goes black. The blackness or invisibleness are parts of real pictures. The rest of the picture is just unconfrontable. The blackness of a Level 4 is on the time track. It is actually there on the time track. It is a nice, dark, "safe" part of the incident that actually happened. Run him through, run him earlier, and pictures can turn on. At this point, he gets very groggy in the incident. As he reaches Level 3 in this way, he can see much more easily.

As Level 2 moves into Level 1, the time track disappears, possibly because "the time track itself is a method of not confronting something.... He doesn't want to confront it, and this overwhelms him to the point where, without power of choice, he makes a picture of it, and you have the involuntary picture-taking apparatus that is the time track." One can, however, only be overwhelmed by that which one does not confront.

So the Levels of Cases Scale is a scale of confronting, and we could mistakenly think that confronting would solve the time track. While confronting does get results and is an interesting process, it is not the common denominator of processes. The common denominator of processes is duplicate. The common denominator of reaction is confront. The time track is duplication of an actual event, and each one of the case levels is a level of willingness to duplicate, or unwillingness to duplicate. So your

breakdown from OT towards clear is an individual lack of desire to duplicate what he has to duplicate in order to be an OT, leading to an overwhelming automaticity of making a time track.

Duplication goes hand in glove with the idea of beingness. As we study beingness, we will see this with great clarity. "To be or not to be" is not the question, in this universe. You are going to be something whether you like it or not. Your power of choice on this matter no longer exists. You can not-be a certain thing, but only in order to be something else. You can be or not-be a certain thing, but you will always be something. "The question is 'What to be?'!"

So this is the problem one picks up as one enters this universe. It doesn't matter if the universe is timeless, because you entered it somewhere. As you examine people's time tracks, you find that their tolerance of time is improving as you go back. Since time is the single source of aberration, if your time-tolerance improves as you go back on the track, you must be getting into periods, not only when the PC was less aberrated, but also approaching the beginning of the time track. An individual's time track is not infinite because:

1. He entered the universe at some point.

2. The earlier he gets on the time track, the less it is a constant, continual, and infinite thing. The universe, on the other hand, continues at its own rate of vibration. If the individual's time track were of infinite duration, cases would be unresolvable.

Getting back to the question of beingness: once in this universe, you can't absolutely not-be. The question is "What to be?" That is the only question in the universe that really bothers somebody. You will drive a kid up a wall by asking him, "What do you want to be?" If you want him to be something and he "knows" it would be dangerous, you have a postulate-counter-postulate situation, a continuing problem of beingness. "There's a dwindling spiral of beingness" the moment one enters this universe. There are fewer and fewer "safe" things to be. You can aberrate someone by being after him to be something that is very dangerous. You get a problem with this. The lesson of this universe is that everything you can be is too dangerous to be. But there is nothing to do but be in this universe. The universe has a finite space that looks infinite. The gains of R2-12 came from the fact that the PC was making lists of beingnesses and the fact that a real RI is a potential beingness. Anything you might want to be is either too dangerous or too discreditable. A state's effort to dominate the individual is out of jealousy of beingness. The press is dramatizing this by saying, "You mustn't be a scientologist. It is dangerous to be one."

So if you want a guy to start sorting out his time track at almost any level, where he is aware of it at all, you could start him at once on a question that would get him into some interesting categories. A time track is "To duplicate or not to duplicate," but any duplication winds up in a beingness. Duplication and beingness are united. or gradients of one another. You will have cases that will not become OT until the beingness of OT is demonstrated to them to be not quite as dangerous as it has been. All cases, or all PCs, have "assigned to all upper states dangerous or discreditable beingness, and [the same] to all lower states, and to [their] own state[s] impossibility to be." Well, that is the state of any case.

If there is no program for the security of this planet that we can push forward, people become loathe to advance their states of case or do anything else. They stay parked in an inertia, because there is no desirable future, no hope factor. This is why hope is a rudimentary therapy. To some degree, you would have to promise that an advanced state of case would not then bring about further problems, complicated by the political or sociological problems on this planet. If there is nothing that one can do with an advanced state of beingness, it is doubtful that people will try to attain it. So one needs a future, or else the problems one got into before, as a free thetan, make one see no point in case advance. People will downgrade their own states if they feel uncomfortable, lonely, or unsafe up there. Planning and organization to resolve that problem alone would bring about a case advance. In the absence of such planning, promise, and organization, you won't get as fast a case advance.

If you advance any Helatrobus goal, a lot of people will go on an automatic not-is. There are people who are on a prevented beingness. They make theta traps, implants, etc. They can be tested for by offering them any beingness. They will not-is it. For instance, you say, "A wise prime minister would be nice." He says, "Oh, I don't know. That would just give you a more powerful government." They would degrade any more advanced beingness or anything you wanted them to be. They might even think that they were doing people a favor.

We have the idea that if we don't have success with a certain number of cases, we haven't got enough people to form any strata of a civilization. It is OK to say, "All right. You are making an officer cadre. The rest can be as they are." That presupposes that there is a future plan to take care of all this. We have a plan now for what to do with this planet. Fine. Now, what about the boys from the next planet? You inevitably progress into an organizational future.

So you have to solve the problem of beingness, not only at the level of the individual case, but also on out into the future, through some organization that ensures some safe future. An OT can straighten things out on the planet, but unless you mock up a plan to do so -- to solve the beingness problem more broadly -- you won't make any OT's. Unless you plan to straighten things out, few people will go through to OT, because it has been so unsafe. In the past, the OT has had a blind spot. His own power was so great that he thought he could stand alone, but every time he went up against an organized body, he lost, because the organization could furnish more viewpoints than he could. It is the plurality of viewpoints that confuses the individual. He can't sort it all out and eventually gets pulled down?. The individual could furnish only a limited number of viewpoints, to which he could pay attention and which he could coordinate. Communism advances because it has a plurality of viewpoints, organized to confuse the individual viewpoint.

The individual OT has his problems because he is an individual and has been convinced that he could do it all by himself. And he could! But the little boys with the airplanes always show up some time in the future. The universe was ended by Magellanic clouds less than 500 trillion years ago. Only space and rubble was left. There were no suns and no planets. A lot of thetans got together to put it all back together. You got planet builders and sun-builders. In spite of all this, the little men with the airplanes showed up then, with their theta-traps. Where did they come from? This has happened repeatedly in this universe.

This universe surrenders to co-operative action and not to individual action. But now we have a new breed of cat: the experienced being. When you get through auditing someone now, he is an experienced being who knows the isness of the universe and who knows that no matter how tough you are, you can get in a pole trap. We have the technology to straighten someone out. Unless a powerful being learns that this is a universe of organization and co-ordination, he will just be back on the pole trap again. Any body of beings operating with a coordinated program can beat him. You have got a situation where the individual is trying to operate in a universe of co-operation, and of course that degrades the beingness of the individual to that degree. The "more he fights to be an individual, the less he co-operates. The less he is willing to co-operate, the more enforced is his co-operation, the more he fights against this sort of thing, and the less freedom he has." That is a description of the dwindling spiral that an individual goes through. "No-confront" is the mechanical basis of the spiral. Discarded beingnesses are what bring him down.

In a facsimile, the hardest problem the PC usually has is trying to isolate what is him and who is he, and what is he. This is usually the biggest lie in the facsimile. The PC has been running it as an overt, being the executioner, and he finally turns out to have been the victim's wife.

It is, in fact, dangerous not to be a scientologist. But the rest of the beingnesses are a matter of opinion, and the co-ordination of beingnesses is one of the better solutions.

A being at the bottom of the reality scale has gone down through a scale of beingness. To get him to be anything at the bottom is impossible, except to be an unaware being. There are deeper channels of unawareness, but there is no absolute unawareness. He goes into a coma, taking no responsibility for any beingness of any kind whatsoever. To move him up the line, he would have to have some security in being able to be something at an upper level. You can have problems in processing if there is no future beingness. Going out of responsibility occurs, because one continually gets the lesson that being responsible lands you in the soup. The repetition of this lesson is what puts the individual downscale in livingness. The scale keeps going further south, to deeper levels of unawareness. It has to be made safe to be exterior, to be a theta clear; without some guarantee that you won't just wind up in the soup again, you won't become "skyscraper tall" again.

Havingness is useless without purpose. "Unless the game itself is an expanding game, then processing cannot produce a stability." Future livingness ties into a rise up the scale.

Out-reality equals no responsibility. "What to be? To be an A or to be a B?" That is the question. If you can't be an A and can't be a B and there aren't any other things to be, the answer is anaten.

It is interesting what you can do simply by using the tool of secure beingness. Marital difficulties result from:

1. A husband who won't be a husband.

2. A wife who won't be a wife.

3. A husband who won't let a wife be a wife.

4. A wife who won't let a husband be a husband. This is the average marriage. "Marriage is not unhappy. Marriage is a difficult beingness." You could use beingness processing to remedy it.

Bypassed charge that causes jealousy is bypassed charge in the other person. It is not knowing about the other person's past. Therefore, there is a criss-cross of BPC. Because we are not bypassing charge in each other, scientologists will be the first people who can be friends in this universe. Because time alone builds up BPC in people who know nothing about the time track.

You have to handle the Helatrobus implant because it bolluxes up the time track and debars an easy route to running engrams and to reaccustoming the individual to different levels of beingness. Only engram running will clear somebody.

Beingness, case state, hope, expectations, and confront are all tied up in the case scale. Now that we have the scale of cases and a knowledge of what gets a case up to engram running, we can sort out the time track, reaccustoming the person to various levels of beingness. After you've got all the engrams run out, you've got an OT. Then you need an organization to handle the problems of the OT in this universe. Otherwise, he will just slump again.

6306C19 SHSpec-276 Summary of Modern Auditing

Processes fall into categories, according to which case conditions they handle. Cases deteriorate as they go down the time track. One factor against which they deteriorate is confront, and the other factor is duplication. Confront has to do with willingness, and duplication has to do with ability. As the PC becomes less willing to confront, he becomes less able to duplicate. Similarly, processes are allowed to deteriorate [and fade out of use] through failure of willingness to confront and ability to duplicate. CCH's, for example, went out for five years through getting down into the effort band. There was no duplication. You would have a very exact sort of process if you ran, "What are you able to/unable to duplicate?", along with other flows. You add more legs to it as the case needs more complexity. A high-scale case, not being much troubled by flows, could go far on one leg only. You can get different viewpoints on different flows, also. This can give you TA action, where you might not otherwise get it. "You add enough brackets to get TA." There is no perfect way to run brackets, since the number of available flows is virtually infinite. The idea of flows is something that monitors all case levels and breaks its back around Level 4. Above Level 4 any or all flows could be run. A person well downscale, below Level 4, almost at the bottom, can only run one flow. Such a person can't function on any other dynamic than the first. He can't conceive of another viewpoint, though he needs to run more than one flow. There is a problem here.

This is a problem of the dynamics: How many can a person function on? There are many facets of processing, by which you could match up a case to its ideal process. You might be able to figure out the perfect process mathematically, but there is the point about the need for workability that we mustn't lose sight of. A process should not be "perfect". It should be complex enough to be workable. The complexity factor also goes into the number of processes you need. We should not emulate modern science. "Modern science is a method of precisely determining overwhelming nonsense."

We also have to determine the common denominators present in all cases. The processes that have survived the development of scientology are those that have broad workability. They include ARC, the mid-ruds buttons, and common incidents on the time track, the common denominators of all cases. Kraepelin's list of psychiatric case types is ridiculous. It is like saying, "I am auditing Betty, so it is a Betty case type," or "Well, everybody is a George case type." In the first case, you get too many case types; in the second case, you get too few. There is a middle ground. This is a finite number of case types, classified according to their behavior in auditing sessions, and a larger but still finite number of processes. It is only useful to divide cases up into case types so that you can match them up to the

processes. the case types are based on behavior in session, not in life. You get a finite number of them, then match them up with processes. that raise the PC upscale.

You can't expect auditors to memorize more than a few types of auditing processes perfectly. If you expect more of auditors than this, they end up mixing types and styles of auditing and you get hash. Repetitive processing seems easy, now that you are familiar with it. In fact, any type of processing you have learned well presents no particular problem.

CCH's got badly learned. They are a kid glove type of process, since cases that get CCH's exclusively are low on the effect scale and can't tolerate being mauled about. [LRH tells an anecdote about dropping CCH's because "they weren't getting results," then giving a TVD and discovering that no one knew what he was doing.] They had utterly alter-ised the process. It was then that he stopped just creating new processes and began to insist on perfect duplication of what had already been developed.

We stopped accumulating process types when LRH found out that it was variation that made processes and process types stop producing results. People shifting from the original type of process would then apparently bring about a need for a new process type. Process types are dependent on how many you can keep in line. How to keep processes in line and working is a more important factor than you might think. When a process seems to have stopped working, you will find that variations from the original have crept in. The simpler process types tend to survive better than the more complicated ones. They are also perhaps easier to keep in line in their unvaried form. But even the simpler ones will drift out of line.

A process can die when it is too simple and gets used very seldom. Reach and withdraw is a good example of this type of process. It works at Level 8 and is the only type of process you could use on an animal. Processes that work very slowly also tend to get dropped, since they are seldom run to a flat point, so you don't see results. We don't really know how much reach and withdraw processes can do.

Processes can vanish because of disrespect; we use one diffidently. ARC processing disappeared for awhile because of this. That they are the only workable processes for a certain type of case gets lost, and so those cases get lost. Reach and withdraw is one of these. It is slow but sure and it is almost lost from lack of respect for its potential. There are lots of processes in the band of reach and withdraw that are ignored. Book and bottle hangs right in between reach and withdraw and CCH's It contains duplication like the latter, but is the former type of process. Lots of cases won't move unless run on these processes. They won't move on CCH's. We mustn't lose processes.

We have been pressing so much at the top of the scale of cases that the bottom has been neglected, so these lower scale processes have dropped out.

The next division in processing is what the auditor knows is wrong with the case vs. what can be done with the case. These can be two very different things. Modern processes have nothing to do with what is wrong with the case. The viewpoint of curing specific conditions by specific processes is an outmoded viewpoint, left over from old medical practices. One must run what the PC can run and not fixate on curing. That is a sort of Q and A,

II. A case with a temporary relapse into heavy problems may not be able, for the moment, to be run on problems, a repetitive-type process. Therefore, you had better be able to undercut problems processes.

"If [a] case is dramatizing something, that something is not real to the case." That is a guiding rule of processing. What you are guided by is not "Are we handling what is obviously wrong with him?" but "Does the case respond to the process that is being run on the case? 1.e. does the case get TA when the ruds for the session are in?" You must, of course check that:

1. The session ruds are in.

2. Flows are in line.

3. The process is not already flat or unsuitable. For instance, speaking of flows, most of the stuff we run, e.g. the Helatrobus implants, are motivators. So if you had TA, and it ceased after you had run several flows, the flows may be getting stuck.

We are interested in increasing the capabilities of the case. He should at least be getting easier to audit, because that means that he is getting more responsive to external orders, getting more capable of viewing his track and pictures, getting into less trouble, getting better at locating BPC. The case would be getting more done per session, too. Auditors tend not to notice that a case is paining and winning, because they are too close to the case and they don't observe the slow gradient. The way to spot it is to notice how the case was a month ago. If the case is progressing well; if he is interested in and happy doing what he is doing, don't change it, unless there is no TA for a long time. Give TA motion time to develop, also.

It may take several sessions to establish the PC's case level.

Run engrams using the precise system and commands given. The precision of the system tends to develop the PC's precision on the track. Don't word the item too adventurously. Make it finite enough so that there is a hope of reaching basic. It should be something he is worried about and can reach. If you run a chain of "being held still", you are asking for lots of still points, which may be hard to get to the root of.

What you validate, you produce, with the exception that getting the PC to confront what he doesn't want to lets him take over the automaticity of producing it, so it stops being produced.

Modern processes are built on and monitor the degree of withdrawal of the person into himself, and those things that will lead the PC out from himself, so he is no longer so restricted. Thus reach and withdraw is the most basic action. You should have some idea about types of processes -- how and why they work -- and what case level they are most effective on. And you should get good at estimating where the case must lie, and upgrading the case from that point. Always run the case a little steeper than it thinks it should be run. The reaction of the case, in terms of protest or ARC break, has almost no bearing on whether what you are running is the right process. You look amidst the "Yap! Yap!" and see if the PC is running the auditing command. Protest is a common denominator of the whole track and this universe. It is how the thetan makes pictured. It is more fundamental than duplicating.

6306C25 SHSpec-278 Routine 2-H

[See HCOB 25Jun63 "Routine 2-H -- ARC Breaks by Assessment"]

The use of different processes has been monitored or regulated by two things:

1. The ability of the auditor to do the process.

2. The efficacy of the process in advancing cases. Both have to be taken into account. It is important that these two factors mesh. Otherwise auditors tend to lose.

What is a win or a lose in auditing? You have to be able to define them, or we won't be able to recognize them. A win, in terms of thetan behavior, is:

1. "Intending to do something and doing it."   or 2. "Intending not to do something and not doing it." A lose is:

1. "Intending to do something and not doing it."   or 2. "Intending not to do something and doing it." A lose gives you a disagreement. A ridge forms between those two things. A ridge is a bit of entrapped energy that will read on an E-meter. In processing, intending to do something for a case and not doing it is a lose. From the PC's side, it is the basic definition for a lose: if the PC sets a goal for the session of becoming OT and doesn't make it, it is a lose, no matter how unreal the goal was.

An auditor's idea of a win could be not to ARC break the PC. Then he does, and gets a lose. This is the intention and sole intention of many auditors going into session. This being the case, it demands

of a process that it work, regardless of the intention of the auditor. That is quite a bit to demand of an automaticity, but it is a very safe base for a process.

Your skill as an auditor is in getting the process across and completing an auditing cycle, keeping the form and running the session. It does not lie in inventing a process as you go along. You have enough to do without having to invent processes, although LRH used to do it. It is feasible to dream up the process while auditing the PC, but it is only necessary when you don't know what to do.

The way around this problem is to know the fundamentals of cases. What we expect of an auditor is to be able to complete an auditing cycle, hold the session form together, and take care of the PC's un-form-ness as needed. That is minimal. If you go lower, you haven't got an auditor, and more randomness than order will be introduced into the session. A person who couldn't master a repetitive process would never make an auditor, because of the importance of the auditing cycle. You need to be able to acknowledge. This is more than just saying, "Thank you." The auditor has to understand, and it is up to the auditor to minimize the possible breakdowns of the auditing cycle that results from the auditor being startled by what PCs come up with.

The auditor must be cured of a tendency to Q and A, since that is damaging to the PC. A common sort of Q and A is echo metering. This drives the PC 'round the bend. If this is done with dating, it can ruin the PC's precious ability to estimate time. Any echo metering is a a and A. Not Q and A'ing is part of the auditing cycle. If the PC says, "Around 750 years", you say, "750 years." The essence of Q and A is departing from the auditing cycle with new doingness, because the PC has added new doingness. This misses a PC's withhold. The worst situation you can get into is the ARC break caused by your taking it up, when all the PC was doing was originating. The PC has originated and you thought it was a question or a request and acted to handle it. Flunk! You didn't acknowledge the origination. You can get the PC to clarify the origination by asking the PC, "Was that a request?"

The final test of an auditor is not, "Is he perfect?", but "Can he unscramble a mess by session end?" Get as good as you can get, but don't get upset about imperfection. Just be sure you can straighten it all out. As an irreducible minimum, let things go that are going well and straighten out things that aren't. R2-H is a new process to assist in this. [See also HCOB 25Jun63 "Routine 2H -- ARC Breaks by Assessment" for more details on the process. This would be a predecessor of the L-1-C.]

R3R is a pretty rote procedure. It has no variations. It took 13+ years to arrive at it. "I intended auditors to run engrams and failed, in the past. I had a loss." That is why R3R came in. The main difficulty in handling engrams is the complexity of the procedure. These rote steps are pretty simple, done one by one. R3R runs engrams better and smoother than earlier engram running ever did. It is quite a triumph. The failure in getting auditors to run engrams was enough to make LRH abandon trying for some years.

Of all processes, this is the one not to learn by doing it on the PC. Don't practice running engrams on a PC. You will tanglefoot if you don't know the fundamentals of the time track. Dating is an interestingly exact skill. The hardest and trickiest step is getting the duration, because it is hard to get the proper duration, and in rote procedure, duration is everything. If the PC doesn't know know what the incident is all about, you have the duration wrong. Why? The later part of the incident is always knowable as to length. The question is where it really begins. For instance, you know how long this lifetime has been, but you don't know how long your track is. If you get the PC just seeing one scene every time you run him through the incident, then the duration is wrong. He has just got the back end of the incident. In terms of reality and behavior of the meter, the PC could reach the last part of the engram. If he can't tell you about what is happening, the duration is wrong, because there is obviously something more to it, and that something more is always earlier. So you must re-do the duration. The first incident wasn't wrong; you've just gotten more incident. This could happen more than once in one incident. If the second run is still very vague, if the PC still "doesn't know" about the incident, if he has gotten only a few more pictures, get the duration step re-done. That's all you have to do! You may have to re-do it several times. Just take the PC's data. The PC will always go to the beginning of that part of the incident which he can now reach, luckily. This is very uncomplicated. And it is very important, because all that is in the bank is in engrams. Engram running is no longer barred to the Black V case. Even GPM's are specialized engrams. A GPM is just an engram with a pattern required to run it.

The mind is not confused. The PC, looking at it and unable to find what he wants, thinks that it is confused. It is an idiotically orderly machine, which does what you tell it to do. Addressed by a

proper technology, the mind is incredibly precise and accurate. The PC may think it looks confused, but he is like someone on his first trip to the library. He will be confused until he cognites that he can just ask the librarian for what he wants and get it. The auditor always gets what he asks for in R3R. The mind is not a Ouija board. Just keep your commands sensible and comprehensible.

The biggest problems an auditor has are:

1. Finding the correct date and duration.

2. ARC breaks. Most auditors are somewhat afraid of ARC breaks. If you haven't learned to assess and handle ARC breaks, you are licked. You will shortly back off from running engrams because you will have had a lose.

Routine 2H comes in here. It is ARC Breaks by Assessment. It is superior to ARC break straightwire. It asks the PC for an ARC break, dates it, assesses it for BPC, locates it, and indicates it to the PC. This puts you at cause over ARC breaks and gives you practice at dating things that the PC is not very nervy about, unlike engrams.

R2H can be run on a PC at Level 6. [Dub-in of dub-in case.] R3R doesn't necessarily run only engrams. You can also run secondaries with it, which is fine. Just don't call it engram running. Don't run chains that haven't been assessed. You risk having the chain try to branch into another chain. You can run locks with R3R, on a case that is not up to running engrams.

Getting the item to run is done by the rules of listing. You could also assess the 18 buttons of the prepcheck and list what they have suppressed in this lifetime, and get a chain that you can run with TA. If you hit one of the Helatrobus implants, shift to R3N. If it is another sort of GPM you hit, go to R3N2. Watch for dates between 38 and 52 trillion years ago, for Helatrobus implants.

The approach to processing has been upgraded because its target has been upgraded. We are not interested in clearing. We are interested in OT's. The governments of the U.S. and Australia decided to get rough. Also the Kremlin and the U.S. are trying to form a dichotomy, expressed with nuclear fission. We must hold the line legally (concerning E-meters) and upgrade the auditing target to OT.

6306C26 SHTVD-22 Listing Assessment for Engram Running (Part I]

Notice the simplicity of this procedure. [See HCOB 1Jul63 "Routine 3R: Bulletin 4 -- Preliminary Step for a description of the procedure.] The difficulties with it are minimal. The skills of R2-12 are used, the rules of listing apply, etc. The key note of any fairly high-level case, and what makes an incident an incident, is protest. By protesting, a person shoves his face towards something. He attacks it, while he resists it. This opposition produces a heavy charge. But some people aren't up to protest, so we will assess an 18-button prepcheck list to determine the thing to assess for engrams.

[LRH proceeds to assess an 18-button prepcheck (with "created" left out because it is a goal), with the prefix, "In this lifetime, have you mainly _____ ?" He gets a huge list of items, after nulling the 18 buttons down to "decided". Lists "In this Lifetime, what have you decided?" to a clean needle. Does goals and gains, havingness, and ends off.]

You just keep listing until the needle is clean without doing anything to disturb the PC and put ruds out. You are not looking for R/S's RR's or any "peculiar needle phenomena". The next step would be to null the list, "In this lifetime what have you decided?" to one item. If this item turns out to be a goal, it would be run with R3N. Otherwise, you locate an engram (chain) that could cause such a decision in life. Model Session was very simple and skeletal. If the PC had not made goals or gains, LRH would have said, "I'm sorry you didn't make your goals/gains." If he had made some of them, the acknowledgment would have been both "Thank you," and "Sorry."

6306C27 SHTVD-23 Listing Assessment for Engram Running (Part II)

[This is a continuation, the next day, of the previous auditing. The session starts off with a missed withhold rud being run, then off and running with L and N. Then similar actions to the last tape. At the end of the session, the list was still incomplete; it was banging on everything.]

A list should be complete, so that everything is out on nulling except the item. Since you know that a list's being incomplete means that the item isn't on the list, you could, when the list is completed, just null the last page or two and find the item. Don't, though.

6307C09 SHSpec-281 The Free Being

The SHSBC is the place that you have been coming to for the last trillion trillion years. It is LRH's job to make auditors who can clear up the track. If we hadn't waited so long, it would have been easier, but two things prevented its being done sooner:

1. The state of civilization.

2. The previous failure to realize that the cycle was the cycle of loss of the OT. A being now had come to the point of believing that the only safe place to be was in a meat-body civilization. The fight, the quality of life, had been lost. Peculiarly enough, freedom as an OT has come down almost into PI, say to 500 years ago, for some. But they were lost, too. There is no way to obtain and maintain a stability as an OT [as things stand]. What is peculiar about this war on OT's was that it was lost by the most powerful.

All battles are won by a combination of force and intelligence. Given enough force, you don't need much intelligence (viz. nuclear bombs), but then all you get is a short-term win. A long-term win is achieved only by a balance between force and intelligence. Intelligence alone is never enough. For instance, in the Communist takeover of Tibet, the wise men of Tibet were powerless to prevent it. There is an imbalance in any defeat. Any co-ordinated civilization, combining technology with force, and keeping force and intelligence balanced, can make a monkey out of an OT. Literally! There is an implant, four galaxies over, that taught you that you came from apes. The whole Darwinian theory is implanted there in about a day. In fact, thetans had different tastes, relative to bodies. For instance, some liked cave-man cultures and some didn't. This is not evolution. It is just different mock-ups for thetans. The "civilizations" of tree-top pre-men and of cave-men were just two different styles, with no evolution between them.

The deterioration of matter is not nearly as rapid as scientists think it is, and the earth has been here much longer than they think. Carbon-14 dating methods, the measurement of time elapsed by deterioration of atoms, doesn't work, because this deterioration doesn't occur as fast as scientists think. Suns in this area have been burning for at least 200 trillion years. Dark stars, suns that look as though they have gone out, were never lit. They don't go out.

So society is full of misapprehensions and stupidities that, themselves, act as traps. These stupidities are intelligently conceived as a means of cohesing a society. Ignorance is used by the intelligent as a means of entrapment. If everyone remains ignorant of the society, nobody can get out of it, so they have no choice but to co-operate and keep society going. So these meat-body societies operate on a combination of mediocre intelligence and mediocre force. They make the airplane and the space ship and progress no further. Then they disintegrate. Societies repeat patterns over and over again. Thetans get on different kicks and make these societies. But beware of societies with as much progress as there is on this planet. Various unusual forces are at work here. This planet is evolving unusually fast, because, for one thing, it is being used as a dumping ground. It is on the periphery of the galaxy. Sun 12 is handy to other galaxies and to the center of this galaxy. It is still being used as a dumping ground. For that reason, this planet has a very heterogenous society and lots of trouble, because no one is guiding it. Most planets have some guiding thetan. These don't change. They are rather like a little play town. There is no master hand guiding this planet. If there were, there would be far less trouble than there is. When you take thetans that have been indoctrinated to have certain types of societies in bodies that have been mocked up, and then they get scooped up and dumped as unwanted in one place, you have lots of different impulses at work, one with the other. This produces lots of friction. That is what our society is.

This society belongs, nominally, to the Espinol United Stars, or the "Espinol United Moons, Planets, and Asteroids: This Quarter of the Universe is Ours." This is Sun 12. "There has been no command post occupied for this system, now, since 1150 AD, at the time when a group on Mars was finally abolished and vanished." You notice that at that time there was a sudden resurgence in science and learning. It became an uncontrolled civilization, and no one has been paying any attention to the

dumping that has been going on since. "Nobody took any interest in this system, and [it has] been running wild ever since that time."

"Probably the most basic impulse on the planet is simply the basic impulse of thetans who have been reduced to more or less meat body level, which is total co-operation" with one another, as you see in Communism: We are all equal. There must be no personalities of any kind, [and the cult of personalities] must be banished." This is the least common denominator of implants and indoctrination: the notion that they must have teammates.

Why did you arrive on this planet in the condition you are in? No good reason, particularly. Certainly not just because of the overt-motivator sequence, though you will try to find the overts you did that pulled it in. You are still trying to be reasonable and intelligent about it. You think that there had to be a reason. It is true that you have overts, but "the only reason you were ever punished was for being you, for being powerful, and for not being quite intelligent enough.... The exact crimes were to be there and to communicate."

Once upon a time, "some OT came along and [for fun] ... put together a civilization, [complete with] curbstones and hairdos. Some other thetan came along and [interfered in some way], so... to get even, ... [the first] thetan would indoctrinate his pet society on how to trap a big thetan. So this became the most accomplished skill that a meat body society had: how to trap a spirit."

"No OT was ever so out of his mind as to depend upon any of his men or troops to untrap him. He never [taught] them to do that, because at the time he was doing this, [it never occurred to him that] he would be caught.... Singularly unintelligent!" It isn't this universe that did it. You were just knuckleheaded. Not enough intelligence was used, proportional to the force. Tributes to God are tributes to the workings of an OT. Creating the entire universe seems like a very intelligent action, but it was knuckleheaded, because no one worked out how to reverse it, to unbuild it, to cause things to as-is. This lack of intelligence was recently dramatized by Frankie the Limper's funding the atom bomb, without building a defense against it. OT's in the past have employed too much force and too little intelligence. An OT could build anything: atoms, molecules, suns, traps, but he didn't bother to figure out how to turn it off when he got tired of it. The problem came from an insistence on matter that was to "endure forever". This was not smart. Eventually, that is what theta poles were made of. "That's the pole you've been on. Confounded things last forever.... It's possible to be trapped for over 13.5 trillion trillion years."

The tech for trapping thetans is vast, but there is nothing on "How do you get him off of it?"! Here is a problem: how can you free thetans when there are no OT's left. All an OT has to do is to pull the trapped thetan off and toss him "out in space to cool off." Seems simple, but it requires an OT, and what if there isn't any?

Einstein was dead wrong. He only contributed to the ignorance by which you get trapped. Space wagons used to travel trillions of light years per day. Teleportation is a pipe dream. You just unmock a body here and mock it up there. "It's not the same atoms.... The skill [of] making matter disappear has been grievously neglected, ... like the tech of how ... [to] free a thetan.... The failure to teach a meat body society equally to free or to trap ... was just unintelligent." This situation is like the phenomenon of stuck or single flows in processing, where if you run motivators long enough, the PC will give you an overt. You can always get trouble when you run only one side of a flow.

That is important to you, because it says where you sit as a being at this exact moment and why you are interested in the technology before you, and why it is appearing at this time. Everyone will tell you that this technology is impossible. It isn't. It is only neglected. They think it is impossible because they have outflowed the reverse technology. The technology Isn't neglected because the lack of it didn't cause societies trouble. It did. The Galactic Confederation is in trouble right now because of this lack. The Confederation operates on a limited OT basis. Its hierarchy of command is that of a limited level of OT, and it goes down from OT's at the top to the doll body as the ship captain and the post captain, and down to meat bodies. It is one of the few civilizations that has endured a long time just because it has used these different levels. They have tried to maintain a no-change condition, which is dangerous and impossible. If you don't improve, you decline. The problem of the Galactic Confederation is that they have run out of the OT's that are needed to command units. That is the limiting factor on how big they could be, since not once in 80 trillion years has anyone ever suggested repairing OT's. They have a static and therefore declining society.

OT's get peculiar. They get fitful. They get moody. They can get keyed in, and all they could do about it was to subdue the errant thetan, turn a sleep-light on him, tell him to get more solid, and take him down to the hospital. "I know. I was there. I was the guy they did it to."

If the technology of untrapping is so vital, why hasn't someone worked on it? Because they are afraid of the technology. "Governments would fear OT's, if they knew about them." The Galactic Federation, of course, does. They would worry about how you could maintain the social strata and the fixed organization, if every janitor could be an OT. It would be fine if you could restrict the technology to OT's, but it would spread to doll body and meat body beings. They would fear the social and political upset that would occur if you freed thetans. "You'd have to give them a political solution which was as great as the political threat. You cannot give them a tech without taking responsibility for [it], or nobody'd listen to you. People on earth don't think that scientology doesn't work, [but they've been trained against the vector of it. They've been trained to destroy," to entrap, to set up a fixed status of something and then work out a destructive means of entrapment with it so people cannot leave certain social and economic strata of the society. You are not up against Pavlov, Freud, etc. You pose a tremendous threat to the social structure of our current civilization. You can tear it to pieces by rehabilitation of thetans' tremendous power and force, which can only be safe if there is also tremendous intelligence connected with it, so that the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics will be produced. For instance, an OT can pull the air cover. Mammoths have been found in the polar regions with fresh-frozen vegetables in their stomachs. To explain this phenomenon, it would be necessary to explain the fact that they must have been quick-frozen in sixty seconds, in a tropical region. What natural cataclysm could have taken place in sixty seconds. Somebody pulled the air cover and gave the planet a reverse spin, because they got mad. An OT who could do such a thing in a fit of pique would be terribly dangerous.

An overt act doesn't just damage; it damages the greater number of dynamics. One can commit an overt act unintentionally by lacking data or not using sufficient intelligence to see what really is for the greatest good. But a really heavy overt act is one where one deliberately sets out to damage the greater number of dynamics. Keep this in mind during sec-checking. You should be looking for actions that are really harmful to a greater number of dynamics, not just some irresponsible actions. "An overt act is often realized after the fact." You could have done it a smarter way that wouldn't have been an overt. So you get regret and hung-up overts. You seldom find anything in this lifetime that is a real deliberate overt. It has been awhile since the guy had power enough to do a real overt. Some thetans will take on their shoulders more responsibility than is rightfully theirs. However, running dubbed-in overts won't get them anywhere. But under all that, there is a real overt of magnitude.

A phase of this universe has taken place and ended: the phase of the free being. The free being has lost, to solid, unintelligent, mean-level societies. Another cycle opens up now. This new cycle involves a different kind of being -- one that is as strong as the old, but experienced; not as stupid, because now you know what the score is. Now you have good reality on a meat-body society and can see their political frailties and the impossibility of obliterating them, because they start again elsewhere. They can be managed, handled, helped, or thrown on a reverse vector.

The use of intelligence with force can maintain a freedom of action ... without racking up a new bank ... and new overts," a new war against the thetan. There has never been a lasting or intelligent society of free beings, for as-isness has dropped out as an ability and needs to be put back in. But such a society is needed, since everyone, on his own, puts everyone downscale in the long run. If "freedom" means "total irresponsibility", up and down the line, you are not talking about freedom. You are talking about catastrophe. We don't need war. We need a balanced technology with the ability to meld force and intelligence. We need knowhow and force, not knowhow in the use of force. We need a balanced intelligence that can reverse what one does, unmocking matter as well as making it, freeing as well as entrapping. If you know how to enslave people, you should know how to free people. If you are going to make up matter, don't insist that it be indestructible. In dealing with meat body societies, don't just stir up the ant hill. It will just disperse and continue to grow.

The era of total irresponsibility is over. A long cycle is over in this universe. The cycle of the free being vs. the meat body society is over. The battle was lost, and the free being doesn't exist anymore. We shift gears by just putting some intelligence in with the force.

Freedom with no barriers is insupportable. There is nothing in this case to be free from or to push against. Freedom must be worked for. If you think that you will stay clear or OT just by never

destroying anything again, you are nuts. Criminals should be permitted to free themselves through compensating victims.

Not to do things for the greatest good of the greater number of dynamics is an overt of omission. One can't maintain freedom in the face of failure of such magnitude. You cannot be or make an irresponsible OT. We have to continue to take responsibility for our fellows. Not to take responsibility for others is to lose our own freedom in the end.

6307C10 SHSpec-282 Auditing Skills for R3R

[Some of the material in this tape is also to be found in HCOB 9Jul63 "A Technical Summary: The Required Skills of Processing and Why".]

We have the exact number of skills necessary to make an OT. Unfortunately they are not simple and they are numerous. But they break down to about five skills, which must be perfect. They are:

1. The ability to follow an auditing cycle.

2. The ability to give it repetitively.

3. The ability to read a meter very well.

4. The ability to read, understand, and follow the procedure of a bulletin.

5. The ability to get and keep a PC in session. Any time an auditor cannot handle an upper-level procedure, it is because of the fact that he cannot do one of these five basic things. As an auditing supervisor, knowing this will enable you to get auditing done. If the auditor cannot get results with a process, it is one of these skills, not the process, is awry. No amount of persuasion will overcome the lack of one of these skills.

You like to think that you are up against case level in training an auditor. Low case level does make it harder to teach some people, but if you make that a criterion of whether you can train someone, you will lose. There is no case requirement for training. You mustn't Q and A with the "I can't" of someone. If you make him do it, you make him right, not wrong. To agree with the "I can't" is Q and A'ing with his aberration. The D of T must never be permitted to refuse a student, because getting into the practice of doing so leads to limiting who can be trained to the point where no auditing gets done. When the instructor says, "Yes, you can't," The instructor is invalidating the reactive mind, and the student's ability to audit deteriorates rapidly. It takes some people a little longer to get towards those basics and just do them, but if you keep at it, they will get there.

A complex technology like R3R will show up the weak points in any of your five basics. For instance, given what you are handling in R3R, if you Q and A, you get major bad reactions. 2 and A occurs when the auditor doesn't make his intention stick in the session. He tends to become the effect of the PC.

The level of error is always stupidly elementary and has nothing to do with what process you are running or how complicated that is. R3N and R3R look very complicated. They have a lot of steps and lots of doingness. But if you can do the basics of auditing, you will have no trouble. It is fantastic to have a process that runs engrams by rote. All that can give you real trouble in R3R is wrong date and wrong duration, which can result from faulty meter reading, or faulty dating procedure. It is difficult for an expert meter reader to get dates and durations of engrams. If the auditor can't read the meter, well!! "Wrong date doesn't mean a minor wrongness. It is something grossly wrong which rapidly snarls up the time track. Wrong date produces bypassed charge and a grouped track. The BPC is fantastic. If a person has his attention on a date or something, it will tick, once, on the meter, even if it isn't the right date. Hence you can Q and A. You might say that a dub-in case is just someone who has his dates mixed up. You could probably cure dub-in by accurate dating.

Nothing drives the PC battier than to have a wrong duration. Say the incident is really a trillion years long and you give him a duration of two days. The PC tries in vain to find the beginning of the incident. He can't, because he is looking at something that happened two days before, so it stays all black and gruesome. When you get that phenomenon, you re-duration the incident. What made R3R

workable is that "a PC has perception on any incident that is properly dated and durationed." That is where perceptics lie. There are only three reasons for no perception:

1. Wrong date.

2. Wrong duration.

3. It has a GPM in it. Wrong assessment and overrun (chain already flat) give you no TA, but not necessarily no perception. The incident can get obscured if it has a GPM in it because black energy goes up and obscures the engram. This was caused by the PC's protest in the incident. When lights go off in an incident, look for a GPM. If that happens, you have to get the PC to straighten out the GPM, by taking him to the first pair of items in it. Get the motion out, pick up another pair of items, get the TA motion off that pair, etc. Just clean it up rapidly, then run it as an engram. It is never very long or very difficult to run.

There is a point where R3R and R3N cross. Start the case on R3R and pick up any implants that turned up while running R3R. Check for an implant on the duration step. If you get onto the Helatrobus implant, clean them up! Get the first pair of items and discharge them with rocket reads, etc., then go back to R3R. Use R3N as the adjunct it is.

There are some technical details that you have to know. These include:

1. How to assess an ARC break.

2. What list(s) one should use.

3. Ability to do an accurate and thorough L and N, to a complete, but not overlisted list.

    The source of ARC breaks on lists is incompleteness of lists. You can, however, assess a prepared, arbitrary list without fear of having the "incomplete list phenomena" turn on, because the PC never started the list, so it isn't complete. But in a regular list, in order to get the items, you do have to be able to do L and N, which includes metering.

If you are having trouble with R3R, be sure that your difficulties do not stem from troubles with getting in ruds or, say, writing while watching the meter. Learn to audit by fundamentals, and you will have no trouble with a procedure that just combines the fundamentals. Your main danger as an auditor is being too complicated. Recognize that the simplicities of the game are what make it hang together and work.

Wrong date and wrong duration are the only things that give you trouble. Wrong assessment is very junior and generally just gives you no TA. Because wrong date and wrong duration are such lies, it is difficult for the PC to as-is them. And what happens to the track when you move to a wrong date?

It is very hard to get the right date and duration to read, even when the PC is in session and you are on the right chain. Date is easier than duration, because the beginning of the incident is so hard for PCs to see, especially at the beginning. One source of a wrong assessment is overrun, when you try to go earlier than basic. Case Levels 5, 6, and 7 [See pp. 414-415, above.] all have a channel through the bank on which the PC has reality, where he can be run on engrams without dub-in, using R3R. So if you find that channel and run the PC in it, the PC wins and can go on up.

6307C11 SHSpec-283 ARC Breaks

The trouble with ARC break assessments is that you will generally have to do them on a PC with a dirty needle. Don't suppose you can or should clean up the needle first, since all dirty needles are ARC breaks. You don't try to clean the needle and then assess for the ARC break. The only thing that will clean up the ARC break is the list. All you have to do is to follow very strictly the rule of the instant read and never miss. An auditor who could do that would be a pearl, and that makes ARC break assessment a splendid training device.

If there were no ARC breaks on the person's track, the fact of a button going out would not cause a dirty needle. For instance, "suppress " reads because it is sitting on a chain of ARC breaks. There are two elements here:

1. The thetan's reaction to the experience he has bad with MEST and significance.

2. The MEST and significance itself.

"Nothing has to be observed in order to be." [Cf. Bishop Berkeley and his tree falling in the middle of the forest.] A thetan's reaction to MEST and significance must involve some contact with it. But it can exist without being perceived. The relation between the MEST + significance and the thetan's reaction is communication. To be affected by something, one must communicate with it or knowingly not communicate with it. This fact eliminates a lot of philosophical baloney. A deliberate not-know of something can get a thetan in trouble. What gets the thetan in trouble is that he has been there and didn't communicate, and he made a picture of it or protested it, and now he doesn't want to confront the picture either, because the significance in the picture has been added to by his reaction of not wanting to communicate to it. So a thetan's reaction becomes part of all observed or carefully not observed MEST + significance. This, then, is the new significance of the thetan's reaction at the time, which, made into a mental image picture, becomes the time track.

The past is different from the present in that the thetan's picture of the past has had the thetan's reaction added into it. In mockups of future track, hope or hopelessness is also added in, so the future also has reaction added into it. It is not often made up into pictures, though it sometimes is. It is just whole cloth dream-ups, not pressures against the physical universe or actual pictures. However, you can cause somebody to run future track.

So what you are auditing is a thetan's reactions to events.

GPM's, with their balanced masses, float on the track and seem to be in PT to the PC. If you want to horrify someone, scatter him out of a PT that the PC thinks is right there. If you can't get a read on dating a facsimile that you know is there, ask if it is tomorrow or yesterday. This will shake the PC out of PT, and you will get a read. However, the PC usually ARC breaks when you do this. You are dealing with a past that seems to be a present time that requires a reaction to it but has already got a reaction in it. So a thetan takes his reaction out of the past incident and wears it in present time, and you have the factor of restimulation of reaction. His reaction of the past becomes his reaction to the present.

When you have audited an engram, the PC's reaction to the engram becomes part of the session time track. It gives a faint shadow of a read if you get the PC to spot it again. It is not really charged; it is just the action pattern of the observed present. You might even be able to get another rocket read out of a Helatrobus implant series. At any given instant of the time track, you can rekindle any given reaction. The time track has reaction added to it, making it different from PT. PT doesn't have reaction in it, except as borrowed from the track or added by the thetan. You could lay out some stretch of time in which you deliberately added happiness to everything. If you get someone to audit you through that time a few days later, you will get a ridiculous amount of happiness. The guy who is always looking for happiness and not finding it simply doesn't put any happiness into PT.

When you are supposed to react favorably or hopefully, but you don't feel that way, the confusion of conflicting significances can be so great that the whole situation seems very unreal, and you want nothing more to do with it, and it can chew on the back of your neck from then on. You say, "I won't look at it," and put it away on automatic. If you don't stir it up, life will.

You can get things to persist just by postulating, "It will persist." Otherwise, you can only get persistence with a lie.

The thetan's reaction to a MEST + significance is about the reality (R) and results in a feeling of affinity or mis-affinity (A). This reaction is communication (C), and it is a bridge between the thetan and the MEST + significance.

The reaction is monitored by past ARC, or lack of it, concerning similar MEST + significance of the past.

331

This assumes that the PC can maintain a detached attitude. Then it is simple. But say your PC's needle is nice and clean, and you ask him to recall an ARC break. That is a moment of miscommunication, a time when some charge was bypassed, which has been restimulated. The PC attributes the ARC break to something other than the actual BPC, which introduces a lie into the situation and causes the ARC break to persist. Time condenses, as the PC's reaction to the MEST + significance prevents him from retaining a detached attitude about it all. If you are involved in the middle of the battle, there is no time to retain a detached attitude. You put it on a total reaction. This is caused by a condensation of time. What we really get the brunt of in this universe is an insufficiency of time. You get that by staying on the time track.

If you start protesting time, you get "too much time" on your hands. Actually, this is an unwanted location that is blamed on time. You start protesting time when you have an unwanted location. The basic lie on the track is to confuse time and location. A few trillion trillion years ago, you probably didn't stick on the time track. The further back you go, the less you were fixed into present time. You were slippery on the subject and could go yesterday and tomorrow at will, as with the time machines in science fiction. An CT is the only real time machine. You can't change the past and future without recreating it.

You weren't necessarily surrounded with the environment of PT. This was very useful. You could slip around all over the place. However, the drawback was that since no one was fixed in time, you couldn't stay in communication very easily, and a certain impatience was generated. You got unpopular because you couldn't be fixed in one spot to be communicated with. Only implants could "cure" this. There had to be major louse-ups to cause aberration on the subject. Only GPM implants could do it.

If you have fixed time, you get a fixed reaction, because it is an enforced thereness. You can't drift out of the incident. You have very little time. And it is the unwanted absence or presence of time that gives all problems. You could clean up problems by running, "Tell me a problem you have had. What time was awry there? Where was there too much/too little time?" This isn't especially workable, being rather limited, but you could probably get some changes, shred the bank a bit, and move him on the track. Time is made insufficient by economics. You could also adjust problems by attack on location -- less effectively, but you could. You can actually find the spot in space and do reach and withdraw. That is why spotting spots in space works. If someone had an accident with a car and a tree, you could run reach and withdraw on the car and the tree.

All impact is based on a scarcity of time.

You need some very complex mechanisms to cause facsimiles to stay with a person in PT, "bothering them all the time, with them reacting against them all the time, to build up a tremendous lot of reactions, which then becomes the personality of the individual. That's the only trick" -- that is the chief engram. That is what makes engrams unrunnable. But now, with R3R, we can run them.

Your reaction to MEST + significance is couched in various ways. Where those reactions tend to not communicate or to obsessively communicate, you rough up energy. Then it stays in the picture. I.e. it is flowing at one foot per second and you get it flowing at three feet per second, but it isn't really flowing that fast, or you prevent it from flowing at one foot per second and make it flow at one inch per second. I.e. the normal course of flows is interrupted because of the existence of a problem, or an obsession to be at it or a feeling that you have got to get away from it or that it is bad. The result is that you bypass charge. It is former reactions that get rekindled there, which then throw old pictures into restimulation. Since the PC doesn't spot the old pictures, the present reaction is somewhat inexplicable, and he misses the charge. The auditor locates and indicates it, and the PC feels better. What has been handled is not the facsimile itself, but the reaction factor part, which, since it is the thetan's reaction, is the part most intimate to him.

It is similarity of reaction, therefore, that pulls in earlier similars. [Cf. getting the emotion, somatic, or attitude and running chains of that.] "The only thing that caused a restimulation of yesterday's charge was the fact that you reacted the same way today that you reacted yesterday. The devil with the situation. The reaction was the same [and, for that reason] you pulled in yesterday's situation ... and didn't even know it.... You're not ... interested in running out yesterday's association as a facsimile. [All you want is] to clip out one little piece of it, which is reaction, ... a reactionectomy." When you indicate the charge, you are actually matched-terminalling the past reaction and the present reaction, and they can go, "Bzzzt!", and the reaction or charge can vanish. That is all you handle with an ARC

break assessment, not the facsimile of yesterday's MEST + significance. You don't have to know any more than that there was an earlier similar ARC break.

The way to get a PC into an incident is to ask him to find the largest object in it and tell you about it. He will go right into the incident.

The thetan's reaction to a MEST + significance is manifested as ARC. Your and my "quarrels with many things that are wrong with the world is because our reactions are quite different [from] other people's reactions to the same things." [Hence, "To know everything is to forgive everything." You get down past the reactions to the actual MEST + significance.] On an ARC break, all you handle is reactions, not facsimiles. In other words, you don't run R3R on ARC breaks, you handle reactions. The ARC break assessment lists are just lists of bypassable charge, so they vary, depending on what activity you are engaged in.

ARC breaks never rekindle until they key in. "An ARC break is always a key-in. It is never the fact, but the followup." You can almost always get the missed withhold question to read on the ARC break assessment list, because that is the common denominator of ARC breaks. It requires a missed withhold to key in an ARC break. There could be something far more fundamental than the missed withhold, which won't read because of the PC's preoccupation with the missed withhold. You can run the missed withhold and then still have to run the ARC break. If all you find is the key-in, not the correct bypassed charge, the ARC break just keys in all the more. The missed withhold only keyed it in. On bypassed charge lists, you may find the key-in and still have to run out the charge. [Cf. getting in buttons in ruds, etc.] So "missed withhold" will read on almost any list it is on. But there is most likely more that has to be found. You should continue the list, or reassess. Make sure that you are using the right list. If nothing reads, you are on the wrong list.

All you have to do to clear up an ARC break is to locate and indicate the correct bypassed charge. If it takes more than that, you didn't find the correct bypassed charge. If you don't know that, you will give up using the system because you think that it is not invariably workable. One reason for a failure to cure an ARC break is using the wrong list for assessment. This could happen if there was a little time spent on some other action which you and the PC had forgotten about.

6307C16 SHSpec-284A & B Preliminary Steps of R3R

[This is a demo session, on two sides of a tape, of LRH auditing MSH, doing the preliminary assessment for R3R, as given in HCOB 1Ju163 "Routine 3R, Bulletin 4: Preliminary Step".]

6307C16 SHSpec-255 Tips on Running R3R

Auditing engrams and GPM's is a new world to many auditors, especially to those who learned a different kind of engram handling. This doesn't invalidate yesterday's techniques. They have their place, especially in the field of healing. We can heal things, although we have neglected this area of responsibility, for which reason we are being attacked in the area. So we will collect and publish what we can do. R2-12, for instance, can have fantastic results, when done as a limited process. Just don't do more than four oppositions on one item. Get one RI do two or three oppositions and be happy with it. The PC has been beaten down by his experiences on the whole track. He thinks nothing good can happen in the universe. When one goodness occurs, it is almost too much for him to have. That is a different zone of expectancy from making clears and OT's. People wouldn't be able to conceive what you meant if you said that you were making clears and OT's, although in fact they would believe you and feel very uneasy about it. You would have restimulated bypassed charge, and they will always get cross with you.

In all auditing, don't stir up more charge than you can handle. If you apply that to any process you run or to any program you formulate, you will have happy PC's. The worse off a case is, the less you stir up. This goes directly in the teeth of the Q and A that is yesteryear's "mental sciences". The effect scale has to be observed. At low levels, the person cannot receive much of an effect, so you have to featherweight the effect to let the PC receive it. The more desperate the case, the more featherweight the cure.

The technology of the preliminary assessment step for R3R lowers the level on which it will be effective. That bypasses the ordinary defenses of the mind. So when you do such an assessment, the rule of not stirring up more charge than you can handle applies in neon lights, if you are auditing a case at Level 7, 6, or 5. [See pp. 414-415, above, for a description of these levels.] This person doesn't easily run engrams. The assessment has located the only tiny channel on the time track where the PC can confront engrams and on which you will not find dub-in. That is the basis on which the process has been developed. A case at Level 3 [See p. 414, above. This is the case with a partially visible time track. can be run on any engram you can find and won't be particularly upset or damaged by a wrong date or other error. But a case at Level 6 [Dub-in of dub-in case] has a barge canal a sixteenth of an inch wider than your barge and full of roots, old stoves, and curves. On that channel, there is no dub-in of dub-in, and with a correct assessment, the case will have perceptics. This gives you the responsibility of handling the case very carefully, by the rule of not stirring up more charge than you can handle, because at this level, there is no process that will put the case back together again if it falls apart.

The lower the case level, the fewer incidents you will find per preliminary step. The "chain" may be only one incident long. Test your level after you have run an incident. If it doesn't read and the PC has had some sort of cognition about it, don't choose this time to go backtrack. If you have an incident that the PC can run, it doesn't matter how long ago the incident was. If he gets TA on it, runs OK, and that is all there is to the incident, and if there are no problems finding the date and duration, and if there is no read on asking for an earlier incident, fine. Do another assessment. Things are more likely to run longer with an upper-level case. The clue to whether the chain is flat is TA action, not how far back basic is. To find out if you have run the TA out of the chain, be sure that the TA didn't cease because of wrong date, wrong duration, or a GPM in the incident. If none of those apply, leave it. Those are the criteria of a flattened chain.

The Helatrobus implant goes as far back as 43 trillion years ago.

The situation of having the TA cease is not the same as the situation of not having gotten any TA. The only reason that you have trouble with running a case, with no TA and ARC breaks, comes down to these factors:

1. Wrong assessment.

2. Wrong date.

3. Wrong duration.

4. A GPM in the incident that you are trying to run, that you have collided with but have not found out about, so you have been trying to scan the PC through the items of the GPM.

The worse off the case is, the weirder the assessments will look to you. The PC may run something well that is from the backtrack and still be a low-level case, so don't take the recentness of the incident as adjudicative of case level. Dating anything beyond an easily available incident becomes very difficult. You are very likely to mis-date and pass by incidents, and the PC will know it, too. GPM's are hard to date anyway, being timeless, and a PC will have trouble staying in a place on the time track. This can also happen with upper-level cases, but they can take it. A lower-level case will plow in thoroughly.

The preliminary steps, on a Level 4 [See above]. This is a dub-in case. or Level 3, lead inevitably to a GPM. It is about the fastest way to find a goal you ever heard of. If the case is running well, you can probably run the whole goals series right there. Any trouble you have with running a case all goes back to the four factors given above. Wrong assessment includes running something that has not been assessed. On a lower-level case, you can spend more time assessing than running the engrams. Test the level, after you have something flat. Don't run over the PC's head. When you have flattened the chain, leave it. The worse off the case is, the more it moves from nonsense to murder, so don't muddy the little channel you have to work in. Listen to what the PC tells you about what he wants to run, but assess, before you run it.

The way you make work for yourself as an auditor is by doing things that you shouldn't be doing. For instance, don't mix R3N and R3R. Don't switch from one to the other by mistake.

There is a point on the track where you can get back of and find the basic of all GPM's. "I've hit that point. I haven't got it so I can hold it steady.... I got there by the way by keying out.... Had an awful time, recently, working out the most vicious series of GPM's on the track. There are five pictures, but the first one is invisible. No goal with them. Just opposing items in dichotomy, four firing five times in a row for each picture. I ran into myself on the track trying to figure this out. I gave up. Took two sessions to get it unwound, and the first picture is invisible, so you'd always try to put a picture there, so basic is always missing. It makes a vacuum, and pictures pour in. That's why later GPM's accumulate pictures. You get in the habit." This is the vacuum that holds the whole bank together. When he contacted this, LRH could hear GPM's coming apart all the way down to PT. Obviously, you don't try something like this on a lower-level PC.

Desperate conditions are hard to maintain in the face of featherweight touches, but heavier measures, like bypassing too many goals in R3N, won't help the case. It is always OK to push a PC a little heavier than they can go, but the rougher the case, the less they can take. The ARC break is a good test. If the PC ARC breaks regularly, don't always blame yourself, except for overestimating the state of case and running the process too steep. There is no real excuse for running a PC poorly. But if you put the PC in an available channel, he will run like a doll buggy, if you run him right. Do a careful assessment after every flattened chain, checking carefully for wrong date or duration or a GPM in it. PC's that don't assess easily on the standard scale can be gotten to extend it. "Auditing is as easy to do as it is real to the PC."

6307C17 SHSpec-286 Dating

"Accuracy in dating is the single most important function of the auditor." Since last October, LRH has been studying something with intensity. It took the preceding couple of years to determine that goals and related mental phenomena come down to engrams and the time track. The difficulty with running engrams from 1950 on was the number of cases that couldn't run the time track. Years were spent on improving cases. In October, the time track assumed greater importance, up to the point where LRH discovered that the GPM was an implant.

At that point, we had to discover whether or not a person could go clear without running the time track and engrams. There had already been a lot of failures with getting people to run on the time track. LRH has always operated on the assumption that everyone could make it to OT. A few weeks ago he had to consider whether only fifty percent could go on to OT. This was a serious question, which he had never before wondered about. Research since October has been very rough. It has had to be done more rapidly, because it was obvious that we didn't have much time left, as proven by the January FDA raid. That was one reason that LRH decided to bypass clear and go for OT.

Clear is an an aberrated, comfortable human state which society can accept. OT is something else. It is like making a "playground supervisor" vs. a "commando". With the government attack on scientology, we had no time margin to let us take care of clear first, then go for OT. So we are into research concerning how to make an OT. When you accelerate research, you get problems, because you have taken time out where you need time. In the last few months, the work LRH has done per unit of time exceeds anything previously attempted. The fact that "if you can't run the time track, you'll never get to OT" emerged. However, what also emerged was that with R3R, if you get the right chain with the right date and duration, you can get anyone to run with sonic and visio. That wasn't a solution unless the PC also got TA action.

TA action is the key to all case progress, because it measures charge blown, hence improved reality and better ability to confront the track. The PC's reality must improve, or he can't go any earlier on the track. If you process someone without TA, you would be doing him more good by taking him for a walk in the park. "TA motion tells you how much mass you are discharging off the reactive bank." Where TA is not moving, you are not discharging mass. You can tell in the records that this is happening by observing that the same goals are being set for every session, and the PC is getting only lukewarm gains. That co-ordinates with no TA action. That was what caused LRH to wonder if fifty percent would never make it to OT.

There was the thin hope that, by running lower level processes, you could get enough charge off so that the PC could run track with TA. It was a pretty frail hope. Doing this could produce keyed-out clears, but that is not good enough. The world is going down fast, and no new solutions are appearing to handle crises. We are the only new factor in the world. In order to meet the present

situation, the scientologist in the U.S. will have to produce at least spectacular case results or a spectacular being.

The problem now is: what is absence of TA? "TA action disappears off a case to the degree that time is in error." And there is the answer. TA "does not cease because you have run a wrong goal," or from ARC breaks, or a failure to run a GPM. It is because of wrong time. "Time is the single source of human aberration." This datum now emerges as a more important truth than we had realized. "The GPM is totally devoted to scrambling someone's time." So if you can't get the GPM's off the case, you can't unaberrate him. GPM's are hard to date, but they must be gotten off the case.

GPM's have a characteristic sound. There is a slow statement of the goal; in earlier GPM's, this was preceded by a "Crack!" So they sounded like this, "Spat! ss-ss-ss-ss-ss-ss ... Spat! ... Non - sen - si - cal - ly ... Spat!" Part of the aberrative factor is the PC's effort to speed it up, to get it to run at a speed that he is comfortable with. He is speedy. Sometimes people can't get rocket reads off of items because they don't duplicate the speed of the items. They go very slowly, the the thetan thinks, "why doesn't it get over with?"

The double-firing principle of GPM's also messed up the thetan and hung him up in time. It gave a positive or negative charge to two opposing sentiments. It hit him from the right and from the left. It made him feel as though he couldn't move but had to move to get out of the way of it. He would also get into a time-scrambler. The total purpose of the GPM was to scramble time. GPM engrams are the hardest engrams to date.

A PC can't scan through a GPM. You have to use repeater technique, because if you try to scan through it, it all goes black, because the PC protested it all the way through. In running it, you rekindle the protest he had when he got the implant. That turns the engram black. Then you can't see anything in it, and he can't move on the track, and he is all frozen up in the thing.

The only thing that stops TA action is wrong dates, wrong time. And no TA action equals no processing. The perfection of your auditing alone won't solve this. So dating accurately is necessary to get TA action. This doesn't mean dating down to the last microsecond. Your errors are the gross ones, e.g. dating something at 945 years ago, and it is really 145 trillion years ago. Very approximate dates back in the trillions of trillions of years ago is vastly sloppy, but it is successful enough to get TA.

To straighten out a case where the TA has ceased, you clean up "On time, in auditing" or "On dating", with an eighteen-button prepcheck. You should also clean "Wrong dates" and "wrong time" as long as the needle is rough on the subject. This could in or out of auditing. You handle by:

1. Finding when the wrong dates were found: times when things were wrongly dated. You don't, at first, redate these things.

2. When that is all cleaned up, run down what was wrongly dated and clean it up with the PC, even if you have to redate it. You will see TA action restored to the case. You want wrong dates that the PC guessed at or assumed earlier in auditing. You continue to clean up the area until the needle is really clean and all the wrongness and upset has been cleared out of the way. Now the PC will date easily. Someone who is an auditor will also need the wrong dates that he has found on PC's and his anxiety on the subject all cleaned up, too.

If you got the right date and right duration, you will get perception. If the incident has a GPM in it, the perception goes off because you have restimulated the PC's protest. Dub-in itself is simply a phenomenon of wrong dates. You could produce the effect of dub-in by deliberately giving the PC a wrong date and wrong duration and sending him to the wrong point on the track. Then you will get a collection of apparently dubbed-in pictures and no TA.

Wrong items are tough on a PC. Wrong line plots are a result of wrong time. Sometimes you will flatten a chain, and the TA will go up. This has something to do with wrong dates more deeply seated in the case than you can overcome without reassessment. The PC has overstepped his own reality.

If the PC has trouble whenever he goes on the backtrack, because it is all unreal and he can't believe it, what is his wrong date? It is the notion that life began at birth. His error on time is on the length of the time track. This is a trap mechanism. Clean up all his considerations on the subject, and his ability

to run track will change. Look at the entrapment value of this limited-track business and see how much fuss current society's savants make about past lives! No one protests against truth unless they have a vested interest in maintaining a lie.

Every PC tends to get their track tolerance extended as they find correct dates in the portion of the track that they can run fairly easily. Any case will hit a ceiling of reality on the subject of dating, but people only creak to the degree that there is wrong time.

A wrong date can sneak in on you without your doing any dating. For instance, you assume that a certain GPM is in the Helatrobus implant, when it is really a goal that is much closer to PT. By running it with the Helatrobus line plot, you have incorrectly dated it.

Never leave a wrong goal, or, even more importantly, a wrong date on a case. If the case has been run on R3R and TA action is doubtful, clean up wrong dates and all possible charge on the subject of dates, dating, etc. If a case is getting TA action, don't harass the PC about it, but if there are ARC breaks, look into wrong time, always. Also look into wrong assessment.

Some cases are very nervy about time and wrong dates. They can hardly take it if you make a small error on a date. Getting all the dates straightened out will improve this case, even if nothing is run. Don't invalidate the PC by checking all his dates. Do it periodically, just checking for wrong dates every now and then, in session. Date things in terms on "years ago", since the PC has been on other planets with dating systems that are different from Earth's AD and BC.

The "wrong date" phenomena extend to other parts of auditing. For instance, the PC may be doing an objective process, walking through the room, through facsimiles of Maypoles. Merely in the act of doing that, the PC gets reality on the room and gets the PC date, which straightens out the track to that extent. You could date the facsimiles, whenever the PC hits one and then return the PC to walking around the room. You could probably take a case that couldn't remember half of this lifetime and accurately date things. This would give him tremendous reality on things that he had never remembered before.

6307C18 SHSpec-287 Errors in Time

The insistence on having lived only once seems odd. It takes more than a GPM to produce such frenzy on the subject. Behind all aberration and illness there must be a lie. "Aberration cannot exist in the presence of truth."

Pavlov apparently never noticed that reward was one of the stimuli that he was observing. Communism, based on Pavlov and the physiological nature of man, becomes disastrous when practiced. Pavlov did a total anatomy of punishment, but left out reward. Capitalism works only because no one analyzed it, and pay is still part of the system. If capitalism were earnest about fighting communism, it would dig up such truths and promulgate them. Punishment does not uniformly control response at all. It is not a constant. Not all beings succumb to a threat of punishment. The reward part of existence is at least as important. Men will do more for reward than to avoid punishment. The more that reward is taken away, e.g. by taxation, the more difficulty society gets into. The lie that Man is a driven animal is destroying the social structure of Man.

As long as you are trying to isolate the truth, you will be 0K, no matter how much trouble you have in getting at the truth. The trouble starts when you settle on a lie and stop looking for truth. You can have misconceptions and still not go nuts, but when you settle on a lie and say that that is the truth, you have had it. The lie will pervade your life. It takes a lie of the "only lived once" magnitude to continue the aberration of Man. To maintain such a lie must take a fantastic amount of duress. Someone must be working at it. All psychosomatic healing could probably be done by finding the lie about the somatic. For instance, you could use the command, "Recall a lie behind (the psychosomatic)."

What would be the most disastrous type of lie? It would be one about time. Here is how to aberrate someone: give him a false time track. Implant him with a false past, complete with pictures and times, times in the order of magnitude of a thetan's actual existence of trillions and trillions of years. Only wrong time will freeze a case, as reflected in frozen TA. So this must be a pervasive common denominator of aberration. This suggests processes, like "Recall a lie about time," or dating

everything in the PC's lifetime. Hence the importance of history. With this view of the subject of time, LRH investigated to see if someone earlier had played around with people's time in the past. Sure enough, there were implanted times and areas of track where time was utterly confused and incomprehensible. You could get a guy fixed up with enough false pasts that he would dramatize them. He would get the opinion that he should never return on the time track because it is too dangerous or too confusing. You could confuse the guy further by giving him some incomprehensible dates.

R3R is good enough to be able to find a moment when a false past was installed, date it, and find its duration and then run it out. The incident pretends to be trillions of years long when it was really two or three hours long. The common denominator of these incidents is that the point where you approached is commonly repeated in the incident. One moment is actual; the other is a picture of it in the incident. So you get two beginnings as well as two departures, commonly. Such implants also have a mechanism showing troops marching to the PC (the beginning) and troops marching away (the end), with numbers running along the sides of these implanted pictures to give their times. The implant will often have these pictures of beginning and end reversed. It is very confusing.

The way you can tell false track is that it really doesn't move. There is no time in false track for all the details between major events, and the sound is seldom included. True time track is more sequitur, but can have periods of anaten. The reason the PC is likely to be on false track is that most of it, except for the beginning and end points, is safer and less uncomfortable than actual track.

False track is a lie about time. It may have dates neatly placed on the sides. One thing you can say about false track is that no GPM is on false track. This would be pointless. They may be implants, but they are not on false track. So if you are running a GPM, it is not the false time track. You can find GPM's and date them. There are two things that you want to know when you find an incident and date it:

1. Does it contain opposite-firing items, in which case it is a GPM.

2. Does it contain any false past? You need this data, discouraging though it seems to say so. On false track, be especially alert for false date and duration.

The Darwinian theory is just an implant, putting out the idea that Man is mud. It starts with a goal: "to persist". They have you in a cell, so they start by showing you being in a cell. Then they show you pictures of your arriving in the cell to be implanted. Then they show you, complete with pictures like a movie, all that has happened to you. This is background data that lets you know how mean you are. Then they show you being implanted. While you are watching, you are having the Hell picked out of you by electronic mass stacking around your body. You are hit with electronic waves, and the mass becomes associated with the pictures. Nothing at all is said. There is no sonic in this incident. Some false pasts do have sonic, but beware of running things in these incidents that aren't there. The Darwinian implant makes evolution appear true, but it isn't. When there are horses on a planet, it is because someone came along and mocked up some horses.

This sort of false past implant was done a lot before the Helatrobus implants. Some was also done after the Helatrobus implants. You have to know about this in order to get dates corrected. You have to know that some are false, not just wrong. Look for false pasts, not false dates, per se. The time track can also contain a false future. Fortune tellers practice this to this day. Someone who is always trying to know the future is just dramatizing a false future implant.

Sound and motion are seldom found in false track incidents. Rather, these incidents tend to jump from still to still, more like lantern slides than a movie. The Helatrobus, Dear, Gorilla, and Glade implants don't use pictures. The Helatrobus implant only uses pictures of a railway and a house. In the Gorilla and Bear implants, they have a guy with a pink striped shirt, with a monkey, or sometimes a gorilla, that they put on the cart with you. This is not the same as getting a whole set of pictures that purport to be your past or future, while getting electronic blasts.

False track can get in the way of running actual track. Some of it is pretty incredible, but if "false past" doesn't read, go ahead and run it. Run it anyway, even if it is false. Maybe you will be able to find the real beginning. However, it is hard to find the beginning of a false-past incident.

When you run across something in a session, handle it, but don't louse up your PC. When you start correcting dates, you will run into false pasts and futures. So beware of re-dating. Just get in and clean up first the fact that it is a false past and run it, so you won't have it in the way. If you locate a source of wrong dates, don't ask for another source of wrong dates. Run the one you have. Here is a rule: When you have your hands on an incident that contains a false past or future, run it with R3R to get it off the track. Get its actual duration. The real beginning of the incident and also its end are hard to find, since such incidents generally have two beginnings and two ends. Don't do anything extraordinary. Just be prepared to re-duration it if necessary. Don't just re-date it and leave it, because thousands of dates will have been restimulated in the course of auditing, and finding it again will be difficult, apart from the fact that that incident is all you should run anyway until you have run it out. So when you have your hands on something, handle it. Don't leave the PC struggling with it while you try to do something else.

Remember that your major auditing cycle is to accomplish some particular result on the PC. If you get into something outside the perimeter of what you were going to do, don't neglect it, because it may never show up again. When you have found the source of the PC's upset, what else is there to find? If you invalidate the source, how will you accomplish you major purpose? Don't bypass achieving what you set out to do. A cognition can signal the end of your major auditing cycle.

6307C24 SHSpec-289 ARC Breaks and the Comm Cycle

Current model session is pretty short. Since-mid-ruds and pulling missed withholds is better than the previous beginning ruds. An ARC break assessment at end of session is much better than any end-ruds we had in the old model session, if all lines are cleaned up as they read. Presession stuff is the same as always. She rest of the model session goes like this:

1. Goals for the session.

2. Since-mid-ruds, if TA up or needle dirty.

3. Check for and pull any missed withholds.

4. Body of the session.

a. Use whatever is necessary to get him through.

b. Chat a little before ending the body of the session.

5. ARC break assessment, if the PC is not very happy at end of session.

The wording of this is still very fixed. The only problem is on what to do if a rud question is clean. Asking the PC if he agrees it is clean can cause an ARC break if the PC feels that it is impossible for the question to be really clean.

6. Take up each goal from (1), above. Acknowledge the PC for each one made.

7. Ask for any gains made in session. Don't milk this question.

Acknowledge these by saying "Thank you for making these gains."

8. Can squeeze.

9. End of session.

The reason for a rough needle on the PC is the auditor's out-TR-2 and TR-4. "Clean up TR-2 and TR-4, and you'll clean up more needles than you can shake a stick at. It isn't the significance of it, you see. It's the calm flow of the auditing cycle." During ARC break assessments, "you normally consider a dirty needle [to be] a withhold [or] something the PC has done." But weak or overly heavy TR-2 can do it as well.

There are two comm cycles in an auditing cycle:

1. Auditor ------------> PC.

2. PC   ------------> auditor.

These cycles can operate independently. Both have to be very acceptable before you get a good auditing cycle. The PC doesn't even have to say anything for communication to exist. Thus, from the auditor, you can get an R-factor as an independent comm cycle, and from the PC you can get a PC origination as an independent comm cycle from the PC, as in TR-4. In this case, an acknowledgment is not even really necessary. An artificial acknowledgment can knock an origination off its base. You can handle these with a head nod or a facial expression. The PC origination only needs a ghost of an acknowledgment for the PC to know that the auditor got it. If it is something that seems funny to the PC and to the auditor, it is OK for the auditor just to laugh with the PC. If you can "project your think tank", you don't need TR-2. Sometimes an acknowledgment can indicate no understanding on the part of the auditor. The PC only needs to be sure that you understand.

A good auditor of children obeys kids' auditing commands.

In R3R, you don't have to ask the PC whether he has done the command. On "Move to the beginning of the incident," he doesn't have to tell you that he has done it. You will get a meter-flick when he is there, and you can send him through from that point. If the PC gives you gobbledygook, do not tell the PC that you didn't understand. That is a powerful phrase to use. Furthermore, by saying that, all you have done, essentially, is to ask him to repeat what he has just said. This is a peculiarity of Homo Sapiens. You just get the same words again. That doesn't help. You are just asking for a complete ARC break. You want the PC to vary the statement. What you want is an explanation or a broader statement, so you have to be able to get him to do that without invalidating him.

Here we get the basis of the ARC break: there is a bunged-up communication cycle, whatever else there is. What is bunged up about it is that the communication is not fully detected and understood. Lacking those points, there is no comm cycle. The intention of the PC is cause, distance, effect, and that cycle is interfered with so that the communication is not fully detected. This is the woof and warp of all ARC breaks: communication that is partially but not fully detected. Or, you could detect something but not receive it. For instance, say the PC says that he feels fine and doesn't need to continue. You say, "well, that's fine, but we will continue, to fill in the time." Here, the PC sees that the communication is not received, because no action is taken. You said that it should be something else before it arrived at you. Therefore there is a busted communication line. You can get a roaring ARC break on this. This is a primary cause of ARC breaks. In this case, A, R, and C are out because U is out. Actually, the communication is detected.

Expectations come into this. You can yell at a rock. Since you don't expect detection, you don't ARC break. Auditing is different because the expectations are different.

There are no other kinds of ARC breaks. All of them are based on the communication cycle. The whole definition of bypassed charge is "partially detected". It had to be partially detected, because it must have been stirred up. "A comm cycle, once begun, must go through." If it doesn't, there will be trouble, eventually.

You would think that people at cocktail parties would always be bypassing charge on each other, because they are always partially detecting that someone spoke. The only reason wog meat bodies don't explode during cocktail parties is that they are armored. "They don't expect anybody to hear them, so there's never any partially detected charge [comm]." It is very dangerous to ask for a communication and then fail to acknowledge what is received as a result of your request. You are inviting an explosion in doing that.

For instance, an auditor asks for the "earliest incident". The PC can't give it and ARC breaks, because the question kicks in an earlier incident than the one he can see, which he cannot reach. Thus the PC's bank gets only partially detected, and you get an ARC break. If the time track is like a bunch of mines laid out in a line and activated magnetically, let's say you want mine number 4. You throw a magnet to mine number 8, then you wonder why you get an explosion. Mine number 8 speaks, but it is only partially detected. One way to locate the earlier incident is to find its order of magnitude of years ago.

A comm cycle, once begun, must go through, or there will be an upset. E.g. the President promises to communicate to everyone, but lacks the ability to carry through. This gives the background for the revolution.

People who don't know anything about the communication cycle find this all so threatening and dangerous that they just decide to withdraw from communicating, because they don't understand what is happening or how to remedy the upset. Desperation only enters in when communication goes out. Think of the sessions when you have gotten desperate. Your response to the PC ebbs and flows to the degree that you could put a comm between yourself and the aberration that's bothering him and straighten it out and see the evidence of its discharge." You don't worry about a case for any other reason. When you can't seem to reach the PC or the bank with your comm, you get worried and upset. When you are upset as an auditor, see what communication you are not getting home to the PC, and you, as an auditor will feel better.

If the PC is miserable, a comm cycle is awry, but this could happen in various ways, from the PC's point of view. "Some comm cycle has begun. It hasn't been ... fully detected, ... and it hasn't been understood." That is the basis of low ARC or ARC breaks in your PCs. Even when the PC doesn't have an ARC break, realizing this point will help you understand something about your PC that you hadn't seen before. Keep on figuring out whether you are bypassing any charge. The basis of low ARC or ARC breaks is:

1. Some comm cycle has begun.

2. It hasn't been fully detected, but has been slightly detected.

3. It hasn't been understood. Actually, in any PC you are going to see an out comm cycle, because he isn't OT. The telepathic cycle is usually out. There can be the mundane result of the PC not having ever understood the command and at least faintly knowing it. The reason that it is an ARC break is that the non-understanding brings in A and R. It is the A and R factors that tend to make the C not understood. Something didn't go through.

"An incomplete comm cycle always results in BPC." You should know that that simple little outness can bring the living lightning. You should also know that the cause and effect always work in that direction. The "catastrophe" that you are handling has a simple little outness as its origin, not a complex bear.

The basic things that won't go through and get detected are A, R, and C. And the basic things that these three face are M, E, S, and T. So you have the livingness of the person, ARC vs. the material universe, or MEST. Or it is the individual vs. time. That is what keeps the A, K, and C from completing the communication cycle. There is a lie in the individual's communication with time or with time's communication with the individual.

"Bypassed charge originates as the beginning of a comm cycle" that is not wholly detected or understood. Charge is energy excited and channeled to go in a certain direction. But it never arrives, because it is not wholly detected or understood. So it always remains as BPC, then explodes in a dispersal of some sort. It does not always explode. Sometimes it just results in a downtone PC who is "not feeling so well, lately".

"We know the magic of ... the explosive nature of interpersonal relationships." Knowing these things, you should be able to handle a session better. Don't be afraid that "handling" means always doing what the PC says. Just let the PC know that you got his origination and understood it, and go ahead and do what you are doing. "You've got to be an expert in the detection of a communication that has begun. The better you are, ... the fewer ARC breaks you'll have."

The ARC break assessment covers the number of types of comm that can be started and not detected in the activity you are doing, so that you can find the correct BPC and not have to shotgun it with something like, "An earlier incident was restimulated." Deciding which list to use could be a problem. Look in the right place. "If the ARC break is in the session and you do an R3R ARC break form, you [won't] find it." Therefore, use the right list. If you don't get the BPC, you are using the wrong list. Get the right one. Just realize that deciding which is the right list could be a problem and use another list if you didn't find she ARC break. The main mistake you could make is not to be sure everything is

fine with the PC after you have "handled" the ARC break. Make sure that you are right about the BPC.

Lists "locate the type of charge bypassed, the type of comm cycle that began and was never completed.... Now it's up to you to... locate and indicate to the PC the charge. The charge is not on the list. It is in the PC.... The assessment is not the location," even though the magic is good enough so that you can often get a result just by indicating what was assessed. You only actually get a type of charge, not the charge, with the assessment. You must still locate and indicate the specific charge. If you tell the PC what you got on the assessment and he feels better, fine. Let sleeping dogs lie. But, if he doesn't feel better or if there is still charge there, find the exact charge that was bypassed. You may need another list to get it.

So there are five steps to handling BPC with an ARC break assessment:

1. Find out if there is an ARC break.

2. Assess the appropriate list.

3. Locate the exact BPC.

4. Indicate it to the PC.

5. Check whether the indication was all right with the PC. If it is a wrong date, check the one's you have gotten, or see if it is in the first or the last half of the session.

6307C25 SHSpec-290 Comm Cycle in Auditing

[Illustrations for this lecture are contained in HCOB 74Aug63 "Lecture Graphs".]

Most auditors, early on, get the idea that there are all kinds of PCs: good and bad. There are PCs who are nervier about comm breakdowns than others, but practically no PC can stand up against a good comm cycle. The difficulty an auditor has comes from his own auditing cycle and his impatience.

There are two comm cycles in the auditing comm cycle, one with the auditor at cause, one with the PC at cause. They are only connected by the fact that the auditor has calculatedly restimulated something in the PC which the PC discharges on his half of the cycle. That is the whole game of the auditing cycle.

Some auditing breaks down because the auditor is unwilling to restimulate the PC. If the PC doesn't answer the auditing question, he never gets rid of the restimulation. If the PC alter-ises, e.g. if he alter-ises the question [or if he alter-ises the data from the bank], then every restimulation gives rise to an alter-is. The cycle of acknowledgment is another little shadow cycle, a fade-out. Another shadow cycle is the auditor seeing that the PC has received the auditing command. You can tell by locking at him that he didn't get it, or that he is doing something peculiar with it. So do look at the PC to find out.

So there are really seven comm cycles in the auditing cycle: the four main ones, plus three more:

1. Observing that the PC is ready to receive the auditing command.

Failure to do this one can cause trouble, if the PC is hung up on the previous cycle. He doesn't really get the command if he wasn't ready to receive it.

2. Observing that the PC got the acknowledgment.

3. A tiny one before the acknowledgment, which is seeing whether the

PC has or hasn't said all he is going to say. If you acknowledge him before he has said all, you haven't let one line flow to its end, so the acknowledgment can't actually go through, and the lines jam. When you violate one of these comm cycles, you will get trouble, in which case you might need more cycles to unsnarl it, so the auditing cycle can occur.

There's another comm cycle inside the auditing cycle, which is between the PC and the bank. You have an effect produced by the auditing command which results in a cause, the restimulation causing the PC to outflow. It is actually two comm cycles there: PC to bank and bank to PC. Then you get PC to auditor. The latter is actually the least important of the cycles, except when it isn't being done. And it is the hardest to detect when it isn't being done.

What is mainly wrong with your auditing cycle is that you have confused some of the comm cycles within it. When you are doing a complicated action like R2H, if you are nervy on handling a basic tool like the auditing cycle, break it down and work on it while doing something simple on an easy PC. Then you will find out where it is jammed up.

There is a different auditing cycle inside the regular auditing cycle, which occurs when the PC originates. Just handle it as its own drill. It handles any origin, including the PC throwing down the cans. The pattern of cause-distance-effect is reversed, because the PC is now being cause at the start of the cycle. What the PC causes has to be understood, so there can be some little comm cycles where the auditor gets it clarified. What the auditor uses to clarify it mustn't just cause the PC to repeat himself. "Tell me some more about that," is a good approach, but whatever you use isn't rote. Once the origination has been clarified, the auditor acknowledges and can then resume the regular cycle, if the PC is ready for it. Also, at the beginning of the PC's origination cycle, the auditor should observe that the PC is about to originate and shut up and make the comm cycle of "I'm listening".

The fact that duplication is part of the comm cycle carries it over into A, R, C and U. This makes the auditing comm cycle different from the military comm cycle, which doesn't require understanding:

Military Cycle: Cause-distance-effect-compliance

Auditing Cycle: Cause-distance-effect-understanding. Hence the auditing comm cycle involves A and R too. There has to be A and R at the effect point, because of duplication, and there had better be A and R at the cause point also. So there should be ARC at both the cause point and the effect point.

The TR's handle comm cycles, from one side or another. A full auditing cycle would need a full-dress TR, above what is covered in TR's 0-4.

A and R come into TR-1. It is one thing to enunciate syllables clearly and another to have an understandable communication. R is involved; it has to be duplicatable. An accent can get in the way of duplication. It is up to the auditor to be comprehensible, from the point of view of accent, diction, and sense, since if the auditor is not comprehended by the PC, TR-1 is out and no comm cycle or auditing takes place.

Then there is the PC who doesn't want to be audited at all. Here you have to establish a comm cycle with some trick, like "Tell me why you shouldn't be audited." Or if the PC ia misemotional and the A is out, you can do an ARC break assessment in order to pick up what is awry with the comm cycles between the PC and himself, where the BPC lies.

A repetitive auditing cycle is a specialized activity. It gets you in trouble if you don't realize that there is a point beyond which you shouldn't be trying to complete the cycle. That point is an ability regained. That EP is of senior importance.

The major auditing cycle has as its EP ability regained. Junior to that is the process cycle, which, in turn, is made up of single auditing cycles, repeated as needed. So the cycles that exist in auditing are:

1. A single auditing cycle.

2. A process cycle.

3. A major auditing cycle. Indications of flatness in a process cycle are:

1. Three equal comm lags, with the PC confidently doing the process.

2. A minor cognition; a win.

3. TA flat.

4. Major cognition.

5. Ability regained.

The above EP's are given in ascending order of seniority. (1) and (2) are both absolute minimums. The first real flat point is when all the TA has been run out of a process. A major cognition takes precedence over the TA criterion. To continue over a major cognition invalidates the PC. The senior EP is ability regained, which is also the EP of a major auditing cycle.

6308C06 SHSpec-291 Auditing Comm Cycles -- Definition of an Auditor

"That mixture which is not shaken, stagnates." For that reason, we have checksheet changes. People who ask for changes in organizational structure overlook the fact that the character of this planet and its population makes it practically impossible to do anything with this planet. It takes incredible stress and planning to get anything done. On the backtrack, one ia used to operating with ease and swiftness. This planet is different.

This planet was part of a Federation, and passed out of its control due to war, etc. This federation has been called the Markab Confederacy. This sounds space-opera-ish, but if it is true, is should be stated, whether it is acceptable or not. The planets of the confederacy united, out of fragments of earlier civilizations, over the past 200,000 years, but it is not native to this galaxy. In the past 200,000 years, mental implanting has been taking place that is not native to earlier track. The Markabians have the basic problem of how to kill a thetan. The best way to hide your overts is to give someone amnesia and tell them that something else happened. That's what is going on here. Their ideal is the conformist. What they are conforming to is pretty scummy and low-toned. Their standard choice citizen is the contented wage slave. This leaves the artist, the brilliant engineer, the manager, the criminal, and the pervert all persona non grata. They are afraid of all these types, so they condemn them to perpetual amnesia, calling it being "dead forever". Then they ship them here. So on this planet, we have a minimal number of workers and a maximal number of artists, geniuses, managers, criminals, and perverts. How do you make an organization out of these dudes? They are all non-conformists. Therefore the difficulty you get in organizations with these people is alter-is.

This has led to a civilization on this planet that is totally different from the civilization that planted it here, until recently, when current western civilization started to look like the Markab Confederacy. The fact that current western civilization has the same image as the Markab Confederacy makes this civilization restimulative; it makes it look dangerous. One of the highest crimes in the Markab civilization is error in income tax. That makes matters relating to income tax very restimulative, here.

The material of the between-lives area is contained in What to Audit [A History of Man, pp. 65-66]. The Markabians have not launched a big reaction to the fact that their secrets are out, probably because they fear that a landing in force would restore everyone's memory and blow the amnesia. People get mad at governments and organizations on this planet because they are really mad at the Markabian government. Almost unbelievable force was used by the Markabians to create the amnesia. You can easily restimulate people's amnesia by giving them some data about the Markabians. It seems very unreal to them.

As an auditor, therefore, you are handling the roughest case in the universe. To rehabilitate the individual, you have to rehabilitate his knowingness. Charge on the case represents lost knowingness. As the case moves up the line, you get an odd phenomenon: the case remembers more. One kind of memory that is restored is picture memory. At an advanced state, the PC can tell the difference between a false and a genuine picture. He graduates up to simply knowing, without depending on pictures, up to a point of knowing who and where he has been, independent of cross-proof. Knowingness is slow to increase, but it does rise. Over the top of that identity-knowingness, which is still rather general, comes detailed knowingness, e.g. knowing how you got here, why you are here, and other details of the past, without pictures. That is the restoration of the beingness of the individual. It returns gradually, bit by bit, along this gradient.

What does it take to bring about such a total amnesia? A total explosion of a spaceship in his face, twice, was enough to be a little confusing to LRH. It takes far more force than that to destroy someone's memory to the point where he would have a case. The force also has to be combined with trickery: scrambling dates, giving balanced items, etc., to keep the thetan's memories scrambled.

The amount of force it took is what the auditor has to get off the case. It's easier for the auditor and the PC to confront things like unknownness than to confront force. But the force must be confronted. E.g., in running O/W, getting off critical thoughts does nothing for the case. There's something done behind it, which contains energy and must be gotten off. It is the energy contained in a done that makes it hard to confront -- harder to confront than some random think.

The mission of an auditor is the restoration of a person's awareness, which includes a restoration of his memory, his identity. What holds it down is force, used with trickery. Thus an individual gets an ARC break with force, and then becomes the effect of force. So you are handling someone who has lots of ARC breaks with beings, matter energy, space, time, location, and form. That is a PC. An auditor has to be somebody who can release this force from the PC. TA movement registers relief of force in the reactive mind. Force is being removed from the case as long as the TA is in motion. When force is aberrated by trickery, the TA hangs up until the trickery, e.g. wrong dates, is handled.

You don't always have to run a process to get the TA moving, i.e. a particular curative process. If the TA is moving, the PC will eventually go OT. Auditing in the absence of TA motion will never produce an OT. If you run the right significance off the case and get TA action, you will make an OT quicker. But running the right significances without TA won't do it, while getting TA alone, on anything, right or not, will eventually give you an OT. If might take thousands of hours, if you audited a person randomly. IA motion indicates the blowing off of encysted force, as it leaves the case. When you run the right significances, it speeds up the case, because you are running the force off early track, and you get extra charge blowing which doesn't all show up on the meter. Sometimes you will see a repetitive blowdown as a remote force area blows up.

The most fundamental method of making a TA move is not running a process. It is the basic definition of an auditor: a listener. It is up to the auditor to permit the PC to blow the mass that has been restimulated by the process, which he does by listening. His basic job is to listen, not to restimulate. We can get away with restimulating charge because we can talk to each other. The only way to get rid of reactive charge is by a communication line. That is the only method [Cf. Axiom 51]. The auditor only gets hit by the charge if he stops it from flowing across the comm line. All therapies from time immemorial have consisted of listening. But what makes auditing different is the TA action which the auditor produces by restimulating charge and letting the PC blow the restimulated charge.

The auditor gives the command. It crosses the distance and hits the bank square in a confrontable aberrated area. The bank now causes an effect on the PC. The PC now becomes cause as he tells the auditor about it, answering the question. The PC gains some knowingness, when he observes what happens when the command reaches him.

Additionally, life is always giving commands to the PC and restimulating all sorts of charge. As the PC tells you about his between-sessions activities, with or without since-mid-ruds, TA occurs as he gets that restimulation communicated to you.

This shows that the line from the PC to the auditor is a little senior to and more important than the auditor's line to the PC. In the former line, you will find all auditing failures, providing any process at all has been run. If the case was loused up by auditing, we inspect the TA in judging a particular process. If there was TA on the process, the process was OK, as far as getting the cause-distance effect of the PC to the auditor goes.

When that line goes out, the restimulation flows back to hit the PC. Where else can it go? You see the first symptom of that line going out in the PC's dirty needle. The auditor isn't listening. He is doing something to shut the PC up. The line with the PC at cause may take many times as long as the one from auditor to PC, as the PC examines something, undoes identification, gets force off, and gains knowingness. The more TA action you get, the more positive the PC sounds, even in just one auditing cycle. A TA blowdown accompanies returning knowingness on the part of the PC.

The names of these main lines in the auditing cycle are the what's-it line (from auditor to PC) and the itsa line (from PC to auditor). The tone arm follows a pattern: it goes up on a what's-it (possibly the reverse happens on a low-TA case), and it comes down on an itsa. A high TA shows you restimulated but unresolved charge. When charge flows across the comm line, it as-ises and the TA moves down.

Knowing scientology, if you were in the Galactic Confederation now, you would be enthroned. You could fix up all the messed-up OT's, as long as you could listen. In the confederation, your PCs

Wouldn't have all the enforced amnesia you have to get rid of with an earth PC. It would be like the difference between auditing an earth case and an ant.

The progression of events that occur when an itsa line goes out and is not restored is the following:

1. Dirty needle.

2. Stuck TA.

3. ARC break. The itsa line is the most fruitful source of BPC: charge restimulated and not allowed to flow out. There are no ARC breaky PCs. There are only auditors who don't listen.

The only crime you can commit by letting the PC talk is to do it without getting TA action. What about the PC who is just talking motivators? Well, they don't get TA from it. Besides, someone who is just motivating is already in an ARC break. So you should find the BPC so that the itsa line, which is the the same as just talk, can get in again. So let the PC talk, as long as you are getting TA action and no longer. Don't acknowledge; just look intelligent and nod if the PC looks brighter at you. This is case Level 2 [See above, for a description of this level.] auditing, by the way, if the PC is telling you all about the track. Lower down the case levels, you have to direct the PC's attention more.

6308C07 SHSpec-292 R2H Fundamentals

R2H is one of the most satisfying processes you have ever run. [For a description of R2H, see HCOB 25Jun63 "Routine 2H: ARC Breaks by Assessment] It takes apart ARC breaks by assessment. However, it falls apart with inexpert handling. It is different from any process we have ever had in dianetics and scientology. It has great power. It will run engrams and secondaries and may be senior to R3R. The only thing it won't run is a GPM, which must be run with R3M and R3N. R3M gets you the patterns of wildcat engrams. R3M is how you got the GPM patterns in the first case. In R3M, don't ask the criss-cross question on oppose. I would ask, "What does the next pair consist of?" or "Give me the oppterm of the third pair?", then "What would oppose that?" R3N presupposes that you have the reliable items. On some PC's, if they don't random list, you don't get TA. Random listing gets off the locks, so you must still do this, even if you have the item. The main thing that causes the TA to rise and stick in R3N is wrong date or wrong GPM pattern. A cut itsa line will, additionally, send the TA up and stick it.

A GPM is hard to date and floats on the track, because its purpose was to foul up time. The opposing items firing at each other sound like time to the PC. The GPM floats in time and produces a no-change situation. This makes it perilously easy to misdate one. Also, there is an implant basic to the Helatrobus implants but much earlier, which looks the same as the Helatrobus implant. It is at about trillions-4 (1048>s) years ago. It is far more aberrative than the Helatrobus implants. That ia the one that they put on the screens in the between-lives area. [See A History of Man, pp. 65-66.] GPM's are the only things that need to be audited with a special technique.

R2H has the potential for running whole-track engrams and secondaries better than R3R, by taking all the BPC out of them and letting them snap back to where they should be on the track. We are not actually trying to erase everybody's time track in toto. We are trying to take out of the time track the things that prevent the PC from having his pictures. We are trying to pull the PC's havingness up to the point where he doesn't need pictures in order to know who he is. If you can take the charge off of his unconfrontable pictures, pictures that deny the knowledge of the track to him, he can have pictures or not, as he chooses.

The main pictures that louse things up are GPM's. However, because the between-lives implant has the target of invalidating all your pictures, restimulating implants, and wiping out identity and memory, many people who are upset about auditing might think that you are trying to do this. Telling the PC that you are going to erase his time track will, therefore, cause an overwhelm.

LRH was thinking about outer space tactics and figured that lack of comm is the main trouble. He speculated about entering societies from within, with communication and wondered what would happen if we put up a Markab headquarters, complete with flag, etc. They, when they arrive, they would think we are still loyal, etc. But the reaction of the earth's population to the symbols could be rather wild. The point is that when you tell the PC that you are going to erase his time track he goes

into a propitiative anaten, because that is what has been done. However, if he had heard that you were going to return him his pictures, he would feel very different. Pictures, if inimical, can be disowned. The PC's real trouble is the pictures that keep him from seeing his pictures. Of course, they are his pictures too, but he disowns them. You are only trying to pick out and handle pictures that bar other pictures. When you have done this, you will wind up with a case Level 2 [See p. 414, above], with all his pictures. Then you can get at the automatic mechanism of picture-making and place it under the PC's determinism, whereupon you have got an OT. [Level 1. See above.]

There is an interesting point that can occur in auditing, where the PC may disown the time track and just say, "Well, I don't know who I am, but I am." From there on, you can have the track back, with knowingness.

You could go at this another way. Instead of erasing pictures, bring up the PC's confront on pictures to the point where he could face the hostile ones and understand them without flinching or misowning them. This is comparable to the old exteriorization approach, except that it gets the PC to confront his pictures. R2H, well run, can give the PC greater ownership of pictures, and it makes the pictures better and prettier.

Life and beingness consist of potentials and abilities -- not things, but the ability or potential to have A, R, and C. "Degree of livingness is measured by ARC: how much [ARC] is a guy capable of?" And degree of ARC is measured by the amount of livingness a person is capable of. Think of it as potential for having affinity.

What is ARC ARC with? With other beings. Usually, communication with other beings goes out through MEST, i.e. it uses MEST vias. One usually has ARC with other beings through MEST. One can, however, communicate telepathically even without high ARC, in some civilizations. There are such things as telepathic vocotypers. Telepathy is a hard-hitting force. It can pick up the thoughts or fears of a thetan down the line who is also being subjected to implanting. ARC can also go "way above telepathy. Below a certain level, ARC depends on MEST for its communication medium. ARC only really gets important after one drops away from telepathic communication, because it is so present before then that no one thinks of it. When you introduce MEST into comm lines, ARC becomes the measure of life.

So one could be in ARC with thetans, matter, energy, space, time, form, or location. Those are the principal things to be in ARC with. [See Fig. 16] The ARC an individual has expresses the degree to which he can be at cause over thetans, matter, energy, space, time, form, and location. The potential of ARC of the individual gives the degree to which he can be at cause over the things of life. The less life he has, the less he is. As a thetan gets more and more solid, he can have less and less ARC, because he must have gone out of ARC with MEST, form and location, or it wouldn't be piled on him without his choice. So he must have had ARC breaks with these things. But how could he, without having ARC breaks with other thetans? It is probable that he did have ARC breaks with other thetans. And it was having ARC breaks with other thetans that led him, normally, to have ARC breaks with MEST, form, and location. Not necessarily, but normally. The more the ARC, the more direct the communication. The less the ARC, the more you need MEST to get across a communication. So as the thetan rises up the line, he rises back up to direct communication, direct reality, and direct affinity with other beings. When you drop away from telepathy, you enter MEST into the line, and ARC becomes subordinate to MEST. The less the ARC, the more you need MEST to get across a communication. Then you get very low, where a thetan communicates to MEST, not just through it.

Man is not mud. But a man who wasn't alive at all would think muddily and reach mud-like, confused conclusions. That is the condition of other mental "sciences" today. Their adherents are so far away from other beings that they are talking to MEST, not through it. This is like the kid beating his red wagon, or cussing MEST objects. This situation is different from investing MEST with life and other-determining it, which is on another harmonic. You are perfectly capable of mocking up a living being or investing matter with life and then other-determining it and having it walk around and talk. This is a potential discussed in Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science [Apparently in the form of a discussion of installing demon circuits in the mind. See pp. 32, 60-617. But what if you felt that another living being is no more capable than a shoe? What if you divested a living being of life? That is how far south people have gone.

ARC breaks with thetans, matter, energy, space, time, form, and location bring about the dwindling spiral of decreased ARC. One believes that it is deteriorated, but it never really deteriorates. R2H

forecasts that by clearing up a person's ARC breaks. The auditor returns to the PC his ARC potential. By cleaning up ARC breaks with MEST things, you can clean up ARC breaks with pictures of those things in the reactive mind. Hence the reactive mind becomes more accessible and confrontable, since thetans, matter, energy, space, time, form, and location are what the pictures in the bank are images of. Thus, in auditing, one clears up ARC breaks with things in pictures that the PC cannot confront in his reactive mind. Therefore, the bank becomes more confrontable, and it opens up. The basic concept of R2H is that the reactive mind is a reservoir of ARC breaks.

Space: Space is the cure for no-confront. The button of the bank is "no space", so that it is right on top of you.

Time: You get an apparent absence of time in the reactive bank, in the presence of a totality of time. You get a nothing where a something is and a something where a nothing is. That's what makes the bank reactive: instantaneous response, regardless of when the response was laid in.

Form: This relates to aesthetic taste. The PC's reactive mind has a close-up stockpile of those forms that the PC has detested the most.

Location: A = A = A. An example is running an Australian incident as being in England. Or, you are poking around planets that are light-years away, without knowing it. When you run such things, they may spring back to their proper locations.

The problem is identification or disassociation. "Disassociation is the reverse of identification. Two things which should be seen to be similar are seen to be madly different." R2H helps the PC to differentiate all the identifications of thetans, MEST, forms, and locations that he is afflicted with. You could also run into disassociation, if you really put in the itsa line. The PC will be giving you all the disassociations he runs into, as he looks over whatever it takes to answer your question. He should see a similarity between your question and his answer, but he doesn't, at first, so you will get non-sequitur responses. These are things that are on the PC's mind, as he tries to answer the question. Hence, to get them off his mind, he says them. The thing to do here is to wait until the disassociation is run out. Eventually, the PC will answer the question.

Disassociation is an inversion of identification, which also gives an inversion of ARC. You get a restimulation factor that works this way:

1. The PC knew a girl with pink hair.

2. Therefore girls with pink hair aren't to be trusted.

3. Therefore nothing pink must be trusted.

4. The PC knows a fellow named "Pink" who brushes his teeth, so he had better not brush his teeth any more. Below disassociation, you go into an inversion, and you get more identifications. At lower levels, good comm is shooting people. ARC doesn't just decline ; it inverts, and then inverts again. There is no bottom, but odd things happen on the way down. Beingnesses, forms, and memory can die, but not the individual. There is some method of communication all the way down, because ARC never ceases. You can get into weird versions of reach and withdraw. For instance, you have to go through the anger band.

So if you can improve C, R, or A, you can keep raising the triangle by running ARC breaks, as in R2H. The main limit of the process is the limit of communication of the command, "Recall an ARC break," but that can be communicated with a little work, if need be. Furthermore, it is therapeutic to someone just to comprehend the definition of "ARC break".

You don't care what the PC is ARC broken with. In GPM's, you may get ARC breaks with MEST for obeying implanters and with implanters for debasing MEST to this use. It is an up-scale case that recognizes a real ARC break with MEST. It all works out if you just follow the formal structure of R2H:

1. Ask for an ARC break.

2. Get what it was.

3. Get where it was.

4. Get when it was.

5. Do an assessment, cleaning every line as it reads.

6. Work the ARC break over until the PC feels fine about it and it no longer reads.

Take what the PC gives you. Don't probe. The PC may get into trouble getting "when". You use your meter to help out only when the PC is in despair about the time and has utterly given up. Then just tell him what you have seen reading. That is your meter-dating. You can watch the meter while the PC gives possible dates.

Repair of R2H:

1. When the TA is hung up, you have a wrong date, and you had better find it.

2. You can also get in big mid-ruds on the session or the process, because the PC has recalled ARC breaks that he has suppressed and that he hasn't told the auditor.

3. The PC can ARC break in the session because of an ARC break in the past.

4. You may have missed a read on the assessment, so you don't have the right BPC.

When you get a read on a line of the R2H assessment, be sure to take it up with the PC by getting the PC to tell you more specific data about the reading line. E.g. on "Had some emotion been rejected?", you must find out what emotion was rejected. Don't just indicate the generality to the PC, since that won't handle the ARC break. It is not the correct BPC. If this doesn't work, then one of the factors listed above under "repairs is out. If the PC protests a line, fine. Don't shove it down his throat, but come back to it later. It just wasn't ready to be answered. You should get BD's on finding the correct BPC. If you don't get BD's with running ARC breaks, you are going to have trouble with future ARC breaks. You must find the BPC. Getting one doesn't necessarily mean the ARC break is fully cleaned up, so check with the PC and notice the meter, after you have gotten one BD. You ask the PC how he feels about the ARC break and watch the meter like a hawk. If the meter is clean and the PC ia OK now, don't go on, or you will be after a withhold of nothing, and you will create an ARC break. Do not keep cleaning a clean. If the ARC break isn't clean, continue running it.

It doesn't matter how many ARC breaks you handle per session. What matters is how much TA you get. Don't leave an ARC break until it reads smooth as glass. If an ARC break doesn't blow down, you are asking for future trouble, because you have bypassed some charge without cleaning it up. The mechanism that you are operating on is that the incident will blow if the mis-aligned or bypassed charge is knocked out, and that ARC breaks are caused by bypassed charge. If you find the BPC, there won't be an ARC break, and the PC's bank will straighten out. Clearing an ARC break depends on itsa. The slippiness of the process of running an ARC break depends on knowing when to leave it and letting the PC get charge off with itsa. You could theoretically get the PC all the way to OT with this, just by getting the charge off.

6308C08 SHSpec-293 R2H Assessment

The original meaning of the symbol "8" has to do with money. It represents two money bags, one on top of the other.

How can you evolve a List 1 for R2H? This has really taken some doing. R2H is a process with a new rationale. It is the case Level 2 process [See above, for a description of Level 2]. It is not just headed at OT, but it would give you free needles as a clear waystop, in many cases. You would get key-out phenomena that would give you the straightened-out track that would look very like case Level 2. It is really only a key-out, but it would have the attributes of clear. If you combined it with R3N, when necessary, to get GPM's out of the way, it would take you to case Level 1.

A recent policy letter [30Jul63 "Current Planning"] gave a series of scientology levels.

Scn 1: P.E. level scientology.

Scn 2: Healing; care of the body. Contains HPA/HCA.

Scn 3: Advanced auditing and academy courses, leading up to the phenomenon of clear.

Scn 4: Research towards OT. This contains the present material: R2H, R3R, R3N.

Scn 5: Social, political, and organizational scientology, or what an OT does about it.

The various levels compare with the classifications of auditors, which is convenient. It puts more order into the subject and its materials:

Class 1: He can listen.

Class 2: He can do CCH's, run repetitive processes, or cure something.

Class 3: He can make a better human being.

Class 4: He can make an OT.

Class 5: He can make a sane universe.

R2H can be used at scientology Levels 2, 3, and 4. It is phenomenal to have a process that can be used at so many levels. It would be putting a lot of stress on the theory of ARC, to ask of R2H that it reach into Level 4, and some holes in what we knew of ARC showed up. R2H turns out to be inadequate for certain kinds of work.

The only frailty of R2H, given an auditor who listens, and a meter that reacts, is in the list used. If one specific type of charge was missing from a list and you used that list on all ARC breaks, that specific type of charge would tend to charge up on the case. It would be restimulated and encysted. Eventually, it would gum up the track and overwhelm the PC. So the weak point of R2H is the embraciveness of the list used. LRH cooked up all sorts of fancy systems and finally hit on the formula that would give an embracive list. It is very simple, like the itsa line.   The full derivation formula is as follows: The CDEI scale has an upper and a lower band which were previously missing. "Known" and "unknown" go above CDEI. You never get curious about something you know about, so knowingness must have disintegrated down to unknownesses. Therefore, things must be unknown before you enter CDEI at all. In the Logics, we have had the datum, "An unknown can cause a confusion," so that is how it fits in. [Actually, this is not in the Logics. Dianetic Axioms 105: "An unknown datum can produce data of plus or minus randomity." and 107: "Data of plus or minus randomity depends for its confusion on former plus or minus randomity or absent data." may be relevant, here.] The "know" at the top of this expanded CDEI scale is below "not-know", the First Postulate.[See p. 14, above. The "know" on this expanded CDEI scale is evidently equivalent to "know about", the Second postulate. "Unknow" on this scale, then, is evidently equivalent to "forget", the Third Postulate.] "Unknow" is not the same as "not-know". You never get curious about something you know about, so "unknow" would have to intervene between "know" and "curious about", on this scale. Below CDEI, there is a lower band: nothing, an absence, nothing to inhibit. That is the "black panther" mechanism of "ignore it". Man routinely does nothing about things.

Below that, there is one more level: falsify. Falsifying puts something else there, so that now you can get the whole scale again on an inversion. The "false" at the bottom of one scale becomes the "known" at the top of the lower inversion scale. So there is a known falseness, then unknown falseness, then curious about the falseness, etc.. all the way down. So you get perversions of perversions, falsifications of falsifications, as you descend into lower and lower inversions of the scale. So, in this universe, one probably never sees "know", but always a form of "false". Finally, you get modern science, based on the false premise that Man is mud.

The pure CDEI scale wouldn't handle engrams because it was incomplete and didn't invert the way the full scale does. The pure CDEI scale still shows only one band, say 2.0-1.0, of the tone scale, whereas every time you go through one cycle of this expanded CDEI scale, you drop 7.0 on the tone scale.

Now you can look at ARC for an incident and ARC for an earlier incident. To each level of the expanded CDEI scale we also add "missed withhold", and all this dives you the List 1, containing "the totality of all possible combinations of charge on an ARC break," all possible levels that will have all possible reactions for everybody. So, combining them, you've got attitude, reality, communication, and missed withhold on each of the eight questions, plus all these on earlier incidents, giving you a total List 1 with 64 questions. That is how you would evolve List 1 if you were off in the boondocks.

You could use this schema by assessing the CDEI scale on the incident first, then assessing the level with A, R, C, and missed withhold. The current List 1 is really the inhibit scale. You wouldn't have to put in KUCDEIOF on a missed withhold. On lower level cases, some on the levels of the expanded CDEI scale are null anyway. You can eliminate K, U, C, D, E, and 0, leaving you with I and F as the most potent sources of ARC breaks, because of the low case level with which you are dealing. So for beginning cases, this would leave a 16 question list. As you go upscale, you find, after awhile, that your list falls short, so that you have to add E (as "too much"). Someone at case Level 2 would need a still more expanded list. Don't have anything missing on List 1. The Dale Carnegie course is a course in the creation of and maintenance of false realities. Psychiatry isn't even up to this. Lower case levels probably need "emotion" on the scale, as well as "attitude", representing affinity, in order for it to communicate to the PC. After all, the whole know-to-mystery scale can go under "affinity".

You might wonder why we don't expand this schema to include "overt". The answer is that O/W mushes engrams and ruins pictures. Overts and prepcheck buttons ruin the energy structure of an engram, because of GPM's, etc. The buttons are too powerful and fundamental. It takes a certain amount of aberration to hold the picture together ao that you can run it. But the buttons of ARC and CDEI only strip charge out of the engrams and make pictures better. Big mid-ruds are OK for use on the physical universe, as in ruds, because the physical universe won't unmock easily, at lower case levels. However, perhaps when the PC gets up the line into case Level 1, using big mid-ruds on the physical universe would be dangerous too! We don't want the list to be too beefed up so that it mushes things up too much. That would defeat the purposes of R2H.

The heaviest button on the list turns out to be "falsity". That is what the thetan objects to most, and it is also what he feels guiltiest about. Falsity aberrates because it destroys trust. It is part of every theta trap, and it accounts for lots of ARC breaks with MEST.

The way to get the most TA out of a list would be to go down the list, preassessing it then take the biggest read and have the PC explain and itsa about it [Method 5]. Sometimes when you use this method, some PCs will drag the BPC that got restimulated on an earlier part of the assessment on through the rest of the list with him. Such PCs would do better being cleaned up level by level, as you go along [Method 3]. But if you do it that way, the major charge that would give you a BD has been bled of charge to the point that this major charge won't read much on the list. You should therefore take any change of characteristic as a read. You get that difficulty in exchange for no dirty needle. The best solution might be a preassessment that narrows the search. Too abbreviated a list leaves you with BPC and a high TA.

Charge moves the time wrong in an incident. The incident is charged, say, because of something that happened in 1912, but the incident is in 1920. You could miss this, leaving BPC and eventually getting a stuck high TA, from the wrong date.

A process that would be a TA pump would be: "Recall a worry. What was it about?" From this you get a TA pump consisting of an alternating what's-it and itsa. This is not particularly therapeutic. One other point: What if you had a PC who got TA but got no better? His failure to get better would be an apparency. Eventually, he would go OT, but it could take thousands of years. However, you also have to run the right significances. You also have to complete cycles. No case change may result from shifting processes on the PC, that you were getting TA on. With this happening, the case could still get better, but uncomfortably. Also, you can restimulate things on a case that don't get handled for some time. For instance, you could, early on, get screen-restimulated engrams that could not be run out right away. This would be an unnecessary restimulation of charge.

Getting better is not how the PC feels, but whether he is getting more knowingness and more ability. Also, current state is not a measure of getting better. For instance, a person may have had a good memory and awareness level, and had it knocked out in the last between-lives. This, then, would be a temporary condition. You have to review a case over at least thirty days to know what the true state of affairs is.

6308C14 SHSpec-294 Auditing Tips

1. Audit to a gain, for a result.

2   The PC is always right.

3. The significance is less important than the TA action.

4. "TA action on the right significance brings about faster clearing."

5. "The right significance and no TA action equals no case gain."

6. "Keep the itsa line in."

7. "Get TA action."

8. When training an auditor, get him to figure out how many ways you can cut an itsa line. "The smoothest auditing is the auditing which least cuts the itsa line." "Auditor" means "listener".

9. "It takes a lie to hold aberration in place."

10. Serious aberration surrenders easily. "It's the mediocre-type aberration that takes the long haul."

11. The primary difference between scientology and psychiatry is that psychiatry is authoritarian and tells the person what is wrong with him, often introducing a new lie. Scientology finds out what is wrong with the person from the person, and then knows more about it than the person, but listens anyway.

12. "Listening is the badge of Superior knowledge. He who has privileged to listen." Only he who has no superior knowledge talks all the time.

With this data, you could evolve all of scientology.

Don't discount the knowledge of scientology, even though you don't use it to evaluate for the PC. If a PC feels unreal about having lived for, say, 30 trillion years, let him go through the unreality and run it out. He will natter about how unreal it is. He has never talked about an unreality before. But in the process of talking about it, he is raising his ARC with whatever it is, albeit slowly. A PC has two kinds of talk: theta talk and entheta talk. Auditing consists of two actions, corresponding to these two kinds of talk:

1. Listening, with TA action. This is getting theta talk out of the PC, keeping the itsa line in. It is theta the PC is generating that is blowing his bank apart.

2. Locating, e.g. by assessment, trapped charge. "Entheta talk is handled by locating the impeded charge of theta which is barriered in the bank: BPC." This is the first step of putting in the itsa line: Find what trapped charge is trying to get loose.

The PC is talking up out of the bank. He has been protesting cut communication lines, unrealities, and lack of affinity. Charge has been ticked and missed, and the PC will go on nattering unless the auditor locates and indicates the charge.

What about talking havingness down? This only occurs when it is entheta talk. The whole phenomenon of havingness is raising ARC with the environment. If the PC is cutting his ARC with the environment, his havingness will drop.

How many ways can you cut an itsa line? It would be beneficial to an auditor in training to give you all the ways he can think of it, with an example of each, and how to prevent or remedy it. There are three parts to a successful session:

1. Get the PC in session, i.e. interested in his own case and talking about it.

2. Keep the itsa line in, so that you get maximal TA action.

3. Knock out the significances necessary to resolve the case fastest. The above would define the super-skilled auditor. You would get lower classes of auditors as you cut out parts of this, until you end up at the bottom with a Book Auditor whose skill is just to listen to the PC talk about his case, with no idea of TA or right significance.

When training auditors, pound one significance home at a time. Don't get complicated, and you will win. For instance, on a co-audit, just keep the PC talking about himself. Don't worry about repeating the command or acknowledging, etc. All you want is the PC telling the auditor about his troubles. You can see improvements if the PC looks brighter and talks better, i.e. if he shows increased ARC.

As you move the auditor's skill up to using a meter, you want to get TA motion. Keeping the TA moving is the deepest problem in auditing, at present. This can get complex. The reason a TA stops is time. The type of incident that is the most TA-stopping is the GPM, especially after it has been redated, cross-dated, or grouped in one of the between-lives screens, and after it has been mislocated. If there were no GPM, probably nobody could group a bank. The GPM gets pinned down in the between-lives screens and TA stops. It is a time-stopper because it floats in time and appears instantaneous. The auditing action that stops TA motion is wrong date. It tends to group incidents. If the incident is 3D visio and stays in the same place, as you run it, the date is OK. If a person is running different incidents at once, he has a wrong date. If you wrong-date a GYM, it is grim. TA stops as if hit by a truck. It is possible to date a GPM, but the reads on dates are tiny because it is a GPM, and it is very rough to date it. After you have dated a GPM, the date is as valid as you get TA. If TA packs up, the GPM is very likely to have been misdated. You could find that you have to redate a GPM when the PC gets off enough charge to spot that the first date was a screen date. Your new date could still be only temporarily right. You could go for seven sessions, getting it dated, which could be very fine if you kept the itsa line in and let the PC help you.

Most of the track you see is real track, but it is often invalidated. "False track" is nothing, because there really is no false track. There are false pictures, but "false track" is just the dub-in someone has put over his actual pictures. If you invalidate someone's track hard enough and hit him hard enough, he puts dub-in over the top of the picture, which looks like the original except that it has a little film over it. As you audit it, the film comes off and he sees the original picture. The dub-in is not very different from his own track, actually. The unreality the PC gets about the picture is the force and invalidation that has been laid in. If you hit someone hard enough, things get unreal, down to unconsciousness. Unconsciousness is just a total unreality. So there are also ARC break phenomena, which prevent the meter from reading well. That is one reason why the meter reads so little on GPM's. They are full of ARC brokenness. But if you just keep trying to date the GPM and don't cut the itsa line, you will get TA. Having the itsa line in and blowing charge will increase the PC's reality on the incident to the point where the date is more and more real. Bundles of facsimiles will start to come apart. If you just keep chewing at a GPM in this way, chewing at its date, its pattern, etc., it will suddenly be there so clearly that you will wonder how you ever missed it. You are getting enough charge off so that he can see it. Keeping the itsa line in while dating is very helpful but hard to do at times. Let the PC give you anything he can tell you about the date. Get all the TA out of it first, and only go to the meter when the PC throws in the sponge. Then work it over, and when it is all hopeless with the meter, talk from the PC takes over. Keep at it, persevere, and relax. It might take up to seven sessions to get the date. The stable datum is that if you keep chewing away and trying to find it, suddenly enough charge will disappear so it all folds up and you get it. Just keep him talking, and he will come up with it. But the more you ask the meter for the data, the less you will win. You can kill TA by evaluating, because the itsa line is being put in for him. Don't put in the itsa line for the PC.

The meter gives you a preview of coming attractions. A meter reads at a deeper level of awareness than the PC. When some charge is blown, the PC will now see what the meter "saw" awhile earlier. You say what's-it and the PC says itsa. This is auditing. But if the PC says what's-it and you use the meter to say itsa, the TA folds up. This will occur if you create a meter-dependency. It is better, if you must tell the PC what the meter says, to present it as a question. If you put in the what's-it and get itsa from the meter, you will get no TA action. If you have a PC demanding information, you can help him out. It is more desirable to use the meter than to have the PC quit. Sometimes you have to snap in the itsa line. Try to get the PC certain before using the meter. Then you may use the meter, but get the PC's agreement first, as an itsa, e.g. concerning the date. You can work back and forth with the PC and the meter, using the meter to jog the what's-it, e.g. to get the order of magnitude, then ask the PC if he gets anything, let him find it. If he asks, "Does that read?", see if you can get him to say, "Itsa," e.g. by asking, "Does it seem right to you?" Then, when he has said, "Itsa," you can confirm it with, "That reads."

One way to cut an itsa line is by continually asking for more than the PC can give. For instance, the PC says proudly, "I've got a picture of some mountains." The auditor says, "What kind of mountains? Are there any people?" Or when the PC says, "I just can't find the date. I don't have a clue," the auditor says, "Well? Come on! What is it?" This stretches an itsa line beyond its ability to stretch. The situation is that you have bled off all the restimulation that was available. So stir up a little more by using the meter on one step or so of dating. The PC easily invalidates his own reality and ability to know a date. Don't, above all, use the meter to invalidate him. It is better to leave the charge on something than to ARC break the PC about it. If he gives you a date and asks for meter confirmation, and there is no read, make it as OK as possible. For instance, you could say, "Well, I didn't see one there. It doesn't say anything right now on that," Use your meter to give him the what's-it line and coax the itsa line. At last resort, all you have is your meter, like when there is a howling ARC break and the PC isn't talking or thinking. That applies to sessions where the PC is out of comm. You can cut an itsa line to ribbons with ARC break assessments, as the drop of a hat. The value of the assessment is when all else has failed, because the most operating thing you have around you is the PC.

The problem of how you discharge a GPM without cutting the itsa line is a tricky one. What if he is going over one pair of items and the next pair comes up and he wants to go on? If you leave bypassed charge on the items you are doing, he will ARC break. One solution is to write down the new pair, acknowledge them, and then clean up the old pair.

The what's-it line raises TA; the itsa lowers it. The solution of mystery is the resolution of the case and the restoration of TA motion. The PC is stuck on a what's-it for which he has no itsa, when the TA quits. The PC sometimes has his own what's-its. He forgets the what's-it you gave him and never gives the itsa, so you get a high TA. PC's do this all the time, especially during a break. Hence you could ask, "Is there anything your attention is on?" or "Did you speculate about anything during the break?" The funny thing is that as-ising what's-its doesn't give you auditing. You can't as-is what's-its. You could ask, "Get the idea of questioning things," repetitively. This would give you a high TA. The bank is composed of a cure to the problem or puzzle. The reason that the puzzle is hung up is that there is something in it that was a cure. Cures brought about problems. To as-is problems, you have to pick up the cure, which is the itsa. The problem was the what's-it; the cure is the itsa. So you announce the confusion, the PC gives you the stable datum, and you get a restoration of balance. It blows off. Two-way comm blows all the locks off of engrams. For instance, if the PC says that he has a big PTP, you could ask when he became aware of it, what solutions he has had for it etc. So you need to find the what's-it and the itsa. A problem is, in microcosm, a GPM. You could ask, "What have you been puzzled about?/ What answers might there have been to it?" Auditing questions must balance between announcing the puzzle and asking for the cure.

6308C15 SHSpec-295 The Tone Arm

A meter that only had a tone arm would be useful to teach auditors to keep the tone arm moving. It should have the same numbers. It should probably also have a one-handed electrode. It should be very small and rugged. Ideally, it should be able to go "through the bottom" with no stop. You could hang it on the PC with a belt and keep him on it for CCH's. It would show discharge of charge.

The minimum TA you should get is 0.25 divisions per twenty minutes (0.75divisions per hour). A small amount of TA is enough for healing. A needle blow-off is enough. R3T or R2T consist of putting in the itsa line and dating. Even 0.1 division per twenty minutes is enough to blow a somatic. That is enough for healing, but not enough to make the PC feel better as a result of auditing. This explains the oddity that dianetics heals chronic somatics, with the PC not realizing that auditing had done anything. You would heal the illness, but the person still doesn't believe in dianetics. You haven't helped the person. That was what drove us out of healing, not the medicos. Auditors found it frustrating.

Without understanding the TA, it is doubtful if the auditor will ever be able to predict his result. If you know about the TA, you will know that if the PC got no TA in a session:

1. He is liable to throw the auditor a curve at the end of the session.

2. He is liable to have some sort of upset within twenty-four hours.

3. You have restimulated charge, because all auditing restimulates charge.

These phenomena are not inevitable. The reason O/W is not being stressed is that not all auditors seem able to restimulate overts. They accept critical thoughts and motivators and miss all the PC's withholds. Any auditing that requires extraordinary targeting and restimulation becomes more difficult to do. A difficult part of auditing is in selecting the significances of restimulation which the auditor must engage in with the PC. The degree of restimulation restimulated in the significance becomes an even greater level of skill, e.g. the question of how much GPM you have to restimulate to get the GPM run. The skillful auditor restimulates only the number of items he wants to run. The less skilled the auditor, the more items and GPM's he restimulates in order to get one pair to run. The whatsit line regulates restimulation. On the whatsit line you should:

1. Know what you are going for.

2. Know what you have to get to.

3. Have a heart, and don't over-restimulate.

4. Avoid Q and A.

Auditing works by restimulation and blowing of charge. You can blow a charge on an early incident of a chain and have the later charge blow off without registering on the meter. That speeds things up. If you don't put in the itsa line and let the charge blow off, the PC stacks it up and ARC breaks, etc., etc. Not restimulating charge at all or restimulating too little charge equally result in no-auditing. This will give an ARC break because the expectation of auditing not fulfilled will itself bleed charge, which is then bypassed and will blow up. Restimulating too little charge or no charge is worse than restimulating too much charge. For instance, you will get in bad trouble if you fail to run the PC through an engram twice because he is in pain.

Incidently, a thetan in good shape probably enjoyed pain. You can pick this up by asking the PC to "Waste some pain," repetitively. He will cognite that he can have it. Sadism isn't peculiar. It is a lower harmonic of an actual fact: any sensation is better than no sensation. Anything is better than nothing. That is different from only being able to enjoy pain. As a thetan goes upscale, he can stand more effect.

Most newspaper reporters are unauditable. If you try to audit them, all you get is a lot of missed withholds. The reporter's attention is all "out there" He has no attention on his case. This guy has a lot of ARC breaks. He is dramatizing overts.

Indicating BPC gives the PC control over his charge.

When you run a circuit with no charge on it, it gets a sponge-like character. Then it starts picking up charge, whether you want it to or not, out of the intention that auditing will occur. It will still bleed charge out of the bank, and the PC will still ARC break.

TA measures the adequacy of restimulation. It shows that an adequate amount of charge is being restimulated and that it is adequately dispelled with the itsa line. There is really miles of margin for error on either side of the ideal amount of restimulation, where you will still get TA and case gain. You can have the PC swamped and still get TA, or you can be running the PC pretty shallow and still get TA. There is a lot of tolerance. Too much or too little restimulation, beyond this margin of error, causes cessation of TA. The meter doesn't tell you if you are getting too much or too little restimulation. Most standard processing is strong enough that you are not restimulating too little charge. Auditors therefore don't worry much, as long as there is some TA motion. Just doing any auditing at all guarantees some restimulation. What you are auditing regulates how much charge you are restimulating. Using upper-level processes, you are only going to err by getting over-restimulation, since Niagaras of charge are available. If you are going through GPM's without getting TA, it is not because there is too little restimulation. It is over-restimulation.

If there is too much charge, the PC shuts it down and the TA locks up. You can say that it is unreal to the PC, but unreality consists of:

1. Force: uncoordinated, raw force.

2. Invalidation.

3. Disagreement (on the thought level). So to say that something is too unreal to the PC is to say that there is too much charge on it. The auditor's problem is delicately to put the whatsit line in the right place so as to bleed off charge where the PC can confront it. If the discharge line gets overloaded, the PC will explode in an ARC break. The problem of the auditor, therefore, is not how to restimulate more charge. It is not the problem of how to empty the Atlantic ocean but how to bleed a few drops off of it. The PC may beg you for a one-shot clear process. Here you see the working of the effect scale. What the PC needs is some small effect, some line to bleed charge that is small enough not to be dangerous. He is very careful, because everything is a live wire.

If you run any PC at too high a level, it can become too much for his body, while still being OK for continuing to get TA. E.g. a person with cancer is in an almost continuous ARC break. However, if you go above the charge tolerance, then that's it for the TA.

[LRH comments on Wilhelm Reich's character armor.] Wilhelm Reich had an esoteric form of charge that he called "orgone". This sort of charge was thought to be involved in the buildup of arthritic deposits. Charge is also what caused things to break around Jung, and it is what gives people odd somatics, acute or chronic. Acute charge destimulates in three to ten days. If it keeps on being restimulated, with no opportunity to be destimulated or bled off, one gets chronic somatics. Even then it takes periodic restimulation at the end of each lifetime to keep a thetan as unaware and charged up as he is. There is a preparation series of GPM's that have thirty to forty wrong dates apiece, with a command to return, sandwiched between each of about eighty GPM's. The goals make life the opposite terminal. They are all derogatory goals, like "to be wrong", or "to get caught".

Your first indication that the PC is nearing his limit of restimulation is a lessening of TA action. By this time, the PC is already past the point of comfortable charge level. Audit as delicately as possible at this point. As you go on, be sure the itsa line is very in, and don't let any more charge get restimulated until you have cleaned up what you have. Do not let the PC dive into earlier track, no matter how eager he may be to do so. That is how you get stuck TA's. Haul out of there! Start getting thorough. You can ordinarily trace back any ceased TA to some action that stirred up more charge than got handled. For instance, say we run the center goal out of the Bear implant. Then we start running the rest of the goals. Suddenly, we lose TA action. We have just restimulated three or four out of five goals. I.e. we have three or four GPM's on restimulation. That amount of charge stirred up eliminated TA motion.

The overcharged case is always the high TA case. It is the whatsit line that is responsible for this over-restimulation, with resultant high or low TA, even if it is life or the PC that put the whatsit line in. The wrong thing to do is to get wore whatsit. "Tell me something you have been worried about," is therefore not a good process. It is all whatsits for the PC to look at. If you want to cure the overcharged case, you could assess his problems to a central one and ask, "What solutions have you had for this problem?" This allows the PC to itsa and thus permits the TA to come down. The "cures" give you the itsa line. Get all the whatsits already in restimulation and get the solutions off. That will give you itsa, bring the TA down, and get the TA into action. When you finish one whatsit with itsas, find another whatsit that is already there and finish it, etc. This is guaranteed to fix the TA. Find something small enough for the PC to let go of.

Knowingness and reality don't increase unless you get charge off the case, so the case knows that nothing has happened, unless you increase his knowingness.

6308C20 SHSpec-296 The Itsa Line

The itsa line is the PC's comm line to the auditor. It is not always pursuant to the auditor's whatsit. Sometimes it is pursuant to the PC's whatsit. The auditing cycle is made up of a concatenation of comm lines. A comm line can be very faint, as with the attention line. There may be lines preceding the attention line, as the auditor gets the PC to put his attention on the auditor.

Having an attention line already extant, you convert it to an itsa line. There's the situation where the PC's attention line is on something other than the auditor. If the auditor is adroit, he can flick it over to where he wants it. For instance, the PC says, "I can't stand wild parties ... Blah! Blah! ... " It takes skill to flick the attention over to what you want the PC to talk about. This is getting the itsa line in. A

PC will always follow the least-charged aberrative line with his TA action. TA exists on the least-charged aberrative line at any moment. The mind is so regulated that it will not release charges that the PC considers too dangerous. TA action ceases when you have too much charge. You could bleed it off, but you have gotten into too much charge. And no TA action equals no case advance, even if you get somatics off. You can make it even worse. By running the PC with no TA action, you can make the needle action cease too. The longer you run a case with no TA action, the more the case freezes up and the harder it will be to produce TA action.

The most likely way to get TA action on a case is to get in the itsa line. Routine-1-C (Routine-1-Comm) is the process that does this. It is a "soft touch" way of getting in the itsa line. This is the workhorse. It requires deftness, but it gets in the itsa line on a jammed, overcharged case, and it will restore TA action. [Per BTB 4Dec71R I "R1C", R1C consists of:

1. Finding something that moves the TA.

2. Running the TA out of that subject, to F/N, cog, VGI's. The usual method of finding what to run in general R1C is by assessment of dynamics. Assessment by dynamics gives a series of questions covering each of the dynamics. This is assessed by tone arm, as given in E-meter Drill 23. Take up the reading question by use of further questions on that same subject.]

The best way to restore TA action to a case that has become overcharged is to cleverly get in and handle the itsa line. Cleverness is required. You could ask the PC who comes into session talking about something else, "Did our last session have anything to do with this?" This puts his attention back into session, gently, without putting it on the auditor. This is preferable to the psychoanalytic practice of letting the PC run on and on about irrelevancies. Getting your job done and having your PC like you all the time conflict and are sometimes diametrically opposed. The crudest way to get the itsa line in is, "Tell me about it." This is functional, however. What you want to do is to move the itsa line around enough to relieve his problem, to the point where you can put the attention line on a significance that will give him case advance. It is about as skilled as building a watch: very adroit, to the point of invisibility. You duplicate what he has been talking about and pull his itsa line a bit further and put it on something you want it to be on. You can even re-use the PC's origination later, when you have run out of TA or itsa. For instance, the PC complains of headaches. You get him to examine how they are affected by what you are auditing. Then, several sessions later, you can bring the headaches up again as needed.

Unless you can handle the attention line smoothly, you can't get the itsa line established. You are split between wanting the PC to think well of you and getting your job done. In the end, they come to the same thing, but for the moment, it is a matter of making forward progress despite unavoidable, or avoidable, upsets. Be as clever and as adroit as you can, plus a little.

There are thousands of ways to shift the PC's attention. Say his attention is on something. You ask, "What have you learned about _____ ?" You get TA. Parallel what the mind is doing, and you can control it. Find what the PC's attention is on, and if you can get TA motion by having the PC locate things about what his attention is on, he will recover from any obsessive or compulsive tendencies about it or toward it. It is the TA motion that takes off the compulsion, not the significance of what he digs up. The PC way be talking about his grandma's jam-making, but if he is getting TA motion, he is getting gains. The fastest recovery comes with a combination of significance and TA motion.

The least charged aberrated area of the case is where you will get TA motion. Sometimes a direct approach to a highly-charged area may fail, until it is unburdened by getting TA off some other area first. When you work with that area [the latter area], the PC will know that processing works for him. PC's always make gains if they are getting TA motion.

TA motion only occurs when the itsa line is in. Why do we call it the "itsa line"? The itsa line is more than just a comm line. It is seeing something to describe and describing it. A person in jail can't go to anywhere to see if itsa. He can't say, "Itsa beach," or "Itsa Brighton," etc. A nightmare is the inability to itsa, followed by mocking up something that can be itsa'ed that is wrong. Itsa is the way the thetan orients himself: itsa ceiling, itsa floor, itsa wall, etc. Itsa. Therefore I'ma. [Cf. Descartes with, "I think. Therefore I am."] Hide somebody, and the itsa line is cut on himself. No one else can say, "Itsa." Disassociate somebody from his identity and he won't be able to itsa himself. he won't be able to say, "Itsa me: Joe Jones." This is the basic aberration: inability to orient, identify, declare, or recognize. It is not just the inability to solve. If itsa is so important to ability, memory, identity, and

power, then we would expect the major trick on the track to be that of cutting the itsa line, one way or the other. And so it is. Implanters give you all sorts of false data. You get killed one way, and they convince you that you died another way, or that you didn't die at all. They disrupt your itsa line. This can go on to the point where people believe that they live only once. The report-back mechanism is even used by doctors, when they have insane people report back for shocks, etc.

People think that what we are doing is unreal, but we know the substance of their unreality. We know where their itsa line is out. The notion, "Man is an animal. At death there is a cessation of cellular commotion," makes nothing of everyone.

The itsa line can be out of ARC and on KUCDEIOF, the whole scale for R2H. Tell someone that something that is, isn't, and his itsa line will go out. Give someone chalk for candy; he bites into it. His itsa line is out. This is the "false" level. Nothing: Say that nothing haunts this planet; it's all natural, and anyone who thinks otherwise must be paranoid. Say something isn't that is, or that something is that isn't, like the Darwinian theory. Inhibited: Tell someone not to examine something because it is dangerous. Enforced: Know this or be shot! Desired: A want-to-know itsa. Curious: a curiosity itsa. Not just curious about. Then there's unknown itsa: You have reality on the unreality of people on this planet. The itsa is their unknowingness. A thetan's tolerance rises to where he can confront an unknown comfortably, without doing anything about it. X, in algebra, would be an example of this. A mathematician has gone overboard on the subject of unknownnesses and having to solve it all. Some auditors, likewise can't stand the PC's being in an unknown as he is working on an itsa and have to leap in and get the itsa line in themselves with the meter. Known: An itsa line can be too known. For instance, some crimes are unsolvable because they are committed in too known a fashion. The obviousness of the postman makes him the ideal murderer in a mystery. He is too known. Sometimes things are too obvious. That also includes the "Everyone knows," that never gets examined.

Itsa identifies, either individually or, if that is not possible, by classification, by type. You get a comfortable feeling from this which every now and then gets betrayed, e.g. when you find out that you are in a stage set, not a room. This gives you an ARC break from the false itsa. GPM's are full of such false itsas. The subject of itsa has to do with straightening out one's ARC with the universe. It is an interesting question why there should be this passion for itsa.

Getting the itsa line in has nothing to do with getting the PC to auditor comm line in. The latter is more likely to be related to the PC's attention line to the auditor. Getting the itsa line in is getting the PC to identify, inspect, decide about, and differentiate things in his bank or in the physical universe, e.g., in objective processing, the room. You could probably get TA by running "What's that?" and pointing at things. This is not always workable. Itsa is familiarization, e.g. with a car or a typewriter. That is why familiarization processes like, "Touch that _____ ," work.

A person who is really itsa-ing is blowing off encysted charge caused by former confusion about an area. That is the mass aspect, the force aspect of it. When you have itsa'd on a area, the area never comes up again. Until then, the area keeps coming up -- in the future, ten years in the past, two trillion years in the past, as this, as that, etc. While the PC is looking for the itsa, what drives some auditors nuts is the extra itsas he puts in and takes out. "This ... No, that...." A lot of apparent itsas come off before you get the final itsa. But you could almost say that all the running of a case, on through to the final cognition, the final itsa, consists of conditional itsas. An auditor should never expect only permanent itsas.

It is adroit of the auditor to use the PC's attention line to get the itsa line in by steering it to areas that can be itsa'd. Put the PC's attention on things he can identify. Letting the itsa line exist is the lowest level of auditing. Putting the itsa line in is more active. The universe is full of whatsit lines, so concentrate on the itsa line. The itsa line will suffer from being too known, as in "Everyone knows." The itsa line is the PC's line to the auditor.

6308C21 SHSpec-297 The Itsa Line (Continued)

Things look more complex than they actually are. Sitting somewhere in back of every thetan's bank is a tremendous insecurity, in which the thetan believes implicitly that the universe is dangerous, or that he is in danger, or that he cannot live or survive as a powerful being. The itsa line could look to you like a simple communication line on which, if you let anyone talk enough, he will get better. This is

not so. If you understand the itsa line, you will see the PC go through a cycle of fishing for an itsa. If the auditor tells the PC what is there by putting in the itsa with the meter, it leaves the PC in a zone or area of insecurity, as will any interruption of the PC's itsa. The PC has to be responsible for putting in the itsa line. If the auditor does it too much, e.g. saying, "The meter reads that it is before 1850," etc., you have created a psychiatric, potentially hypnotic, evaluative set-up. It is OK to give a little help, but not to put in the whole itsa line for the PC. When you tell a person that there is hope for his case, you are putting in an itsa line, the "Hope Factor".

But what about the line plot, for instance? This puts in an itsa line for the PC, to some degree. The line plot for the GPM is the lesser of two evils. It allows the PC to identify it to his own reality, and it is less undesirable than letting the PC wrap himself around a telephone pole. It was an other-determined thing in the first place, and the most important thing is to get the charge off of it. Similarly, if the PC is trying to date something and bogs utterly, you should help him with the meter, enough to increase his ability to see what he is after by narrowing his search. Even if you get down to the hour and minute and the PC never spotted it, at least you've got it dated. But it is still a bit of a lose. The only time you totally lose is when you have to put the whole itsa line in.

Aberration is a means of perverting the itsa line. Pure evil is denial of the itsa line and aberration of it. Perversion of the itsa line has to be very direct in order to be very aberrative. Given the slightest chance, the PC will put in his itsa line. But the question is: will he put it in on anything aberrative? He won't, unless directed to it. Psychoanalysis directs the itsa line to something non-aberrative, lets him itsa, and then evaluates, putting the itsa line in totally, analyzing it for him.

Putting in a hope factor by saying that something can be done to change conditions puts in the itsa line, to a small degree. Even, "Start of session" puts in an itsa line, with the intent of putting the PC in a position to itsa. The intention makes the difference, where one puts in the itsa line for another. An evil intention, [in this respect] is one that is devoted to decreasing the person's ability to itsa. That is the way to make slaves. A good intention is an intention to improve someone's itsa. Get the person to identify, spot, and point out, and he will be in better shape than he is.

This corner of the universe is suffering from a surplus of lousy civilization. It was recently conquered, but it was set up to be conquered by the use of degrading mental technology. The civilization in this area implanted their own soldiers "to be loyal" "to be brave", etc. Such a civilization has no power, because for an implant to stick, it has to have two items: one positive and one negative, e.g. "to be a loyal soldier" and "to be a disloyal soldier". So fifty percent of the implant is in the negative. Also, the fact that the implant was done at all destroys loyalty. The Galactic Confederacy, with no implanting, lasted eighty trillion years. The Espinol Confederacy, with implants, lasted a few hundred thousand years. Rome died at the hands of her slaves, not at those of barbarians. Being a free man didn't pay, so who wanted to fight for Rome? Slavery produced a civil war. The first families of Boston made their money from slaves [and so we got a civil war, too.] It is not just a matter of sentiment. Statistically, slavery never pays off. It is dangerous. Russia is having trouble because of the slave economy, which is a hang-over from pre-revolutionary Russia. Probably the white Russian nobility came back from the between-lives area as communists.

Slavery always produces a backlash because a thetan never really gives up. He can hold the postulate that he was right all the way down to the bottom of unconsciousness. The effort to dominate and to deny power of choice to others is the road that this universe walked towards the Hell it became. Fear stands ahead of that. The nonsense behind it is that a thetan can't do anything but survive, so for him to fear non-survival is foolish. How to kill a thetan is the biggest problem in this universe.

How can a being who cannot cease to survive get into a state of mind where he is afraid that he won't? It takes a lot of trickery. Usually it is on an extension of self into a possession, like making a minion: mocking up a mock-up, endowing it with life, and protecting it when someone attacks it. It can be a body, a state, etc. The thetan must have confused himself with it to the point where he thinks his survival can be affected. That is the first step into aberration.

The next step is elementary. One is worried about survival, so one solves the problem of survival by domination. This solution is not successful in the long run. That which is not admired tends to persist. That is one reason why domination stays around: domination is not admired. Thetan A, to protect something, dominates thetan B. In so doing, he sets himself up to be dominated in turn. Having set up a cause-effect line, the line can reverse. It is a comm line, with duplication, which makes it easy to reverse. Any custom on this planet has this reverse duplication element. You can

count on its having been the reverse at some time. The duplication factor easily makes cause look like effect on this comm line, and it leads to the overt-motivator sequence. One commits overts. Then, one day, one slips into effect and gets what one caused. Running O/W frees up a vicious comm line and cures some mis-identifications, thus undoing aberration. For instance, waiters wear black tuxedos. Any custom was a reverse custom at an earlier date.

If communication is so dangerous, why does a thetan communicate at all? It is because he wants to be oriented. Once oriented, a thetan uses his best tool: communication, to dominate, to do people in and to mess up things that he tries to identify with. He mis-uses his comm line. It is there because he is lost and feels the need of orientation, hence his desire for communication. There is insecurity behind this desire, the reason for which we don't know yet. In using the itsa line, "we're using the obsession to identify, which lies back of the communication line. We are using a principle higher than communication, coupled with communication, in order to orient and rehabilitate the thetan."

All we are missing is what lies behind the insecurity that caused him to start the whole cycle. Originally, the thetan was not insecure, was not reaching, not protecting anything, and he was not communicating! How and why did anyone get to him, originally, to the point where he felt that he needed to be oriented to be comfortable? It is hard to figure this out because there was no communication at the time. But "you show me the problem, and very shortly later, I'll show you the answer."

Just as it took only one step to start down that road, so it takes only a step at the other end to go back up. The PC gradiently comes up to OT, then breaks through with a shock that may scare him. Processing is the cure for having to be familiarized with things to itsa. We are undoing the tendency to itsa by using it. Once a thetan is free of those things, he will snap back to his original lost power, at least until he rights some wrongs and slips, briefly.

Self-determinism, pan-determinism, and personal power is restored to the individual along the line of minimal help and maximal recovery of self-determinism, of self-ability to itsa, on the part of the PC. As the case goes along, its progress is measured directly by the degree to which self-determinism is returned into the PC's hands. Thus you could get a fantastic number of engrams and GPM's run and have a foggy PC, by dating everything in the bank for him or by invalidating some datum of the PC's, no matter how slightly.

An auditor has the same problem a mother has: to give enough help, but not too much. The amount of help required is not constant from one PC to the next, because PCs are at such different levels of independence and aberration. Both could be high! The problem is to determine how much help the PC needs in order to know. What you want to do is to take whatever ability you find and reduce any dependency you find. Give the PC all the help he needs to get along, and then reduce it.

Added into all this is your flubs. You will never reduce them to zero, so don't try. You will get caught in cross-currents of communication and purposes. Since the PC's comm line is so often fogged up in session, the auditor's ability to handle it perfectly is nil. So the auditor shouldn't be afraid of mishandling the PC, because an occasional mishandling is inevitable. So, when this happens, you have to get slippy and handle the intention line, if possible.

Don't put the PC's attention on the auditor. This can happen by mistake, but watch out! E.g., don't say, "Do you want to tell me about it?" This inadvertently diverts attention to the auditor.

The PC's itsa line will get better to the degree that it is permitted to exist. Don't just let the PC talk, but direct his attention to things in the bank that he can identify. Don't tell him what he is looking at, if you can avoid it, but if you do have to tell him, let him itsa it. If you don't, his ability to identify will deteriorate, and his ability to know whether he is right will decrease. That is the effect of confirming his itsa line with the meter. If you look on what you are doing as improving the PC's ability to know that he is right, to be positive, you will make minimal mistakes. That is the chief ability that is there to be improved on a case. If you look on a case as something from which significances have to be removed, regardless of the PC's ability to be certain, the PC will still make it, but it will take much longer. The PC's case improves by removal of charge but is impeded by the auditor cutting back his ability to itsa.

An "ARC breaky PC" is probably one with a high degree of independence, perhaps swamped by charge. You can create dependency by telling him everything. There is also the point to be

considered, that if you don't tell the PC when an item is finally discharged, early in running GPM's, the PC will leave items charged, and the mechanism of the bank will cause him to bounce and ARC break. So you put in the itsa line: itsa discharged. Sooner or later, the PC will start to tell you that it is. At that point, stop telling him that it is clean. Don't stop if he still can't tell. To do so would leave him with live RI's and postulates. Wean him off from the meter slowly, validating his knowingness as it develops. Give the PC all the help he needs. If a PC can't tell what is in his bank, he can't live with it. There is a certain minimal help that a PC needs to get started. He can't do it all on his own.

On the other hand, you could get a PC who hasn't been here long, who cognites on the Axioms, knocks out the bank, does change of space processing between the auditing room and the next building [See The Creation of Human Ability, pp. 37-39; 171-173. This is the "Grand Tour" process, the object of which is to get all areas into present time by directing the PC to be in a variety of places.], and says goodby and thank you. Fine. You audited him.

ARC breaky PCs sometimes get into the situation of having their concept of their own independence cut up by people putting in itsa lines for them. They dramatize. A PC who is routinely ARC breaky undoubtedly has something wrong with the itsa line, and not from auditing. He could benefit from an 18-button prepcheck on the itsa line. Those eighteen buttons are the most powerful itsas there are or ever have been in the universe. Another approach would be to handle the fact that the PC is using the ARC break to solve a problem. But the prepcheck normally gets it cleaned up.

A cut itsa line is the most colossal PTP there is. A person's itsa line to the rest of the universe is cut just by the fact of his being on earth. If he tries to leave earth, he goes to the between-lives area.

The only missing piece is: why does a thetan have a compulsion to itsa?

6308C22 SHSpec-298 Project 80

"80" is a mathematical trick to say "oo and 0". It embraces "all". Project 80 has to do with organizational targets, dissemination, and technical planning. 1964 will be the Year of Scientology for Everyone. Organizations suffer from loss of personnel. One would be rich if one just lived and persisted long enough. If you are persistent, you yourself become a sort of institution. To "solve" a problem is a MEST universe way of looking at things. The right way is to find out, "How did it become a problem?" LRH operates on the basis that if he conceives of a problem, he is about forty-eight hours away from seeing what made it a problem. An organization's problem of losing all its people is one that we have licked. With all the shifts and changes, we, the people, are the stability in the development of the tech. We have the material for Scientology 4 [Research towards OT. See above.], making OT's, wrapped up, as far as research is concerned. In view is a wrapping up of the between-lives area, so as to strip out the report-back mechanism. It is a bit tougher than LRH thought it would be. There are, in addition to GPM's, screen-type incidents and postulation-type incidents. The GPM's are all negative on the beginning end of the screen and positive on the leaving end, so the dichotomy makes them tend to collapse. Some rules for cleaning up charge faster have developed, but it is all just auditing -- keeping the PC's attention directed to those areas of the track where he gets TA action. That is the highest level of professional skill. Drills for a thetan exterior is all wrapped up.

Not everyone will reach the technical level of those who are at St. Hill, who have been through all the developments and changes. That is too much to expect. Auditors elsewhere are operating at different levels of reality, which establish different levels of ARC for them. The gap between our R and theirs has been getting wider and wider. So we are in an informed ivory tower, with no bridge behind us. That is rather important. This planet is in slightly different circumstances then others. It has a chance not to get tilted. Things put here tend to stay. Other nearby planets are more tightly governed and are harder to enter, to salvage them. They are invasionary planets. This area used to be controlled by the Espinol Confederacy, but their return platforms are closed off. That spells defeat [for them]. Is there some other implantive system that is deeper into the heart of this galaxy -- a system that is going to backfire against this one? Probably so. It is probably coming up soon. But conquerers almost always spare the jails. We can't bet on the preservation of earth, but we can bet on this planet having a better chance of becoming a rehabilitation center than other planets. But what if we have left no bridge in the rehabilitation center, so that everybody flounders around with no way to improve? If you don't leave a bridge, you will wind up with a group of people who are very angry at those who might assist them. That would be very undesirable. We've got to leave a bridge. However, at present, our feeder lines into the public are weak, not organizationally, but technically.

Project 80 is the bridge. It requires that we find what the public agrees with and use that to improve their ARC up to another level, and that we keep doing that, in order to bring them up gradually. We are not necessarily improving their ARC with us. We are just improving their ARC to a point where we can hit another level of agreement. The dynamics, various scales, the ARC triangle, and the dynamic principle of existence -- all of these are too high-toned for Scientology 1. So they comprise Scientology 2. [See above for a description of the Scientology Levels.] So we are back to 30-60 day HCA/HPA training. This is only possible because of the discovery of the itsa line.

Some of you, as auditors, overlook what is a win for a PC. Knowing that your goal is to run out GPM's, etc., you miss the fact that the PC has had a win in being able to talk to an auditor, when he couldn't talk to anyone before. The feeling that one is getting case advance, and real case advance, lies in the fact that the itsa line is in and the TA is moving. Get the itsa line in and the TA moving, and you will get a level of improvement and result never before achieved. This has nothing to do with significances. If you get somebody talking about his health or his lumbosis, you find out that the cures, solutions, decisions, discoveries, cognitions, comments, reiterations, and hopes about that lumbosis, in their aggregate, caused the individual to have lumbosis. If you get them off with TA action, you get a recovered lumbosis. The condition could well vanish just from getting the PC to itsa about these cures, etc. This does not apply to broken legs -- yet. Someone who has been trained in getting an itsa line in and not cutting it, given also some basic training in the Auditor's Code, the Axioms, the ARC triangle, the CDEI scale, etc., would have good results and wins.

Scientology 1 operates at the level of: "It is possible to have a happy marriage," or "If you want to get along with children better, listen to what they say and let them know you heard it. Don't just ignore them," or "Employee-boss relations are mainly problems of communication." In fact, you should make communication the stable datum. How you design this line is all regulated by what people can go into ARC with. You have to talk to people at a level where they can have ARC. R1C is a list of questions that you can use to get in an itsa line. Specific questions from this list could be used by a Book Auditor to run on someone's lumbosis. This could be done on a co-audit basis and would get fine results. That is the auditing level of Scientology 1.

Lower grade Scientology 2 (HPA/HCA) can get fabulous results with R2C. R2C is R1C, preceded by an assessment on the expanded CDEI scale, plus the eight dynamics. [See HCOT/F 17Oct63 "R2C: Slow Assessment by Dynamics", as well as HCOB 17Oct63 "R2C: Slow Assessment by Dynamics -- Directions for Use of HCO Technical Form 17Oct63" and HCOB 31Oct63 "R2C: Slow Assessment by Dynamics (Continued)".] The tone arm is used. The PC first looks over the CDEI scale to see which level best characterizes his life. It might take ten minutes and it might take fifty hours. The PC has to see which levels applied, at which times in his life, and where and how and which they are, and how they relate, etc. You can get a lot of TA on examining the scale. Eventually, the PC comes out with a level, X. Now give him the eight dynamics, expanded, i.e. broken down into sub-parts. He has to find out which ones he has been most concerned about this lifetime. This could also take ten minutes or fifty hours. Eventually, the PC comes out with a dynamic, Y. Therefore, the question becomes X, Y. The PC gets asked about the combined assessments, e.g. curious about children. The question could have a third component:

Considerations

Solutions

Decisions about

Concern for.

So you have matched up the ARC triangle with MEST, form, and location. The PC will start off with ARC vs. ARC. Then, when he can confront MEST, he will get into the sixth and seventh dynamics. So, as you repeat this operation, the PC will go up the dynamics to the sixth and seventh. This would be a way of clearing this lifetime.

Upper-grade Scientology 2 would use R2H, ARC break dating, and any other process, like prepchecking, that uses needle action as well as TA. It is a retread level for HPA/HCA's. So the line-up for Scientology 1 and 2 is:

Scn 1:

a) Non-auditing: P.E.-level scientology.

b) Auditing: Book Auditing, on a co-audit basis.

Scn 2:

a) Lower level: HPA/HCA level. Uses R2C. Tone arm used only, not needle action.

b) Upper level: HPA/HCA retread level. Processes using needle action and TA.

Another element enters the scene: the ARC break assessment. This would be a specialized activity. It can be done by central orgs or auditors in private practice, to patch up field auditors' PCs, and, at the same time, the field auditor whose PC needs this action can be nudged about following the Auditor's Code, e.g. about keeping his mouth shut. Try to bring it home that ARC break assessments need to be done. We can use them, both on PCs and on auditors. You can keep a lot of co-auditors straightened out by having someone around to do ARC break assessments.

You could have a course in which you can give a classification of HBA (Hubbard Book Auditor). The student gets a gen on:

1. The itsa line.

2. The Auditor's Code. This course would also include testing and co-audits.

The whole secret of our communication is that it is up to us to establish the level of the communication that we engage in. We have considered it somewhat dishonest to put our communication at a level of anything less than everything we know. But it isn't really dishonest to say less then we know. There is no reason to overwhelm people with all the data. It would just be out-reality.

There will be snags in the program. There will always be people who are uncomfortable with motion and change. These people will try, overtly or covertly, to stop it all. They will be the people who despair of getting a result by doing the usual, because they won't do it. They will be the ones who keep applying unusual solutions. Don't get your attention pinned on one bad apple and forget that everywhere else it is going fine. To do this would be to embark on a crusade in an ill-advised direction. Probably all evil generates from too great a concentration on evil. If you concentrate on how the show isn't getting on the road, when it is in fact on the road, you will contribute to keeping it from being on the road. You should take care of such matters on a routine, rather than an emergency basis.

When we have auditing at lower levels totally shaped around the definition of an auditor as a listener, we will have no trouble getting the whole project well done.

6308C27 SHSpec-299 Rightness and Wrongness

People use mental technology the way they do, in this universe, because they don't know what they are doing. The purpose of mental technology must be one of survival, with a consequent necessity to dominate, so it must consist of being right and [making others] wrong. Survival, rightness and wrongness, and domination fit together. Apparent contra-survival actions are the thetan's effort to be right. This is the lowest ebb of aberration, because the thetan can't do anything else but survive. In order to survive, you have to be more right than wrong, so you get obsessed with being right. The beginning of succumb is the recognition that you are wrong. This is not sensible, but it is the way a thetan behaves. Therefore, if an individual is surviving at all, he must be right, even if it is only an insistence on being right. A = A = A. If an individual is undertaking an action and is surviving, then it must be a right action. A thetan has to enter a basic lie on the scene to worry about his survival. This is idiocy, because there is no reason for a thetan to worry about survival. A thetan first worries about the survival of something else -- something that can be threatened with non-survival. Then the thetan identifies himself with that thing. This is the first lie. When he starts worrying about his own survival, because he has taken the idiotic step of identifying himself with his creations, he enters into the necessity to dominate to ensure his own survival. There is no reason why, if you are protecting sand castles, you have to take the idiot step of becoming a sand castle, and you can go on protecting them indefinitely without doing this. But once you have identified yourself with a sand-castle and are

worried about your own survival, you enter into the necessity to dominate to continue your own survival, to be tougher than the other tough boys on the beach.

You don't even have to become a sand-castle to start the game of domination, if that is what you want to do. The game of domination consists of being right and making the other fellow wrong. That is all there is to it. It's a silly game, really. For instance, Russia and the U.S. are each devoting so much of their production capacity to defend themselves from each other that they are failing, economically. People justify all sorts of insanity on the basis of rightness and wrongness. Even a skid-row bum is being a bum in order to be right. Everyone has tried to make him wrong for what he does, so he has to continue to be right. If he admits he is wrong, [he feels] he will die. You may be confused, just watching what is being done, because some of it could have good results, but the basis can still be a nutty rightness. People assert nutty rightness, because everyone is always making then wrong for the nuttiness. If someone agrees that he has been doing something wrong, he is liable to collapse, since he has identified wrongness with succumbing.

Behavior doesn't necessarily have everything to do with the whole track. Behavior is behavior. People have tried to aberrate it one way or another. They have tried to make people behave some other way, but the science of life still remains the science of life. The factors of life still remain the factors of life, and if you were to delete all the GPM's and incidents and everything else, you would not have removed the basic laws on which scientology is built. GPM's, etc., merely use the existing laws of life to enslave people. They simply enforce, exaggerate, and destroy freedom of choice over the exercise of the ability to be happy, powerful, etc. They destroy the ability to be self- or pan-determined. They make people one-sided about everything. They use basic laws, unwittingly, to exaggerate certain things, which then lead a person to enslave himself. The basic mechanism of enslavement is:

1. Insistence upon surviving, followed by

2. The necessity to dominate, followed by

3. The necessity to be right or wrong,

4. Which then becomes as irrational as the original postulate to survive, and then

5. The person becomes more and more degraded. The postulates made by the individual go downhill to the point where you would be amazed at what the individual is doing to be right.

When you get down to very aberrated rightness, you are dealing with death, because at that level, cessation of survival is so imminent that it gets dramatized before it happens. In that way, the individual is still right by succumbing. Currently, there are three organizations under attack:

1. Scientology.

2. Buddhism.

3. Theosophy.

The U.S. government is supporting the Vietnamese government in its attacks on Buddhists; it has attacked the Theosophists recently, and it launched a raid, via the FDA, on the FCDC, in Washington. But these are the only three groups that believe in reincarnation, i.e. they are the only groups that don't believe in death forever. In attacking them, the U.S. government is asserting a rightness about death.

To get some sort of aberrated behavior of this kind straightened out with someone, you would have to get him to tell you how the behavior makes him right. You would get an automaticity for starters, which would finally run out. Then you could see how it makes someone else wrong. When that is all run out, the individual will have far less inclination to do the behavior that he previously had to do to be right. The strongest intention in the universe is the intention to be right. The diagnosis of how you could make a person wrong depends on what that person most insists upon. That is what you can make him wrong on. [This would be getting a person's goat.] Behavior doesn't consist of an aberration that someone is dramatizing. It consists of an aberration that a person dredges up in order to make someone else wrong. That's behavior: It works, too. Making someone wrong all the time does worry him. Furthermore, one can be made wrong to the point where one inverts, goes into agreement

with what is being said by the person who is making him wrong, and now makes the former wrongness an obsessive rightness. The "right" label gets identified with the wrong action. A government may be made wrong about bringing in law and order, to the point where it now exercises criminality, using the label of law and order.

The issue of rightness and wrongness has been further booby-trapped by guys on the whole track who implanted people with GPM's that contain the words, "right" and "wrong". However, when making himself right and others wrong, an individual is not acting because of the GPM. That just intensifies the action. If you try just simply to run someone on right and wrong for very long, you run into the GPM and can't keep on in that line, ordinarily. Getting in an itsa line on the aberration will de-intensify its power, however.

If a guy has accidents frequently:

1. Find out what he is having (wrecks, accidents, injuries, etc.). This doesn't take very long. You have to isolate what it is that the guy is doing. The obvious action may not be his intention. Maybe it is not his automobile accidents that are making him right. Maybe it is getting injured. When you have the right thing, he will run easily.

2. Ask the PC how (an auto accident) makes him right. You will get an easy itsa line.

3. Ask him how (an auto accident) would make them (or another) wrong. You will get another avalanche.

4. Ask (2) again, then (3), etc. Keep it balanced, and you will avoid bumping the GPM as hard.

This process is below the level of recognition or cognition. It undermines neurosis. Neurosis is defined as an anti-survival action that is compulsively undertaken by the individual. The only qualification to this process is that we have to be capable of communicating with the person and listening to him. And we have to get our hands on him first. But on a cold-bloodedly practical basis, service fac processes are a more practical mental technology than the alternatives: implants, drugs, electric shock treatments, etc., just because of the backlash from angry thetans who want revenge on implanters. The hole in implanter tech is that the survival of the implanter can, in the future, be threatened. Implants can be undone. Many implant set-ups have been destroyed. Implanters do implanting because they are trying to be right and to make others wrong. That's all. It is a mere dramatization. When you see someone acting simply to be right and to make others wrong, you will see a worsening condition. You are looking at the last dregs of domination. The person who is being "right" is, in fact, getting worse, as are the people in his vicinity. Implanting works only over a short-term period, e.g. 100,000 years, which is short-term, on a galactic scale. Implanting worsens not only the people implanted, but also the implanter and everyone in the vicinity of these people.

What is true of neurosis is also true of psychosis. Psychosis has the same mechanism at a lower level, and it gets treatment from psychiatrists at the same low level of make-wrong and Q and A.

The overt-motivator sequence also fits into this effort to dominate and be right. When you get two people, each insisting on his own rightness, their ideas eventually commingle, and they can't tell who is doing what. This is because both are saying, "I'm right and you're wrong."

If a "science" is dramatizing an unknown one of its parts, it is not a complete technology. It is impossible to have a science of life under these circumstances because you can't fully understand something that you are dramatizing a part of. A science of life should be a complete understanding, and since one is dramatizing at least a part of living, one can't have a total understanding of it. [In other words, "being right" should be one of the parts of a mental technology. However, if "being right" is being dramatized by the practitioners of a mental technology, then clearly they don't have full understanding of the mind.] This is a particular problem with the science of life. Hence there is a tendency to withdraw from life. A total cessation of the dramatization of the game called "life" would put one in a confused state of thinking that the way to do it is to separate oneself from life by going off to a cave and meditating.

But a person that can't experience easily has to experience, compulsively. The final challenge of a science of life is, "Does it produce life?", not "Does it produce death?" If you know all the answers, you can live. It is remarkable to be in a situation where this can be sorted out. As one goes along,

getting more understanding, one doesn't have to work so hard to experience existence; one doesn't have to be convinced that one is surviving, being right, dominating, etc. When a person is no longer able to select his own behavior, he must obsessively be right by doing something wrong. It is OK to be right, if you are being analytical.

However, there is a level at which rightness and wrongness cease to be analytical and become obsessive. It is below that level that we speak of aberration. You can find what the person is doing that he doesn't like to do, then ask the person how that makes him right. Everyone has a few of these actions. They generally arise from some overwhelm of the person's self-determinism, where he has accepted another's rightness. The person is out of valence and dramatizing someone else's aberrations. [You could perhaps pick this up on Flow One of Level 4 triples.] But we aren't interested in other people's aberrations. The dwindling spiral is really entered where the person accepts inability, weakness, stupidity, etc., as a way to be right. Any dramatization of mental science that brings about further disability is wrong for the civilization that uses it. Anything that brings about more life, livingness, and beingness is right for that person or society.

Anything that is crazy in a person was OK at some higher level. All madness is an exaggeration of some ability or capability. For instance sexual misbehavior is a lower-scale dramatization of the ability to create. It becomes aberrated in the following way:

1. It was really right.

2. It was a method of survival.

3. It was a method of domination.

4. It was a method of being right in order to make others wrong.

5. Then one got enough overts such that the communication line switched around. What was right about it is now wrong about it, and vice versa. The sexual misbehavior or other aberrated behavior is practically unrecognizable from its [original] state, as far as the person's behavior is concerned. When you understand this, you understand much of the nonsense that you previously only protested against. The explanation for the behavior that is offered by the individual so obscures what he is really doing that it gets confusing. The main line of human behavior is along the lines of:

1. Survival.

2. Domination

3. Rightness and wrongness.

However, when an auditor invalidates another's assertion of rightness, it only drives the PC downscale and cuts the only communication line that can help the PC. "A dramatization of rightness and wrongness is not the answer to a dramatization of rightness and wrongness."

6308C29 SHSpec-300 The TA and the Service Facsimile

If you cannot make a keyed-out clear with a prepcheck in 25 hours or less, the PC is operating on a service facsimile. This is startling but elementary. A prepcheck fits in with the itsa line very closely. The 18 buttons are hot. They give the key itsas of the case. If they are not working, you have a service facsimile on your hands. In doing a prepcheck, it is assumed that you are using a time-limiter in order to keep the amount of restimulation under control. If you don't control the itsa line, the PC will restimulate more charge than you can get as-ised. The time limiter you use can be by subject or location, as well as by date.

A PC answering prepcheck questions is giving you key itsas. If a prepcheck is done for this lifetime, you should get a keyed-out clear, per the Book 1 definition of clear. [See DMSMH, pp. 8-17; 770-17] Clearing in this way is destimulation by knocking out the points where restimulation took place, making incidents inert. An inert incident can be restimulated, however.

Degree of restimulation is not important to state of case; neither is the condition of being restimulated. But there is a state of case with respect to restimulation. All cases are restimulated to some degree, but some are over-restimulated. A case that is over-restimulated will not discharge the restimulation by ordinary means, because discharge has somehow been prevented. This condition is important; it is getting ahold of too much and not discharging it. A uncontrolled itsa line can cause over-restimulation. An incident that is discharged has been relieved of charge, so that it can no longer be restimulated. Restimulation can be let off without the incident that was restimulated being discharged. It can simply be destimulated. So, with a bank, you can either destimulate it by knocking out the key-ins of the original charge, or you can discharge it by running it. A discharge is a flowing off of charge. When an incident is discharged, it is gone, and it is no longer capable of being restimulated.

Let us assume that the reactive mind consists mainly of inert incidents. If they would just stay quiet, you would never have to clear anybody. However, the PC's attention can be directed at the incident, by life, auditing, or the PC himself, at which point the incident converts the PC's attention to restimulation, over which he has no control. If the PC's attention goes to the incident so as to have understanding and confront, you will see TA motion, and the incident can be discharged, or erased. On the other hand, if the PC's attention flicks over the incident, giving a key-in, you can knock out the moment of key-in by having him look at it, and it will destimulate again, i.e. it will key out. Bank is inert until life or auditing causes the PC's attention to go onto a portion of it. The PC's attention is the actual source of charge.

An 18-button prepcheck should key out anything that keyed in. It can destimulate somebody to the state of clear. So you don't have to make a clear to make an OT. You only have to make a key-out clear.

The state of case of the PC is directly represented and analyzed by the tone arm, and the free needle. The eight levels of case compare with eight states of the tone arm and needle. [See above for a description of the eight levels of case.] Case Level:

8. Stage 4 needle.

7. Continuous rock slam.

6. Stuck needle at clear read (dead thetan).

5. Low TA.

4. High TA.

3. TA moving in the high range.

2. Good TA through and past clear read.

1. F/N at clear read.

When LRH tried to go from destimulated clear to discharged clear, he found that there was no waystop short of OT. The condition you've got to have, to take anyone to OT, is a TA moving through clear read, with good TA. Without that, there is too much restimulation present for you to get the PC to discharge material from the backtrack or to get into GPM's. If you tried to do this anyway, the PC's TA would tend to stick, then to go high, then to go low, then eventually to stick at clear read. If you then did a prepcheck, which would now be harder, you could send him back to all those states of TA, as you destimulated the case. You wouldn't have to go all the way to F/N to go to the backtrack, now. The subject isn't how you discharge the incident; it is when. The TA should be moving around, preferably through 3.0, before you try to go backtrack.

So you can make a clear by prepchecking a few prepared subjects. The case will feel wonderful, sometimes for years, until he starts wondering whether he still has any worries about what used to bother him. Then he starts restimulating himself and gets keyed in. A mere key-out clear can't be OT, because when he tries to turn on the power, it kicks in the inert incidents. The only way to make clear completely stable would be to discharge everything in the bank. From F/N'ing, the meter goes blank, because you've got nothing to measure. That's OT.

Over-restimulation is the cause of amnesia, edgy and bad body feelings, etc. If you gave the PC three sessions in a row without getting any TA, he would feel rather bad, because just the auditing would have restimulated charge, and you would have an over-restimulated case. When this happens, memory gets bad, facsimiles get harder to see, incidents get jammed together. The bank gets to be a mess. All this is due to over-restimulation. If the PC now gets prepchecked and destimulated, he can approach the track, but this can be done with good TA only if the auditing is done gradiently, with good clean-up of everything contacted, discharging it as you go. Don't fail to pay attention to the TA and go backtrack, hoping to get the incident responsible for the restimulation. You will restimulate more than you discharge, in the process of looking for the incident. A cheerful PC equals the itsa line in and the TA moving. It almost doesn't matter what the TA is moving on. Case level relates to over-restimulation, not to the amount of bank the PC has.

The auditing target is always the restimulated charge, not the inert material in the bank. The PC can always restimulate more, once he has discharged what was available.

"Clear" means "nothing in the restimulation chamber". If too much gets restimulated, by life, auditing, or the PC, the auditor can destimulate it with prepchecks and ARC break assessments, [See above.] It is not possible to audit someone without doing one of three things:

1. Restimulating

2. Destimulating. This is the same as keying something out. or

3. Discharging. This is the same as erasing.

Auditing is always doing at least one of these three things. When a case is already confused and is not confronting well, naturally the amount of destimulation and discharge are minimal, so restimulation takes over. You will get no TA motion. When you don't destimulate or discharge anything, you will restimulate more and you will get no TA. Lack of TA is a danger signal. The auditor should find out why. There are two possible actions:

1. The auditor may do something that can discharge [or destimulate] the restimulated charge, e.g. prepchecking or flattening what has been left unflat. Prepchecking or R2H would be safest.

2. He can look for something that is preventing discharge. [E.g. by doing an ARC break assessment to find the correct BPC.] If the TA is not restored immediately, only one thing is wrong: the case is sitting in a service facsimile and will only worsen until the service facsimile is cleared.

If a small amount of auditing doesn't restore the case to a clear state, the PC has a service facsimile. If he is sitting in one, it must be run, or he will not improve. Prepchecks turn on mass in the presence of a service facsimile, because the PC has no intention of getting rid of it. The PC won't let go of the service fac and the service fac won't surrender to the prepcheck. This also includes hidden standards. Now that we know that the anatomy of a service fac is a rightness-wrongness computation, we can do something about it. We knew of their existence before, as can be seen in Advanced Procedures and Axioms [pp. 7-11]. The 18-button prepcheck should key out the PC. If it doesn't, the PC has a service fac.

A prepcheck is just a series of types of decisions that a thetan makes about things. If it turns on mass, it must be in conflict with rightness and wrongness. So, in the PC's eyes, the auditor is trying to make the PC wrong with the prepcheck, and the PC moves the facsimile forward as a defense, increasing mass.

The only reason for high TA is over-restimulation. The two things that prevent its cure are:

1. The case's over-restimulated condition.

2. A service facsimile that the case isn't about to give up. To some degree, most cases fall into the service fac category, but most don't have the service fac directly in the road of auditing. Only service facs that lie across the road of auditing interfere with clearing. If the service fac has to do with the PC's spiritual condition, with his case itself, then you have to handle it so that he can get case gain. The more a PC is trying to be right by having a wrong case, the less progress the auditor will make with this case. A PC says, "If I didn't have a bank, they'd give me one," So having a bank is "right".

Don't let the PC itsa beyond the answer to the auditing question. It is far better for the PC to feel that his comm has been cut than for him to pull in restimulation by being permitted to overrun an answer.

An 18-button prepcheck on an assessed this lifetime subject or subjects should give you a key-out clear, but a service fac won't surrender to a prepcheck.

6308C29 SHSpec-301 The Service Facsimile

Although we call it a "service facsimile", there is more to be known about it than was in earlier definitions. In the past, it has been said that a service facsimile is "what a person uses to explain his condition or get his way in the world." It is called a service facsimile because it was of service to the PC. The service fac manifestation is a blood brother to the O/W mechanism. It is how you make people guilty. The current definition of service fac is that it is that condition which the individual uses to make himself right and others wrong. Using this definition, we can crack cases. The only hazard is the use of right/wrong in GPM's, but the use of a time limitation to "in this lifetime" obviates any danger of restimulating the GPM. The GPM is not the reason for the service fac. There is an upper-scale rationale: survival. For instance, the Darwinian implant [See above] has "to persist" at the beginning of it, all by itself. But this is rare. However, when the goal "to survive" occurs, it is couched in the word "persist". There is no GPM known, to date, that contains the word, "survive". This concept is therefore not motivated by bank. Therefore you can use "survive" in processing pretty easily. Implanters used the words "live" and "alive" a lot, but "survive" is the top scale of all this.

It is OK for us to go back to healing now, since:

a. Doctors (the AMA) haven't appreciated the fact that we ever stopped healing people.

b. They will be socialized in five years, anyway.

They are convinced that "curing" is impossible. However, 22 1/2% of people, e.g. patients, PCs, or whatever, get well with any or no or fraudulent treatment. They are apparently in an hypnotic state and respond to suggestion. So any healing profession should get at least a 22 1/2% Cure rate, unless it is doing something to depress the patient and to prevent healing from occurring. If you get less than 22 1/2%, you are actually impeding the cure. Only two things prevent the scientologist from healing PCs:

1. Inability to get in communication with the PC, e.g. because he is dead.

2. The service facsimile.

If we allow for the fact that it takes a relatively short time to train an auditor into using this-lifetime techniques; if you take such an auditor and don't worry about making him into an auditor who can make an OT; if you turn him loose with only an understanding of the service facsimile, the itsa line, and repetitive prepchecking, limited to this lifetime; if you let him rely on the tone arm, there he would be, practically sweeping the boards, as far as illness is concerned.

For a person to have a bad back, he must have more than a facsimile of an experience involving a bad back causing it. He must have had it restimulated by something, and to have a real bad back, something must be keeping it in restimulation. Something has to kick the facsimile in and hold it in.

You must add to the restimulation factor a mental aberration factor. It is not just what is restimulated. It is what the PC feels might become restimulated, what he himself opposes, what he becomes afraid of when he is restimulated. So the individual is added to the equation. The experiential pattern of an individual -- regardless of incidents containing pain, etc. -- might be aberrative. For instance, say a person has lived all his life in a very cold environment. He gets knowingness, in the process. If you throw him out in the 40-below cold, either he has confidence that he can withstand the cold, or he doesn't. Accordingly, he either freezes to death or lives, respectively. This is true even though a person is conditioned and trained to handle the cold. People may react differently to the same engram. There is no guarantee that someone will respond one way or the other to their "stimulus-response" conditioning. One person will be terrified by some danger; another person will ignore it; another will look and say, "Oh." What makes the difference? We come back to the service fac for the answer: How could you use a facsimile to make people wrong?

369

So there are three reactions to an engram:

1. The guy who is terrified of the facsimile has, in back of this, lots of ways to be right and to make others wrong by having this facsimile.

2. The guy who ignores it has no use for it at all, one way or the other.

3. The guy who confronts it has another method of making others wrong: being competent with regard to this type of facsimile. The rightness-wrongness possibility is present to some degree in everyone and in every bank.

To the healer, this represents a barrier, because someone who is using an illness or disability to make someone else wrong won't respond to treatment. Or, if you cure one thing, he will pick up something else to do the job of making himself right and others wrong. [Symptom-substitution. See also Haley on oneupsmanship games.]

Aberrated behavior is a service facsimile in at least a goodly percentage of cases. When you do mimicry processing and the PC persists in crazy behavior, he has a vested interest in acting crazy. This makes it hard to tell how good a deaberrative technique is. However, if it works on a lot more than 22 1/2% of cases, it is probably a good technique that is rendered ineffective in some cases by a service fac.

The tone arm turned out to be a reliable measure of case progress. If you don't get destimulation or discharge, you will get restimulation, because something is happening. If you don't get any TA action, you know that you are not getting any destimulation or discharge and that therefore restimulation is all that is occurring. Therefore, don't audit without TA action. The margin of time during which you can audit a PC without TA action before he starts feeling horrible is only about three sessions. If a PC is upset about auditing, is having trouble handling life, etc., it is only because of over-restimulation, from whatever source -- GPM's, ARC breaks, or whatever.

What about a medium, or "acceptable" amount of TA action: fifteen to twenty downward divisions per 2 1/2 hour session? Excellent TA would be about thirty divisions per session; acceptable is 15-20. Below that level, more restimulation than discharge is occurring. These are just approximate figures. A great deal of adding-up has not yet been done, to tabulate the figures exactly. So there is a point where there is an apparency of TA motion, yet the PC is not getting better and only restimulation is occurring. Auditing a PC on and on with no TA will over-restimulate him all the way up the TA dial, backwards through 7, all the way to dead thetan. [LRH introduces here the idea of a TA counter.]

Why does a TA go up and stick? Only because of the pressure of over-restimulation. If you have no TA action or if you are getting a rising TA without discharge, you get [over-]restimulation, because you are overwhelming the PC's power of choice. You are trying to get a discharge, and the PC won't let go of it, and he becomes more and more ARC breaky. If the TA is going up even when you are not auditing backtrack, you must still be overwhelming the PC's power of choice. Between not getting TA and getting high TA, we move into service facs. When you are doing a prepcheck and it turns on mass, you have bumped into something that shouldn't be there. A service facsimile has moved in to assert whatever you are prepchecking and trying to get rid of. Any mass, for a thetan, is an assertion that something is wrong, and there is something weird about it. The mass comes from the complete disagreement that you and the PC have, concerning whatever it is that turned mass on. You want to get rid of it. But the PC does not intend to get better, because he has to hang onto bank, to make someone wrong with it.

It stands to reason that any thetan that has been hit hard and continuously, that has had continued loses, and that is trying to get back at and attack some area, will be unable to put the itsa line in on that area. He can't say if the area is bad or good. He can't say what it is. He doesn't feel that he can be at cause over that comm line. So his final method of staying at cause is to be right and for the other person to be wrong. This goes down to the point where he merely has to hold the concept of being right and the other person being wrong. This way, in a sense, he is still being cause. This mechanism persists, therefore, because the PC can't as-is it, because he can't observe it anymore. One can be haunted by a nonexistent thing if one doesn't have the comm lines to observe it. The PC never knows when it goes away. If you can't inspect something, you can't inspect its cessation. Therefore, for survival, the best thing to do is to assume that the thing is still there. That is the safest course. Life

teaches you that it is dangerous to go look and see. You operate on the principle that if you can't ascertain that something has ended, you had better assume that it is continuing.

Something that the PC can't cure with processing must be a service fac. You can ask the PC how he is making others wrong. Then, when you get it, you can ask him how he is being right with it. Aberrated survival mechanisms all sit around on buttons of rightness-wrongness, survival, and domination. The O/W system is connected with this through the make-guilty mechanism. These are survival mechanisms, buy they are not sensible. Unfortunately, the words, "rightness", "wrongness", "survive", and "dominate" are also in the bank. So you have to indulge in some broken-field running to handle these buttons.

The more force there is and the less one can stand it and be cause over the user of the force, the more one goes into forms of aberrated rightness and wrongness against the holder of force. Hence people break minor laws to be right about the government, since it is so overwhelming. This is quite irrational.

To find a service fac, you could use the original listing steps of R2 or the preliminary assessment of R3R, or you could ask the PC, "What have you been trying to resolve about your case, in processing?", taking anything that didn't resolve with processing as a service facsimile. "What would be a method of making others wrong?" could also get it. Be prepared for the service fac not to be very sensible, but don't reject it, even if it does seem reasonable, as long as it is something that hasn't yielded to auditing.

6309C04 SHSpec-302 How to Find a Service Facsimile

Apparently, there is more to know about service facs than has been relayed, probably because it is so simple. PCs don't defend their service facs against discovery. If you point the PC in the right direction, he will go right to the service fac, unless you prevent it. So don't prevent it!

In assessing for service facs, there is no substitute for knowing what a service fac is. A service fac is, first, a tremendous solution, always aberrated, in PT, as part of the PC's environment, which, the PC believes, would result in his survival being threatened if it were disturbed. It is something which others keep telling the PC is wrong, causing him to assert that it is right. This assertion of rightness is very integral and important to the service fac. It makes the PC unauditable to the degree that he is getting auditing only to prove that it is right. It sticks out like a sore thumb. One could have more trouble labeling it than finding it.

The human body is a service fac, but if we used that, we would be going for OT, and we aren't shooting for that. We are just using the service fac on this lifetime, to get the PC auditable. So the body isn't the service fac that we are trying to target. Having found a service fac, we don't use it to make an OT. We are only trying to get someone auditable and to get the constantly restimulated solutions out of the way, to clear this lifetime. On the whole track, obviously, having a bank is a service facsimile. That accounts for the reluctance to go clear noticed earlier, while finding goals. "Being incapable" could still be a service fac at an OT level, if, say, the OT couldn't tilt a planet.

But attacking this kind of service fac directly is too steep a gradient. You could run service facs at all different levels. The concept of a service fac is based on confusion and stable datum theory. In running a service fac, we are attacking a solution that is a barrier to getting rid of a confusion. You can pluck the stable datum out of the center of a confusion and thus get a discharge of the energy of the confusion. A stable datum holds a confusion in place. This is the reverse of using a stable datum to handle a confusion. Charge is an electrical confusion. As long as a stable datum holds a confusion in place, the confusion will not discharge.

Confusions are tolerable and are not always aberrative. Most have no aberrative value, e.g. in a card game. Life is not, in itself, an aberrative action. There has to be some force and violence involved in the confusion, or at least a fairly real threat to survival, for it to be aberrative. The thetan "knows" that if he ceases to dramatize a service fac, he will die. The immediate thing someone is worried about may not be the service facsimile itself. It could be the consequence of something else that is a service fac. The consequence could be very hidden; the two things could have at best a faint connection. As you take off service facs, the central one on which they all lean eventually comes off. As you audit the

case, you could get off several before the central one comes to view. The apparent service facs lean on the main service fac.

A rote procedure to apply to this would be a logical solution to a very illogical area, but it is better to understand what you are doing. If the case has been audited, you could collect a list of things that have been found on the PC, e.g. old lists, R2-12 assessments, etc. By discussing them with the PC and following the PCs interest, you could find some service facs. You might have to reword some of the things you come up with, The right-wrong bracket is always the same. The question is, "How would (the condition or thing found) make you right and make others wrong?" The service fac is the PC; it is something he has; it is not like an oppterm. It is something he has, to make him right and others wrong. The PC will slop, on the auditing command. E.g. the PC may misduplicate the auditing command as, "What would be made wrong by it?" You don't worry about this. Let the automaticity run out. Then re-ask your original question and get it answered.

A service facsimile is not an action. An action would be the result of a service fac. The service fac turns on automaticities because it is an automatic, unanalyzed solution. For this reason, you don't run it as a repetitive process. "Automaticity" means that more answers than the PC can articulate are arriving from the bank. When this happens, when words are coming too fast, you know that you are getting the service fac. Throw the question in and let the lions tear at it for awhile; let the automaticity run out. Let "er buck when the PC starts to run. Then, when he runs out of answers, turn it around and run it the other way, if he hasn't already done it himself. You are trying to get rid of the avalanche of automaticity and get TA. Also, don't overrun by insisting on more answers than the PC has, or you can get a stuck flow. Run it permissively. It is sometimes difficult to keep the PC answering the question, just because he is in a dissociated area. The solution is holding back a tremendous amount of aberration, which won't as-is as long as the solution is there. The solution just keeps accumulating mass.

The solution is always below 2.0 on the tone scale, because it is perforce a substitute for an itsa line. The PC felt that he could not itsa the object that he was trying to make wrong, so he dreamed up this solution as a final solution, and that is a substitute for an itsa line. Then there is no as-isness or itsa on the environment. Since there is no as-isness, you get an accumulation of mass. Since it is a substitute for an itsa line, the service fac is referred to whenever the PC refers to anything. When the solution is below 2.0, it propounds the idea that to survive, it is necessary to succumb. That is what it boils down to, aberrated though that is. For instance, the solution may be not eating [as in anorexia nervosa].

The service fac doesn't even have to fit in with the guy's environment. It is often totally hidden. You can't necessarily spot the service fac by what the person is doing. It often goes underground, especially the very hidden ones. Some are very obvious, too, sometimes so obvious that you miss them. You could ask, as an L and N question, "What do you think your service fac is?" Interest is the keynote.

The service fac is not a deliberate solution. It is a sub-awareness automatic solution, which the person is on the verge of all the time. That is what makes service facs easy to spot. If you've got the service fac, the PC can't stay out of it. It has to be specific enough. You can use a "represent" on something that is too general. You can assess the list according to interest. The PC tends to fall into the whirlpool of the service fac.

If the PC has a fragile tone arm, easily stuck, then you've got a service fac, a solution there that is preventing the charge from running off. The PC doesn't have to look at things; he's got it solved. Once you have the service fac, get the PC to tell you how, in this lifetime, it would make him right, etc. Don't go for the backtrack. This improves the PC's ability to get TA action. The peculiarity of the action you are looking for is not particularly great, compared with the peculiarity of social mores, but it is posing as survival when it clearly isn't pro-survival. The PC will be interested in it, and it will get TA, because it is a fixed solution. Your main interest is TA action. Just get the mass flowing that was hanging up.

A service fac is a fixed, contra-survival solution which the person hasn't inspected. It could even be a fixed survival solution, but then that wouldn't interfere with auditing. However, using conduct as a criterion makes anyone liable to be put away. A service fac is batty when compared, not to the mores of society, but to actual survival. So you could say the following about a service fac:

1. It is contra-survival, but poses as survival.

2. It has the PC's interest.

3. It sticks the tone arm.

4. It is always protruded into PT. Thus any constant PTP can contain a service fac. For instance, you could ask, "What did you come into scientology to resolve?" That is one reason that service fac processing is beneficial. However, it is dangerous to list too many problems on a PC, because you are giving the PC too much whatsit, while an incomplete list will ARC break the PC. So you had better two-way comm it. Use a friendly discussion, so you can move out of it if it gets sticky. Don't list it. When you find an appropriate problem, find the solution in back of it, and that fixed solution will give you the service fac. If the discussion does get sticky, you could free up the TA again by asking for a solution that the PC has had to each problem he mentions. Getting a fixed solution means that you've got the service fac.

Notice that R1C and R2C are designed to strip away solutions and stable data. Therefore, they are not likely to freeze up the TA. Find out if the PC has run R1C and R2C. You can use this for data. You can ask what the PC found interesting. Don't ask, "What problems would that solve?" That sticks the TA. Assess it. Then you can get the service fac. The R3R preliminary assessment is almost a dead-center pitch at the service fac, providing it winds up with a stable solution. This solution should be something that makes sense to you and the PC. Getting the item with the PC's interest will give you the service fac. The level assessed will be too broad. The service fac is a magnet. You are asking for right answers, and the PC is giving you the rightest answer of all. You can even get the service fac as a non-sequitur item on a list. So watch for service facs on any list. The fact that the item that is a service fac is dissociated gives you a clue.

The PC will handle your session with his service fac. Eventually it downs on you what he has been doing. Keep running service facs until you get change in the PC and a free needle and good TA. The service fac is the source of the PTP that the PC keeps coming to session with, so getting it saves you all sorts of time and trouble, when you get it out of the way. Get rid of the service fac, and over-restimulation of the case ends. This would reduce by 50% the total restimulation on the case, so cases wouldn't keep dropping between sessions because of environmental restimulation.

Having the PC's attention on disabilities keeps his attention off the bank. Thus a good handling of service facs increases by a hundred to one the runability of the case. So you can now run him on a steeper gradient.

6309C03 SHSpec-302A R3SC

[Some of the data in this tape are contained in HCOB 1Sep63 "Scientology Three: Clearing-clearing-clearing: Routine Three SC".]

The reason a person doesn't recover under auditing has been a subject of investigation, off and on, since 1949. It was most recently looked at with regard to R2-12. It has now come up again with the discovery that to get case gain a PC had to have TA motion. The fact that you are getting TA action doesn't guarantee that the PC will feel better, but no TA action does guarantee that the PC will feel worse. A PC could feel no better, despite getting TA action, because he is getting somewhat over-restimulated, while still getting some charge off.

By classes of auditors, here is what should happen with TA motion:

Class I: He may or may not be able to get TA; it's mostly chance that determines it.

Class II: The auditor has to be able to direct attention enough to be able to get TA action while he listens. It is very light attention-directing.

Class III: The auditor directs the PC's attention towards service facs and clearing. The itsa line is controlled more firmly, to limit the PC's attention to this lifetime and to what you are trying to run, using mid-ruds, etc., to do it.

Class IV: At this level, you are dealing with living lightning: backtrack stuff, GPM's, slippery track, etc. If you see the various classes of auditors arranged in order of increasing control of the PC's attention, rather than by degree of complexity of material studied, it is all quite clear.

By overwhumping the PC, by restimulating more on the backtrack than you can discharge, and by not controlling the PC's attention and letting him skid around restimulating things, you get get the PC into a condition where restimulation is too great even to permit. the discharge of the key-in. This is quite a problem. The resolution of this problem comes with running the service facsimile.

A service facsimile is a solution that the person himself has so restimulated that it won't discharge, and nothing will discharge past it. It is so valuable as a solution that the PC feels he would perish if he got rid of it. It's an overcharged solution which the PC himself is keeping charged up. It sits there, and no charge is permitted to flow by it. Unfortunately for the being, it has a weird sort of workability. It is a non-survival solution that has become survival. It appears to make sense until it is inspected. It has lots of A = A = A in it.

When you start to run a service fac by running engrams of the thing, it will grind, and it won't erase. This is another odd datum. The service fac is mainly diagnosed by the fact that the TA hangs up, not by how the person acts in life. The low TA or dead thetan case always has a service fac. The dead thetan case is sometimes hard to spot. Sometimes he is just sitting in something, and when you ask a question, you get an F/N. A high TA case probably has a service fac, although it is questionable. A case whose TA is between 3.5 and 3.75, with a responsive needle, has a good chance of having a service fac, but doesn't necessarily have one. A person who tends to be out of control on the backtrack is over-restimulated. You might even try to find a service fac on him.

When a PC has a service fac, the normal river of discharge is blocked by a stable datum that the PC feels is vital to his survival: the service fac. The hallmark of a service fac is that sometimes, when it is being run out or between sessions, the PC questions the wisdom of getting rid of it. A service fac is present where life has done so much overwhelming and the PC has done so much overwhelming that life makes no more sense. He has abandoned it, and in lieu of it, he has erected this insane stable datum: the service fac.

It might be better to call the service fac a "service computation" or a "survival computation", since it isn't actually a single facsimile at all. It is the person himself keeping the facsimile in restimulation because he knows it is best. There are also third dynamic service facs, such as the current prison system. Penologists know very well that the current prison system does nothing to handle crime. It only increases crime. This system, which was adopted in 1835, was intended, not to rehabilitate criminals, but to dramatize making criminals wrong. Prisons are actually universities of crime, maintained at public expense. Similarly, the FDA's actions are the result of a basically good idea, namely that the public should be protected against noxious food and drug products. But this idea has gone bonkers. It was a good solution that has been plowed in, so that it appears lower and lower of the tone scale and becomes an aberration. [The legal system of precedent is based on the same principle as the service fac, in that it involves maintaining old solutions without necessarily inspecting them.]

It is not true that every solution becomes a service fac. A service fac is a solution that is insisted upon but won't itsa. A solution, to be a real solution, leads to a further ability to itsa. If a solution reduces the ability to itsa, it is a potential service fac. The FDA is taking over the public's ability to inspect goodness of food and denying the public an analytical attitude towards products, thereby reducing the public's itsa. The public no longer inspects and decides. The FDA can now go in and can pass stuff as good that isn't, because of politics, corruption, etc. The public can now be caved in by it.

You would never look to travel agencies as a source of social aberration, because their business is to increase itsa. It can occasionally occur that they do, though there can sometimes be problems associated with this, e.g. British West Indies immigrants flooding the U.K. However, it is reducing itsa that has a bad effect on society. Generally, those things that result in or produce a solution without inspection that is too broadly applied generate service facs. The service fac prevents itsa of charge that comes up, thus causing the accumulation of mass. This mass gets restimulated when you prepcheck something that nicks the area. Lack of itsa also causes lack of TA action, since without itsa outflowed, there is no discharge of charge. Families can get into a no-itsa of their individual members. Lack of itsa results in a failure to handle a situation in its own zone of reality, which is all that aberration is. A service fac makes it [apparently] unnecessary to cope with anything in its own sphere of reality. That

is the "service" that a service fac performs. The resultant accumulated mass causes no TA in the area, no result in prepchecking or other processing. The more service facs the PC has, the harder it is for you to get TA action on him.

In some cases, there are definite advantages to getting service facs out of the way before proceeding to running back track. You can save time and stabilize clears by destimulating what could key in. R3SC is a very workable process. Just inspect the folder, past assessments, etc., looking especially for periods when the TA shut down, i.e. where TA motion stopped for awhile. Whatever TA motion stopped on will be a likely candidate for R3SC. Don't overrun it. If the PC has trouble answering it, come off that particular subject. The right subject gives very good action. The faster you get the real service fac, the sooner TA action is restored.

So this makes R2-12-type processes unnecessary. It solves the problem of rockslammers, chronic PTP's, hidden standards, and body masses. Mainly, it restores TA action. R3SC, run on a few service facs, advances the case to clear. It is a Level III process because it is a clearing process. Current Routine Threes that actually produce OT's, e.g. R3N, will be renumbered as Level IV processes.

6309C05 SHSpec-303 Service Facsimile Assessment

We have been walking around the edges of the field of psychotherapy for some time. There is a third dynamic service fac in this field, in that medical doctors, who have no training for and have no business in the field of mental healing, are attempting to take dominance over this field. They have no understanding of the mind; only an understanding of the brain. All you would have to to to is to get legislatures to pass laws that would only allow those trained in the field of the mind to practice in that field, and you would have secured the field. There are only 272 mental practitioners in England, so we have mocked up our own opposition, our own extra item. So people qualified at Level III will soon have a certificate as a psychiatric consultant. There is no legal patent on the name.

Level III is expected to be able to clear. It also, incidentally, takes in the ability to treat insanity: neurosis and psychosis. These are just a different degree of what is wrong with the mind. The person who can't even manage himself and the environment, we call insane. What is wrong with him is that he has got the final solution: some solution that is so all-pervading that he doesn't have to itsa anything. After that, he never has to look, so he just disappears in a mound of un-as-ised mass.

In processing, a certain amount of introversion takes place, for the purpose of bringing about extroversion. The only time introversion and erasure do not bring about greater reach and greater ARC is when over-restimulation is brought about. That factor still exists in Class IV, but there it is whole track that is most likely to get a PC into an over-restimulated condition, not just itsa on this lifetime. At Level III, you could over-restimulate someone who was already batty. The worse off a case is, the more careful you have to be of over-restimulation. For instance, someone who had been running on a conceptual basis, who did not have much reach and not much ARC with the environment, might get over-restimulated if you got them to contact the pain in the thing that they are running.

To clear somebody, you will stay in this lifetime. Only at Level IV do you leave this lifetime, and that is when someone has an active TA that doesn't go high or low. With any PC on this planet, it is environmental restimulation that is the straw that breaks the PC's back. You can go backtrack, but it is rough. It can make the PC unauditable. An HGC, operating with raw public, or even with scientologists, has to battle with environmental restimulation, not with the bank. Neurotic and psychotic states are caused by environmental restimulation. The two factors involved are:

1. The amount of environmental restimulation.

2. The inherent susceptibility of the individual. Therefore, if all you did was to try to reduce environmental restimulation, some people would go sane and others would go mad with boredom. It is a question of acceptable randomity. Do-gooders end up reducing randomity, and things can get pretty boring. An acceptable level of randomity equals the amount of environmental restimulation divided by the amount of restimulation the individual can withstand: this being equal to some constant. PCs usually audit only what they consider safe. The mind starts to shut off any restimulation that would overwhelm it [Cf. "the mind's protection"]. The PC's ability to resist restimulation is too low for him to face up to track. So how are you going to get anything done?

There are three types of cases:

1. Normal confront of bank: those which audit easily.

2. No confront of bank: those who refuse to approach the bank.

3. Suicidal confront: those whose eyes are bigger than their stomachs, so that they go in over their heads all the time. We want to convert the two latter sorts of cases into the former.

All cases tend towards the safe solution. Some cases also adopt a vengeful solution, like getting even with people by dying. Even a dangerous solution seems like the safe solution to the PC. All cases, when they become more auditable, do so along the channel of the safe solution. A safe solution is a safe decision, a safe environment, a safe assumption, etc. All human rights disappear down the channel of the safe solution. That is the hole in the bathtub. It is actually very dangerous to have a safe solution -- it inhibits observation, and anything that inhibits observation, destroys. Someone who is very neurotic or psychotic is so to the degree that they have adopted a safe solution.

This datum underlies mental healing as sweepingly as the datum that "survival is the common denominator". It is another way of saying the same thing. People adopt survival solutions, when then become so "safe" that they become contra-survival. The safe solution makes the person right and others wrong, enhancing the person's survival by putting him in a position of dominance and letting him escape domination by others. It lets him survive and causes others to succumb, he thinks. This reaches extremes of craziness, e.g. the miser who starves in a household of $100 bills. His method of survival is to have lots of money. It is a very safe solution, but in his obsession with this safe solution, he has neglected to spend any of it to live. So his attention becomes more and more concentrated and less and less sensible.

For someone to be wise, he must be able to observe his environment; he must be able to reach. It is not good enough to have maxims tucked away, to which you can refer in times of stress. Philosophy becomes, not wisdom, but a study of safe solutions.

The safe solution is the service facsimile. There are times when you will have to be very clever to find just what it is. In the PC, it is complicated, alter-ised, and not believable. There could be thousands of them. You want to get the One. The test is, "Did it resolve the case?" In the first ones you find, the most you can hope for is to find something that moves the TA and brings you closer to resolving the PC's case. When you have found the service fac on the case, the needle will be looser, and the TA will be in a more reasonable state, acting better.

When something you have found doesn't run on the right/wrong bracket, you prepcheck. This is an invariable rule. You could fix the PC up by taking anything that has been found charged on old assessments and prepchecking it. That which you couldn't prepcheck with TA, you could run on "right/wrong". If it goes nowhere on that, OK. There is no harm done. All this will eventually reveal the service fac.

One way in which you could be too clever with this would be to get over-ambitious and throw the PC in over his head, as follows: You are pulling the stable datum out of the confusion. Therefore, the PC may be thrown into the confusion, which makes him feel weird. If you run R3SC on the stable datum until it is flat, it will make it all right for the PC.

One of the tests of the service fac is that the PC is likely to say, or at least think, that he is not sure that it is wise to get rid of it. Be very sure, if you are working with someone who is already shaky, that you unburden the case gradiently, even though he is standing there saying his service fac. Environmental restimulation has to be reduced on such a case before you add any processing restimulation.

The better the assessment and the less gradient there had been, the greater the shock to the person. Remember: the PC adopted the safe solution because he couldn't stand the environmental restimulation. So you don't necessarily want to get the big stable data first. It is better to start off with R1C or 2WC on solutions that he has had to his problems. The more solutions he has had to a problem, the more it will stick.

How do you raise someone's ability to withstand environmental restimulation? You pull his service fac, since that is what reduces his ability to see his environment. The more safe solutions he has adopted, the more environmental restimulation he isn't as-ising, the less he is confronting, etc. Oddly enough, or not so oddly, the thing that reduces his ability to handle his environment is the thing that he has adopted to handle his environment for him. When you remove that thing, he can now confront and inspect the environment and handle it.

When you get the environmental restimulation out of the way, the PC can confront the backtrack. We have gone into this line because we want a faster run to OT. "I don't care anything much about clearing or whether he gets clear or not." We are not trying to make a happy persons we are trying to make an able person. You can make a clear by getting off enough service facs. It makes a better human being, but the point is to cut down the time spent at Level IV, which is already a sizable amount.

At Level III, then, we can handle environmental restimulation. By knocking out the service facsimile, which is what encourages environmental restimulation, we have enough attention free so that We can go whole-track and erase things faster, and we are not held up by low TA's and high TA's. [So we don't have this situation:] "W started to do a GPM; we got a little bit mixed up; we got into the Bear goals; then we got into the Helatrobus -- didn't realize it, but we were into the Invisible Picture Goals all the time...." By knocking out the service fac, session restimulation also drops, because the session is part of the environment.

The assessment for R3SC is a simple one. It is L and N. The lists don't have to be super-long. In fact, they should not be longer than eight to ten pages, with twenty items per page, unless it is just safe to keep on listing. A list should be only as long as it has to be to keep the PC from ARC breaking because it is incomplete.

Here is the R3SC procedure:

1. You do a Parts of Existence list and null it down to some one item that the PC doesn't object to, say "peanuts". It doesn't matter if the item is right, so long as the PC doesn't argue about it. If, say, four items are left in and the list isn't complete, we will just do step (2) to all four of the levels left in, as long as the PC isn't protesting. PCs dramatize doing only what is safe, ss they move in towards the service fac, so you may need to do this assessment several times.

2. Take the item found and list safe solutions to it, safe assumptions about it, or safe decisions about it, whatever clears with the PC. The item you get, e.g. "not eat them", is probably either as close as you can get to the service fac at this time or the service fac itself.

3. Take the item and work it over until it is a solution to more than just that one dynamic, e.g. a solution to more than just "peanuts". You could ask, "How could that apply to other dynamics?", etc. We want a broader version of the safe assumption, to get closer to the real service fac.

4. In any case, take whatever you get from (3) and run R3SC brackets or prepcheck on it.

5. Repeat the entire procedure, starting with a new Parts of Existence list.

6. Run it to free needle.

If you run something and you still have some charge on it, list for safe assumptions about that topic. Look for identifications. PC's will mention assumptions that don't make sense. Such an identification is a cousin to one or more service facs. Note them when you find them. This whole operation does take some genius.

6309C10 SHSpec-304 Destimulation of a Case

Use Arabic numerals to apply to routines; use Roman numerals to apply to a body of data, e.g. "Scientology III", not "3". Auditor Report Forms are getting a standardized format.

When handling service facs, you are handling stuff that can bypass more stuff than any other thing there is. If the PC gives you his service fac and you refuse it, you have bypassed the major charge on

his case, and he blows his skull off. The service fac is what keeps the environmental restimulation restimulated. When you are handling the service fac, you are handling what makes aberration permanent. Many PCs have second dynamic service facs. This has nothing to do with life, but it has to do with your situation on this planet at this time. The sickness and incidence of illness on this planet is unusually high, because the way to make everybody wrong is obviously to produce nothing. Everybody counts on guys going ahead and making bodies, keeping the civilization wheeling, to keep thetans interested enough so they will keep reporting back. The industrialist is in trouble at this time, because he is producing. On a whole-track basis, a thetan is in trouble simply because of MEST. That is how he looks at it. If he could have arranged never to have created anything, he would not now have anything to be in trouble with, clearly. So any creative activity is doomed to attack, and the artists and musicians of this planet always attract someone who caves them in. The same is true of industrialists, etc. They don't have enough force to protect their creativeness, so people attack them. Therefore you find a lot of service facs having to do with the second dynamic.

R3SC is a thin-ice activity. If you go one step too far, you are in the soup. So be careful to word questions with, "In this lifetime...." That way, you will avoid a lot of trouble from over-restimulation, from getting onto the whole track. With service fac running, we are engaged upon key-out, not bank erasure. Keep the PC's attention on this lifetime. And be careful, since it easily goes to other areas, which can then easily become BPC. That is the second factor that makes service facs fraught with potential ARC breaks. [The first factor was that if the PC gives you his service fac and you refuse it, you have bypassed the major charge on the case.]

The moment you combine Scientology III with Scientology IV, you will lose; you will have had it. You will have left on the PC restimulation both from the PT environment and from the whole track. How do you handle this, so as to avoid this situation? Word questions so as to avoid all goal-type answers. If an item rocket reads, don't take it, since only GPM's rocket read. You could get away with running it, if you handled it very gingerly, with "In this lifetime ...", and if you were very careful and didn't oppose it. You can note it for later reference. The best way to avoid problems is to ask questions that cannon be answered with a goal. Asking for a safe assumption about (item) is pretty safe, in that you don't get goals, but asking for a safe solution to something tends to give you goals. Service facs are almost never, "To...." But they can be expressed that way. Avoid it.

Scientology III bypasses less charge, run skillfully, than Scientology IV, just because you are not among so many potentially heavily charged restimulatable things. What you want to do with Scientology III is to destimulate the case, so don't restimulate it. In running service facs, you can be wrong by restimulating -- the more you restimulate, the more wrong you are. The value of destimulation appeared in the search for TA action, which is the only way to advance the case. The whole track is too restimulative for most PCs. Getting into it produces over-restimulation and stops TA action. The only reason that the TA doesn't move is that the PC is in over-restimulation.

Take a room and fill it half full of cotton bales (representing charge). A person in that room won't be able to move too well. Then put some more cotton bales in the room -- now the person will have even more trouble moving. Trying to handle the situation by putting even more cotton bales in the room stops his entirely. The proper course of action is to get rid of as much as you can that is already there. Clearing is getting all the false data and this lifetime restimulation off the case prior to recovering the truth. One gets very good TA action doing Scientology III just by working on that line.

Any case is over-restimulated when you start work on it. The basic mechanism of entrapment is to keep the person's attention diverted, to financial matters, for instance, to keep kicking him ground with various forms of trouble and worry so that he doesn't have a chance to observe what is really going on. The thetan wants something out of this planet, and he thinks there is some pay. He thinks that he is getting something out of it. The trap wouldn't run at all unless the thetan was so busy in it that he never had time to look at it. If he could see the trap, he could get out of it, but his attention gets diverted in it. He then makes foolish decisions to hold off foolish confusion and gets still more entrapped. It is a perfected system of attention fixing, shifting, and dispersal, a real trap, not just a cynical snide comment. Those aspects of this planet that you protest are probably there to excite protest and over-restimulation, e.g. finances. Money is a bum itsa. What is it? In socialism, you can never buy yourself off. You stay tied down.

Life is a constant restimulation. The PC comes into session subject to all this environmental restimulation. Restimulation comes in several different forms.

1. PT environment.

2. Restimulated bank, restimulated by the service fac. Actually, there is an interrelationship between environmental restimulation and service fac restimulation, in that the PC wouldn't have the PTP of environmental restimulation if it weren't for service facs.

3. Auditing restimulation: what has been restimulated in auditing and not erased.

4. Current session restimulation: what you are going to restimulate in the session, or what you are in the process of restimulating in session.

5. Auditor restimulation: restimulation occurring simply from being audited, if the auditor is rough, restimulation from flubs. All of these sources of restimulation are interactive. To some degree, they all hinge on the service fac. Cross-restimulation occurs; the only core on which it sits is the service fac. The service fac keeps the environment restimulated. It has great bearing on other forms of restimulation and prevents their discharge. However, it can be knocked out.

The most notable thing about the service fac is that the thetan is doing it, right now. He is making himself right and someone else wrong, all on his own cockeyed determinism. He is keeping the GPM in restimulation because he is using the service fac. He is mocking up his bank, and he is the effect of it too, but he is responsible for everything that is happening to him. The preceding is happening right now. He is doing it; it is decisional.

How does the auditor restimulate something? By putting the PC's attention or letting the PC's attention go on any heretofore inert charge that can be restimulated, i.e. anything that is not already discharged. The PC is totally incapable of causing trouble in a session. The auditor can let the PC's attention wander all over, restimulating anything his service fac directs him to. You wouldn't have psychosomatic illness unless the thetan had, as all do, the service fac that the best way to handle a situation is to get sick. That is a service fac that goes backtrack easily.

The way an auditor restimulates something is to let the PC's attention wander to it or to mention it. How much it gets restimulated just depends on how often you mention it and with what intensity. The mechanism of restimulation is "name it". The way to get an ARC break is to name something and permit no itsa. This gives you instant BPC, as when the auditor says, "Sorry about that last session we had." Another way to get an ARC break is to let the actions of the session bar the discharge of materials already restimulated. E.g. the PC comes into session itsa-ing, and the auditor "getting model session in", shuts the PC up. Auditors often ask silly questions to be sociable, then shut the PC up in order to start the session, cutting the itsa line. An auditor can goof at start of session by putting in a whatsit, e.g. "How are you doing?", and then not letting the PC itsa: "We're going to start the session now." You can do this any time. It results in an explosion.

On an uncleared PC, the service fac is interacting with whatever else is restimulated, so the PC is putting in a continuous restimulative factor in sessions. You will get restimulation trouble as long as a PC has a prominent service facsimile. Getting one out of the way knocks about half the potential restimulation out of the way. Audit smoothly as you do it. If you, the auditor, do the tiniest little thing wrong when you are approaching a service fac, the PC targets you as the one to be made wrong. Provide good, specific, small targets for the PC's attention, and don't let his attention slide around. It is a trick to find a service fac without restimulating everything. Here are some tips:

1. Audit smoothly. This is the solution to session restimulation.

2. Restimulate no more in your current auditing than you have to. Don't start naming a whole bunch of things.

3. Give the PC frequent "on auditing" prepchecks to handle charge from past auditing. Do this every five or six sessions.

4. Keep up with the PT environment. Audit at least 2 1/2 hours a week. In a case that was over-restimulated, one would look to see what was practical to cut out. Normally, the auditor would be concerned with reducing the auditing restimulation. This is often overdone by:

a) Excessively big targets.

b) Loss of control of the itsa line. The auditor lets the PC talk too much.

One reason an auditor goofs is that he has his own service fac. He is unwittingly trying to make LRH or the tech wrong. He will usually come around when this is pointed out. Another phenomenon is that, as you look for the PC's service fac and jog it, he will target you to be made wrong, which can be fairly restimulative and make the auditor flub. One way to handle that would be to switch auditors.

You want to key out service facs, so in assessing, always use "In this lifetime." You don't want whole track.

"Only a GPM rocket reads."

If you have a room full of cotton bales, you won't get anywhere with that [finding the service fac] directly, because there is no room to move around. But you can reduce the restimulation in other ways. If you handle all auditing on the basis of reducing restimulation, you will seldom be wrong. Any PC who is running badly is doing so because of over-restimulation. Any solution of the auditing situation or the case has to take into account reduction of restimulation, either by discharge or destimulation. You can destimulate the person's life somewhat. You can reduce one or more of the five sources of restimulation [See p. 503, above]. You could destimulate any restimulatable area -- whatever you can, in fact, work with. Then audit out this lifetime service facs. "A case is as hard to run as it is restimulated" -- no more than that. Anything that reduces restimulation on the case is valid auditing. For instance, you could destimulate past therapies. Psychiatrists add more environmental restimulation than they pick off a case, so of course they fail.

6309C11 SHSpec-306 Service Facs and GPM's

HCOB 8May63 "Routine 3 -- The Nature of Formation of GPM" says, "The early GPM's contacted are implants. This does not mean the PC's own GPM's do not exist." The PC's own GPM has power and velocity over an implant GPM in a ratio of 1000 or 100,000 to 1. There is a great difference in order of magnitude. The whole and entire amount of implanted GPM's -- all together -- are one RI of one of LRH's GPM's: the oppterm goals, which is one of about a hundred RI's on a personal GPM, which extends from trillions 30 to trillions 20 on the track and is actually still continuing.

A number of you have some protest on the length of the time track -- multiple trillions of trillions, etc. "Modern times" is trillions 13 to now -- the stuff that is likely to influence the PC in PT.

What you are doing in R3SC is "fooling around with the PC's current RI in his existing PT goal line of his current truncated goal [GPM]." There is an opposition to it. Clearing up this stuff is clearing a dumbbell pair out of the PC's own GPM, restimulated in PT, out of sequence on the track. The PC's goal will fall out of this with a thud. It is probable that while you are listing for the PC's service fac, you will get the PC's goal, rocket reading.

The amount of aberration required to reduce power must be comparable to the power reduced. To account for the reduction of power of the thetan, we must find some force of equal power that could aberrate him. All the implant GPM's did was to confuse you as to what was your goal and what was an implanted goal. Implanted goals were installed backwards, from top to bottom. An actual GPM is run the way it was lived: from bottom to top. Use R3M2 to run actual GPM's.

[R3M2 is apparently a variant of R3M. R3M is a method of running the sequence of actual GPM's, RI by RI, starting either with an RI or with a rocket-reading goal. Starting with the goal, the first RI is obtained by using a "goal oppose list", also known as a "source list", more or less with the wording, "Who or what would (the goal) oppose?" Subsequent RI's are obtained by "RI oppose lists". These have to be listed right-way-to. There are different rules for finding the item on these two sorts of lists. Each RI, after it is found, is packaged by relating it to the goal and to the RI found just before it, and, when verified, is added to the line plot. This packaging step also lets you know when you have entered a new GPM, as the RI's will no longer relate to the goal previously found. When this happens, the new goal is found by doing a new goals list for a new rocket reading goal. Or the PC may volunteer the new goal. You can also start R3M with an RI, perhaps one that was obtained from R2-12. In this case, you just keep doing RI oppose lists and getting new RI's. By the time you have several RI's, the PC will give you his goal. But you continue with the RI oppose lists. Other references on R3M are to be found above.]

Don't use an early actual goal as a service fac [and try to run it as such.] If you do this, you are making the guy look down the goals channel. The goal in an actual GPM is the furthest item from PT, being the bottom terminal. When you get the PC to reach down for that goal, he is, to some slight degree, traveling through time between that goal and PT, and he livens up the whole track, which is a lot of charge. It is like looking down between the rows of the Helatrobus implants. You get a tunnel of blackness. That is what happens when you reach down a GPM. The same thing happens with the PC's GPM channel, only it is a quite different order of magnitude. With the Helatrobus implant, it is not so good to do this, but with the PC's own actual GPM channel, it is like having your head shot off with a sixteen inch cannon. The residual charge in an actual GPM is incomparably greater.

If the goal comes up as you look for a service fac, put it in the Auditor's Report Form, clearly marked with a red circle, and don't do much with it, except in R3M2. If you run it, you are getting the PC to look down through the GPM to the beginning of some track, with at least a hundred RI's between you and it. You will get TA, etc., if you run it as a service fac, but the PC running it will scuff up his track.

The PC's own GPM looks like a black island, floating. It is quite meaty. They come in different sizes, but each is a distinct size. You are running the PC back and forth from the bottom of a mass maybe three feet thick, 75 feet long, and 30 feet wide. You could well restimulate so much mass that the TA will, all of a sudden, freeze up. You would have to remedy this by working out the GYM with R3M2. The PC's own GPM has the beauty of disintegrating as you work with it. You get rocket-reading blowdowns. The black islands turn grey, then start shaking and fraying, like opaque jello that someone left in the sun. The power in this early GPM is commensurate with the native power of a thetan, i.e. there is a lot of charge on it. This charge doesn't discharge through the PC or the meter, luckily.

The technology for handling this is all in R3N [See above] and R3M2. RI's relate to a goal, but each as its own central postulate, with regard to the goal. This is true of every RI in the PC's GPM. For instance, the current RI might have a central postulate of "to ring bells", where the goal is "to go to school". You might get an oppterm of people who bring their lunches. Without knowing the goal, this would be puzzling. That's why it would be an aberrative factor.

R3SC will land you somewhere in the vicinity of the current oppterm or terminal of the PC's own GPM. as it applies to PT, or it may land you near some old RI that is in restimulation in PT. That will be the source of the PC's PT restimulation. With R3SC, you can knock that in the head. You can pull its central postulate. But when you try to make the service fac make sense, you may find it impossible to do so until you relate it to his goal, by running R3M2. So that is actually what you are auditing when you find the service fac.

You could find a service fac without a meter by having the PC write a list of solutions, until he is easy about it and feels that it is complete, then looking on the list for the solution that makes the least sense. However, when seen as an RI, such things can be seen to make sense.

When you are handling a service fac, you are handling the central postulate of an RI. So running R3SC disintegrates the RI. The thinkingness of the RI is sometimes different from its beingness. E.g. you may have the RI, "a lame man", but from that, you may not know what the significance is that lies within it, i.e. you may not know what the central postulate is. You could list for this and find it. It may turn out to be "lameness".

Things can be audited nicely without being related to the GPM where they occur, even though, under these circumstances, they might not make sense. A service fac is actually not a whole RI, but just the central postulate of an RI. You are handling the central postulate of an RI when you are handling a service fac, so you get a disintegration.

A being assumes an identity because it has a solution in the middle of it. For instance, in the middle of the identity, "a lame man", we may find "lameness" as a solution to something. Sometimes an RI comes up as its own thinkingness, but a beingness RI in particular may have an idea at its core. An RI always has an idea at its core, but sometimes you don't have the central idea when you have the RI. Given the RI, you could list for the central significance, which is "an automatic solution. It's safe. It solves everything." [This safe solution would be the service fac.] That is how an RI is generated. The thetan has an idee fixe, so he never has to inspect in order to solve, so therefore he never as-ises the mass, so therefore he gets caught in the middle of the mass. If the thetan does this with a goal, he gets

an accumulation of RI's resulting from this goal. Each of these RI's has the goal carried through into it, but there is also a new idea that makes each RI. And that whole mass comes together as a GPM, so you get this huge mass, this huge block of energy, with its separate items in it. They don't appear separate. The whole thing is all squashed together from so much attack and so little inspection. The whole thing is dominated by one goal, e.g. "to go to school", which is common to every RI or identity within it. This is what it is accumulates it. But that goal, all by itself, is no-inspection; it is a way to solve all problems, totally uninspected, in a fixed way. For instance, the goal "to solve all problems, go to school", is a totally uninspected solution and now gathers to itself identities who have this idea, as well as other characteristics. Because the goal is uninspected, automatic, and fixed, it generates into itself the second step of identities, e.g. "an idiot child", that have the goal as a central idea, but which already have their own characteristics. They have the main idea -- the goal -- as dominant, but the characteristic of the identity, after it is no longer able to carry out the postulate, is something like that of an idiot child. The idea of "an idiot child" is "people like unintelligence." So the central idea may be "unintelligence solves everything", but the RI is "an idiot child". The only way that it could exist in the first place was that the thetan had the idea of the goal. ["to solve all problems, go to school".]

So there are three types of ideas in GPM's:

1. The goal of the GPM. This is the first postulate and central idea of the GPM.

2. The central idea or postulate of the RI, which in itself forbids inspection.

3. The identity or individuality or the RI. This is the accumulation of mass that results from the fact that (1) and (2), above, being fixed, uninspected solutions, forbid itsa and hence forbid an as-isness from occurring. That is the anatomy of an RI, but it also tells us what a service fac is.

This is what gives us the dwindling spiral of abilities. RI's, substitutions of ideas for thetans, the thetan's O/W's -- all these get piled up on these fixed ideas. The biggest fixed idea was a goal, which then developed into a GPM.

"That which is not inspected tends to persist," because it is never as-ised. What happens? A person gets Hell knocked out of him. The RI and its significance is the constant invitation to attack, but it is never the right enemy. The constant O/W and battling that ensues from this fact accumulates as the mass of an RI.

It is interesting that an idea is most easily substituted for a thetan because it has no mass and seems to contain some wisdom. "I am a guard" implies "I don't have to understand or inspect." The thetan has tried to "solve" a screw-up with a fixed idea or postulate. This is a sort of "sweeping under the rug" that permits no inspection, therefore no as-isness, therefore persistence. Any idea is liable to become substituted for a thetan, because he does it himself. When one gives up on one goal, one gets another. For instance, say the last three or four mountain ranges the thetan built fell down and fouled up his planet. So, on the ideal planet, "Never build mountains" becomes the solution that holds all the confusion uninspected. It is "solved" instead. Sooner or later, we will find him running a Society for the Prevention of Building Mountains. He is now an identity. He is the idea, "Never build mountains", substituted for a thetan. The PC keeps abandoning old solutions as they fail, and keeps getting new goals. This is covered in R3M, basically, except for finding the PC's own goal and distinguishing it from implant goals.

So be alert to anything you find in R3SC that rocket reads, but don't run it with service fac tech. You can't run a GPM with service fac tech, but you can run one RI with it. But that rocket read is more than just a service fac. R3SC does handle the RI that is part of the PC's PT environment.

If you find an RI, and your PC is having energy doing odd things to him, giving ghastly sensations, body distortion sensations, etc., the PC is liable to disclaim the RI in an effort to get away from it all. Getting towards the service fac causes qualms and invalidation in a PC. The service fac is "pro-survival", so he doesn't want to give it up. Don't Q and A with that invalidation. To do so will just restimulate it worse. If the invalidation occurs, pick up everything found as a service fac and finish it off standardly, with all of the R3SC steps. When a stable datum is pulled out and not run off completely, you leave some of the confusion behind. So just get it with R3SC. If you take the stable datum half way out of a confusion, you leave the confusion. This is what happens when you leave R3SC on something half-run. The result is that the person will get foggy; his memory will deteriorate. If you took the stable datum all the way out, you would blow the confusion.

The postulate in the center of the RI is so far downscale that it is twenty TA divisions below "hide". It is an idea that has turned into MEST. You run it only as far as cognition, but it may enter at any of these levels:

1. Solutions.

2. Right/wrong.

3. Domination.

4. Survival. But a real GPM item service fac goes through the steps of:

1. Solutions.

2. Right/wrong.

3. Domination.

4. Survival.

5. Domination.

6. Right/wrong. Then the next:

1. Solutions.

2. Right/wrong.

3. Domination.

4. Survival.

Etc. Again, the service fac may enter at any of these stages. It starts off reasonably sensible, but becomes very weird, like "cows are kissable" as a safe solution to "how to repair motor cars". This service fac will turn out to be intimately related to "solution" or "domination", etc., in the PC's mind. When you try to run it, the PC may not be able to fit it in on "right/wrong", so check it over on the other buttons. He may well cognite on it and blow the charge. You could then see how it is a solution, how it would make or has made him right and others wrong, around and around on the buttons, until the PC is out of answers and the buttons are clean. Do an 18-button prepcheck, and it will all cool down.

The auditor is always in danger of grabbing the GPM accidentally, getting the goal instead of the service fac. This has advantages too, since the PC's goal is hard to sort out from implant goals. The PC's own RI's are probably what make implant goals read. They read off the top of the PC's own RI's. The service fac doesn't have to rocket read. You can accept one that does, but be equally prepared to take one that just ticks.

The PC's service fac is his current solution, his current RI, monitored by the goal. It is a very aberrated stable datum. It is an unexamined solution that keeps the PC from doing anything. It was a decent solution when the thetan first got hold of it, but then it started running his life. Therefore, it does not even vaguely take care of environmental enturbulation. [The rule: "When in doubt, communicate," is an attempt to overcome the effect of service facs.]

You have to work at it to do R3SC wrong. The best way to do it wrong is to be completely unthorough, to leave everything unflat. The PC will get very confused, from having all his stable data pulled away. When you handle a service fac, all the incomplete cycles that the service fac has caused hit the PC at once. This generates confusion. When the service fac running is not completed, the confusion gets even worse. So it is a good idea, from time to time, to clean up what you have done. Get it all finished up. Some service facs won't run quite in the order given for R3SC. It may start on a later step than "right/wrong", or earlier, at "solutions". A real service fac behaves outrageously, in that regard. Something else that isn't a service fac may be far more mannerly, while still giving TA action.

Keep your eyes peeled for the PC's goal, since this is the best means of finding it that we have developed. Keep running service facs until the case is in good shape and the PC's goal has shown up. You get the best TA on the PC's own GPM channel. You can use R3M2 when you get his goal, but that is not your immediate purpose. R3SC is for destimulating the PT environment factor.

6309C12 SHSpec-305 Service Facs

The difficulty with getting a PC's case forward is that the PC has a hidden standard, which is that by which he measures his progress. It is often unknown, even to the PC. That is why it is "hidden".

An aberration is an out-of-control exaggeration of the positive or negative of anything a thetan can do. [Hence Aristotle's doctrine of the Golden Mean.] The fact that something is normal doesn't mean that it isn't aberrated. For instance, the difficulty of exteriorization is accepted, but it is not anything much in line with the thetan's abilities. So departure from the normal is no particular index of case state. Auditors sometimes have trouble because a PC runs too easily. So in judging case level, don't use the PC's behavior as an index. Use the amount of TA motion.

By running service facs, the case can change very quickly. So worrying about the PC's "normal" behavior is unnecessary and irrelevant. It is easier to measure a person's case against some scales of abilities than against behavior, and it is more accurate. The condition of restimulation of the case has more to do with understanding the PC and handling him effectively than does the PC's behavior. The only things you worry about with a PC are:

1. Can he do the process?

2. Is he getting any gains?

3. Is he getting TA motion?

The fact that someone has a hidden standard merely means that he has a chronic restimulation that is throwing extra charge on the case. It is some facsimile, or whatever, in chronic restimulation. If it was changed in the session, the PC had a gain. If you got TA, some of the chronic restimulation will have gone, so the PC will have had a gain and will probably say so. That, unfortunately, isn't all that happens with a hidden standard. The PC is also trying to fit every process to this thing, to resolve it. He is so introverted in session as a result that he doesn't as-is anything, and you don't get TA action. Time and the TA fit together, and the PC drags his hidden standard facsimile up into every incident, or whatever, in order to evaluate it. Therefore, the PC is always misdating something. The hidden standard isn't the date of it, whatever date he is in. That is why it is the most effective TA stopper.

There is a way of getting rid of the hidden standard: a process called R3T, now called R4T. In this process, one simply asks the PC for his chronic psychosomatic -- what he is experiencing and what is always present. He answers, and you date it, whatever it is. Then you get the itsa line in on it. In most cases, that is the end of the hidden standard.

The hidden standard always expresses itself physiologically. It is never hidden physically. It will be what the PC complains about. Sometimes it will take you an hour or so of itsa to find out what it is. When the PC spots it, he will feel better, and you will have been getting TA. Don't let him start giving you problems, or you have had it, since problems are not itsa. So perhaps you should stick to, "What physical condition are you trying to solve?"

He will finally itsa it out, if he doesn't tell you all at once. If he gives it to you right off the bat, you might get some TA with, "When has this troubled you in auditing?" or " ... in this lifetime?" You can take it up with R3T and date it, taking it back as far as need be. Sometimes dating it will cause it to blow on the spot, especially if you don't get it so narrowed down that you get the PC into an engram and have to run it with R3R, or, if he gets stuck in his own GPM, with R3M2, or if in another GPM, with R3N. [R3T seems to be the precursor to the date portion of the date/locate, for handling intractable pressure somatics.] R3T is commonly overrun. You've got to watch the PC. When you first start using R3T, you are likely to overrun it roughly 80% of the time. Eventually you get slippy and stop overrunning it.

Not every PC has a hidden standard, to the point where it ruins the auditing. But a hidden standard exists in every case that has a difficult or delicate TA, that the auditor has to worry about. So R3T is the weapon to use to get the TA moving again, when all else has failed. R3T can fix it, but a little goes a long way. Don't try to run the whole case with R3T, since if you tried to do this, you could end up with a messed-up PC. However, you could do R3T on everything the PC is worried about in PT. You could clear somebody with R3T, as long as you you kept good control over the PC and just dated all his PT hidden standards.

The service fac has to be severely located on the time track in this lifetime, so that it will key out. Handle every hidden standard that the PC could dream up. But don't let him pull anything up from the back track in the meantime. Use TR-2. If R3SC goes nowhere, you can still clear the PC using R3T. The tough case is the PC whose service fac is his hidden standard. The only workable handling is carefully to get it dated.

This is all destimulation, so you have to be careful not to run anything. The reason you are trying to destimulate the case is so that the PC doesn't have PTP's, so that he can put his attention on the session. If you start a destimulating action and then go backtrack and start running something, the PC will get restimulated. And if the PC's service fac includes making you wrong, that is the first thing he will do. He will try to restimulate more than he can handle. How do you keep the itsa line in on a PC that wants to restimulate more? Be awful damn careful of your whatsits. Remove all social actions and chit-chat from your auditing. Avoid all violent attention shifts, and attention shifts directed by a whatsit, and don't direct the PC's attention in a way that ARC breaks him, so that he has to get even with you by whatsiting.

The type of model session to use on a case that isn't getting much TA is your W-unit type model session: no social frills. [W unit was next after the V unit, which was heavily supervised R2-10 and R2-12 on a co-audit basis. W unit contained ruds, havingness, CCH's, and assists. It used "GF model session" or "goal finders model session". See HCOPL 8Dec62 "Training -- Saint Hill Special Briefing Course: Summary of Subjects by Units" for a description of W, X, Y, and Z units. GF model session is given in HCOB 15Oct 2 "Goal Finders Model Session". This bulletin is not on the SHSBC.] Over-restimulation leads to self-invalidation and invalidation of scientology and other dynamics. The PC invalidates his own case, chews himself up all the time, and he doesn't know. So let that be a warning sign to you.

The case, minus the service fac, is subject to less restimulation because he pulls in fewer PTP's in his environment. A case without good processing gains has PTP's. The way to handle them is by handling service facs. There is a way of listing for service facs that nails PTP's:

1. "What's a safe assumption about your environment?"

2. "What would be a safe method of handling your problems, here and now in life?"

This is only one of many solutions to this situation. Such a question will drop into your lap the stable datum that the person is using to hold at bay various sectors of his existence. So in that respect, it becomes a method of destimulating the environment. You wind up with what he uses to handle his family, his job, etc. Take the PC's whole environment to pieces. Find out where his life is in conflict and what it is in conflict with, in PT. Get what PT consists of. This orients the PC and is good Scientology I. [See above, for a description of Scientology I. Note also the similarity to the PT environment list in expanded dianetics.] You should both categorize things and locate them spatially. This is good for the PC's itsa. After you have all of PT, use the above process on it. You could plot the PT environment out and find where most of the PC's problems are. The PC gets gloomiest when talking about this area. The TA dies down as you keep talking about it, indicating that there are more problems there than the PC can confront. He can't put any itsa into the vicinity.

As the PC looks at the stable datum that he is using to hold sectors of existence at bay, and as he finds out more about it, you will get his confront on the environment increasing and increasing, as his ability to differentiate comes up. This is a terrific HGC approach.

Now that you know about the hot spots and fixated areas in the PC's environment, you have subjects where he can't itsa. You can assess by rising TA to get a zone where there is a service fac in operation. As long as one can't itsa something, he will continue to have PTP's with it, so since the PC can't confront the areas of rising TA, he will have PTP's there, make mistakes, etc. The frequency of

PTP's is the measure of no-confront. No-confront is caused by a substitute confront, which is a service facsimile. It isn't that the thetan can't confront. It is that as long as the PC has the service fac, the things he is not-confronting can keep caving him in and restimulating him. Here is a lesson that you should learn about life: Don't stay in places that you don't want to keep confronting, because your non-confronting will lead you to pick up a stable datum to do your confronting for you in that vicinity, and the next thing you know, this is going to be a gorgeous piece of mass and will give you more PTP's than you can ordinarily count, and your life will become very restimulative. The rising TA is less observable than the PC's attitude. If the PC hasn't got anything to say about something, he isn't observing it. Something is observing it for him, and that something is a service fac. Find this and run R3SC steps on it.

If you are having trouble with R3SC, you have collided with the RI of the PC's ongoing GPM. It will still handle with R3SC, if with some difficulty.

You use several assessments to get something to run on R3SC. You can use a scientology List One assessment or a discussion of PT doingness and environment, with observation of where the PC goes downtone and where the TA rises, indicating areas where the PC can't confront and itsa. When you run the brackets step of R3SC, you will get TA by as-ising stable data and letting confusion fly off. Do a thorough PC Assessment Sheet. You can use the PC Assessment Sheet to find out about the PC's PT, if you treat it as a leisurely 2WC activity, looking for TA action, not data, i.e. doing it as an R3SC assessment. When dealing with this lifetime, let the itsa run free. When dealing with past track, control the itsa line very closely. An assessment at Scientology IV is a rapid, bang-bang assessment.

6309C17 SHSpec-307 What You Are Auditing

We are interested in the total concept of what you are processing. The idea of old-time psychotherapy is completely useless. We have always gone along with the notion that the ideas of old-time psychotherapies had some historical interest, but they are worthless. All we can say for the old-time psychotherapists is that they tried. And they did give people the idea that something could be done.

In dianetics, we talked about the mental image picture. This is handled today with R3R. It is great that we can now get any PC to see facsimiles, just by getting the date and duration. But the therapeutic value of dianetics is limited, since it handles free track, which is relatively unaberrative. The aberrative value of free track isn't enough to keep someone from being clear or OT. You could run R3R for a long time and never get there. Frequently you can of course, heal psychosomatic illness with R3R. Unfortunately, the wins you get with it are sporadic. This makes it a dangerous technology, since you will keep going on hoping for a repeat win. It is an excellent piece of training technology, however, and it is very useful for an assist.

R3N handles implanted goals and materials. [See above] People keep on worrying whether the fact that they have implants means that they were implanters. What is the relative value of this implanting? The value of it is that, without a knowledge of implant goals and implanting, you can easily get a PC's own actual track mixed up in then, and you will always be confused on the subject. An auditor would mess up the PC thoroughly if he ran an actual GPM as an implant GPM or vice versa. R3N is very good as a way of teaching the form of a GPM. It gives lots of practice getting rocket reads, etc. Implant GPM's have practically no aberrative value, compared to that of a PC's own actual GPM's. What implanters did was to take the form of an actual GPM, as made by a thetan, and mock up a synthetic GPM with his own goal (in some cases), and implant it. Some implant GPM's were given several times. That was very confusing to thetans, because it was a parody and a mockery of the thetan's own actions. Implant GPM's were intended to key in the thetan's actual GPM. They were somewhat successful at doing this, but they didn't manage to scramble up the actual GPM. Undoubtedly, implant GPM's influenced the thetan's postulate of his next goal, or some of his RI's, however. The implant GPM makes the thetan feel sad about the universe.

But the implanter did us a favor, in that he gave us a training ground that can be used to gain familiarity with GPM's without wrapping the PC around too many telephone poles. The implant GPM has no real impingement on the PC. He has never been upset about its RI's. But when you get one of his own RI's, you will get charge off, cognitions, etc.

An actual GPM looks more like the Gorilla GPM. It is more "natural". TA action lies in the actual GPM, because it is much much much more aberrative than an implant GPM. It is difficult to get at the actual GPM. Finding the goal of the PC has always been a struggle. We have just speeded it up by using the service fac to find the goal. The service fac is "the top RI (terminal) of the PC's actual PT developing GPM." The reason that the PC's goal was so hard to find was that PT, bearing down hard on the goal, the GPM, all its RI's, and particularly the RI's in PT, kept the PC sufficiently over-restimulated that the TA was stuck. And the rocket read is suppressed if you can't immediately find the PC's goal. All the PT sources of restimulation are bearing down on the PT RI and oppterm, the last two items of the goal that the PC has and is living with in PT. This is all happening because of the PC's own postulate: the service fac. The mystery of stuck TA is the environment impinging on the PT RI's, which are held there by the PC's postulate. So the PC is doing something there, and we have the service fac.

When you find the service fac in its entirety, you have the top or next to top pair of RI's in the PC's actual GPM. The PC's own GPM will now RR, providing you unburden it.

Here is the situation: The PC is very over-restimulated by PT, and he is keeping himself super-aberrated with stable data like, "Horses sleep in beds," on the goal "to ride". The PT goal is so overburdened by PT that if you find a goal at all, you will find it 'way down the track at trillions 50 or trillions 30. If you try to run that one, the PC's bank goes, "Creak:" All the back track charge is smashing him forward towards PT. His attention is pinned in PT, and the goal you have found seems unreal to him. It is probably a dichotomy of his PT goal.

R3SC, run successfully, occasionally gives a fall which you will see in the next session as accelerated falls on everything you are running. In the next session, as you are nulling a list, you start seeing rocket reads. The bank has loosened up enough so that you are reaching locks as the PC differentiates. Soon you may get a rocket reading goal showing up, which keeps rocket reading. Now we have arrived among the last four or five GPM's, not necessarily at the most recent GPM. As they approach PT, the GPM's are so restimulated and jammed up that it is hard to be sure that you have the most recent one. When you get a goal, e.g. "to hide", test it to see if it is an implant goal. If it isn't, oppose it. You want the PC in good shape before you do this, since you are about to drag him through three or four actual GPM's. Say you have the goal, "to have nothing worth taking". This will seem to be the PT GPM. Check, "Who or what would oppose _____ ?", and get the next goal. You may have to do this again. By now, the PC is very uncomfortable. Try to oppose whatever you get. Keep doing oppose lists until you get the PT goal. Test it out thoroughly, and list for the latest terminal of the goal, e.g. "not to be so slimy". When you get the latest terminal, the similarity or connection to his service fac will be clear. He could have gone over to the enemy camp, where he is about to start a new GPM. The PC may, in this case, be feeling pretty awful and may start rejecting the goal. He is dramatizing the RI terminal that he is in, which may oppose his goal. The way to run the GPM is as accurately as possible. Just keep listing your way down to the bottom of it, not missing RI's or getting off into other goals. When you get to the bottom, go around and run it back up, to get the remaining 50% of the GPM's RI's that you missed on the way down. Implant GPM's are all backwards, but an actual GPM is "laid in" as it was lived. So the bottom is earliest in an actual GPM. Don't go farther south than the bottom. Otherwise you might get into a foreign GPM. Don't fool around too much at the bottom. The goal throws the whole GPM into violent restimulation. Don't find RI's for goals you don't have. That is the only thing that turns off a rocket read.

Note that, with R3SC, you are looking for RI's with no goal. So how long can you keep looking for service facs without finding the goal? Because you are shredding up a rocket read, chewing it up. There is some danger in it, although the way it works, it is probably OK for 15-50 hours. The phenomenon of shredding up rocket reads doesn't start to appear until the PC's goal shows up. When the goal does show up, put it down prominently in a box, labelled as a goal. We haven't yet seen R3SC turn off rocket reads. But the rule is valid, so some caution is in order.

Using this analysis and program, we have programmed OT well within reach by making goal finding easier. We have also found a method of straightening out PT which is useful any time we run into trouble with running an actual GPM. The condition, when this happens, is that PT is now an overwhelm to the PC. So if you are running an actual GPM and having trouble, we now have a handle:

1. Scout out the possibility that we have run a bunch of RI's without goals.

2. Do an ARC break assessment.

3. Do a case analysis checking for:

a) Going into the next GPM.

b) Skipped GPM's.

c) Listing backwards.

d) Implant goals.

Etc.

4. Run R3SC, assuming that the current RI is in restimulation. Clear would be attainable then. R3SC is a good way to end off an R3M2 intensive.

You can get the state of clear at any time, with one proviso: The most dangerous time to use R3SC is at the outset, before finding the first actual GPM, because you are finding RI's for no known goal. Yet this is also the easiest time to run R3SC. So the auditor must be alert for any rocket reading goal. If he finds one, he must mark it clearly. He has to find out what goal it is, because you only want to run the last goal, closest to PT. The system that you know as the service facsimile is the system that applies to every RI in every GPM the PC has. It is the system that has aberrated the PC. All PCs have done this. The service fac cum laude for every GPM is the goal as an RI. It accumulates mass in the form of subsidiary RI's.

The point where you look for the PC's goal is when, using R3SC, you have rehabilitated the PC's RR. You should always run a case on the latest point of his aberration. That keeps his PT cleaned up; it keeps his ruds in. His skills as an OT will slowly be rehabilitated. He advances as a being, in relation to PT. Therefore he advances smoothly and calmly, with regard to PT. You won't get flukey manics turning on and off (roller-coastering) because of dropping earlier on the track than is real to the PC. This, in fact, is the cause of manic behavior. The PC's ARC is down because of unreality, which occurs when he is run over his head, so he can't cope with the aberration that is thrown at him. It is actually doubtful that the PC could make it to OT unless you continually handled the aberrative factors of PT. It is best to cut the case back from PT. This gives a better reality factor and smoother, stabler gains. Running smoothly, cutting back from PT, cuts down the time you will require, also. The PC will be cogniting on PT, having wins, etc. No PC ever really progresses beyond his PTP. That is the secret of processing.

At any given moment in auditing, the PC is introverted at the level of what is now live in PT. His thinking about PT is colored by and introverted into the RI's that he is sitting in, so they can discharge against PT. Therefore, his power is consistently and continuously cut back to practically nothing. We have to handle this. The PC's perception of what actually is a PTP improves with time, so he is seeing bigger and bigger PTP's, as we go back along the actual GPM, [or as he progresses in auditing.] All progress is measured by the PC's ability to perceive a PTP. The measure of a PC's power is the extent of his PTP. It isn't how far he can reach. It is how wide his PTP is. In every case, it is the PC's reaction to PT that is creating the problem. Beyond that, there are no problems. As RI's are peeled off the GPM and new RI's come up into PT, new problems appear to the PC.

The PC is being an RI, and therefore it is his service fac. Underlying it is many more RI's, his current GPM, etc. Fortunately, there are only twenty or thirty actual GPM's on the whole track. This puts us on the sunny side of a thousand hours to OT, and perhaps even within 500 hours of OT.

6309C18 SHSpec-308 Saint Hill Service Fac Handling

It is adventurous to go in to handle something, like the mind, without knowing what you are doing. Every case and every practitioner in the field of the mind has been concentrated on one aspect of existence and dedicated to observing existence only through that aspect. So no wonder little has been discovered, and less applied. Knowledge about the mind means freedom for life and beings in this universe. Therefore, anyone who is after enslavement is also in favor of ignorance about the mind. There are two ways to make people ignorant:

1. Deny any information at all.

2. Substitute false data. This is an easier and more effective way. Add to this the fact that:

3. Everyone is mired in his own favorite data and you've got a good trap.

The way to overcome ignorance is to find the precise mechanics that apply to all minds, because this will be a broader truth that overrides all the minor data on which people are fixated. False relay of the basic truth, dropping out bits, could again make a slavery, because it would deviate enough from the generally recognized broad truth and degenerate into opinion and fixed data. This is the difficulty that scientology has had to deal with over the years. The solution is results, because once the technology is producing results, you get no arguments. So the whole contest has not been for the achievement of certain truths. We have had these for years. Rather, the contest has been for workability, so that we can get an application of those truths, so that we can get a rapid release of attention from "favorite data" and so that there is a demonstration that by using the truth, a greater freedom is attained.

The one reason why you can't get a PC to see that he can get a release of attention by virtue of applying general truths is because of his favorite data, his fixed idea. He considers that any other truths have to agree with this favorite idea in order to be true. He is sure that all horses sleep in beds. This is not only his fixed data; it is his total data. Any data that doesn't contribute to it, he will discard. To a person with a service fac, his idea of truth is whether something fits his idee fixe. A person may have his attention fixed to a varying extent. So a person whose attention is not totally fixed may obtain fringe benefits from studying scientology. To the degree that a person's attention is fixed, he is not able to explore the perimeter of his ideas and therefore cannot see a greater truth. So he is more entrapped than someone who is less fixed. The greater the fixation, the closer to psychosis. Psychosis is the state in which the individual has only the idee fixe. The degree of enslavement is the degree to which the individual is fixated on the fixed idea.

If you try to communicate a datum to someone with a very fixed idea, the datum will be received as false, unless you indicate the fixed idea. If you communicate some idea that fits with the fixed idea, it will be accepted as true. It could be that any other datum you then communicate will be taken as true. But these data will not be inspected.

False data is worse than none, as far as entrapment is concerned. It is like putting up a sign pointing over a cliff and saying, "This way lies freedom." One can only get fixated on falsehood, never on truth. Truth is an all-freeing mechanism. If freedom is not obtained, the truth in question must be to some degree limited, either in conception, reception, or application. Therefore, anything you are worried about must have a falsehood connected with it. There is always a lie connected to anything that you are having trouble with.

A session goes well if and only if you get TA action. The discovery that a PC's case gain can be measured directly by TA action seems simple, but it is an advance in technology beyond anything in the past fifty thousand years, since it takes judgement of improvement out of the realm of opinion and possible inability to observe, on the part of the auditor or the PC.

All confusions and masses must be there because they are held in abeyance, so far as observation is concerned, and will not as-is, because of a stable datum. A stable datum prevents observation of the environment or these masses, and therefore accumulates masses. What is wrong with a mind is that a stable datum is a substitute for observation. A person:

1. Ceased to inspect.

2. Fell back from living.

3. Let everything go to pieces.

4. Chose a stable datum instead of inspecting.

5. Got an accumulation of mass and confusion. When you shake up the stable datum by taking apart some of its ramifications, confusion can start to flow off.

The amount of TA determines whether or not the PC had a good session, no matter what the PC says. There is no opinion about it at all. Good TA means that the PC will feel better. Bad TA means almost invariably that the PC won't feel good.

"A stable datum is held in place by the confusion it's supposed to confront and doesn't." Instead of remedying the confusion, as it was supposed to do, and as inspection would have done, it collects more confusion. Like a dam, the more confusion it is supposed to hold in place, the more confusion batters at it, so the more confusion accumulates around it, like twisting a fork in a bowl of taffy. Modern science and other mental technologies have taken a stable datum that Man is an animal and that the mind is a brain. The idea that Man is mass is a stable datum in a confusion, that is persistently dramatized. Try to tell the modern scientist about stuck flows, and he will think that you are giving him a lecture on blood and the causes of coronary thrombosis. They can't be taught until you get them to inspect some thoughts that they have had about brains. Modern science has "Man equals the brain" as a stable datum.

What can you do for someone who is totally bound in and fixated, to the point where he is being a stable datum? You could take a datum of enormous magnitude and hold a gun on this person and say, "Believe it, or we shoot you!" That substitutes a force-datum for inspection. Ultimately, it fails, because it is just another stable datum with an associated confusion. That is why I.Q. usually deteriorates with years of schooling, since "modern education" is usually just laying in more and more uninspected stable data. You would have a whole new area of education if you said, "Look over this data and sort out what is true in it." You should have the student inspect data and find what is right or wrong about it.

This is of limited usefulness as long as everyone has his own fixed idea by which to tell rightness from wrongness. Another way to go about it would be to free up people's ideas, so that their perimeter of inspection increases, so that they can inspect the data that lies before them. You lead them up with a disciplined action that leads them to their fixed idea. When they have spotted and disposed of that, they are free to inspect and move up to higher levels of truth.

Therefore it is important to find the PC's central fixed idea as soon as possible, thus freeing him to inspect more broadly. You free a being by freeing him, not by making him wiser. Exteriorization and even the state of OT depends on getting greater freedom, not more wisdom, because with the freedom, wisdom will be attainable and will take place anyway. By concentrating on the wisdom, you are all too likely to fall into the idea of the implanted stable datum. Freeing attention leads to freeing the being, since all that can trap a being is his attention. A thetan can only trap himself by:

1. Being unwilling to confront things that are not interesting to him.

2. Being unwilling to back out of situations in which he has lost interest.

3. Being unwilling to move off and go his way but still, somehow, be responsible for where he was. Various combinations of the above lead to the individual trapping himself by leaving some inanimate postulate in his place, to confront confusions for him. E.g. "I have an unconscious mind that does all that." The unconscious mind is that totality of stable data that is holding back that totality of confusion that the individual is no longer aware of but is still doing.

So when you are looking for the PC's service fac, you will be looking for that on which his attention is most fixated in PT. Fetish objects are just things associated in some way with a person's service fac. Any cousin to the service fac that you find will give you TA, as the confusion can flow. The service fac is the last pair of RI's, formed at the top of the last (truncated) GPM postulated. It has a lot of locks and "cousins" which you will be able to pick up first. It is actually impossible to find the exact pair of items as the service fac. The PC has to know that they are part of that GPM before he will recognize them. They must be seen as part of the bank, before they are recognizable to the PC. They have to be related to the last goal and to the last two RI's. You need these three data in addition. You won't find the service fac, but try anyway, because that is where you will find the last actual GPM. It is those two top RI's that have the PC so restimulated that PT is restimulative and his TA won't move. So you have no choice but to find the PT goal of the PC.

Having found the goal, find the top oppterm of its GPM by asking, "Who or what would be the latest idea formed, concerning this goal, 'to catch catfish'?" Make a reasonable-sized list. List it to clean needle and null to a reading item. Prepcheck it after the PC has cognited for awhile. Then you might

see it rocket read. The difficulty in finding PCs' goals has always been in getting them to rocket read. You can do this whole operation with only ticks and no RR, until you have prepchecked the top oppterm.

Here is how to do it:

1. Find what you hope is his service fac. This gives you enough TA so some charge is off. Hunt and punch around until you know you've got something that will get good TA action, either on "right/wrong", prepcheck, or something. Don't do anything with it. It is not the real service fac. This keeps the PC's tone and morale up, by virtue of getting some TA off it, or by having the promise of getting TA off it.

2. Start looking for the GPM. If things bog down while looking for his goal, you can still run the item from (1) for awhile and give him some TA.

3. This could go on for a couple of sessions, until you get a goal that ticks and that keeps going, "Tick!", which reads as an actual goal, probably from the past track. It is not likely to be the PT goal.

So:

4. Use goal-oppose to get up to PT. So you oppose the goal, do the same check on it, then oppose that goal and get another one. Check each new goal found as being for sure an actual goal. Check if it is the PT goal. The PC will be very interested in what you find, since they are his actual goals. Keep doing this until, eventually, you will reach his PT goal.

5. When you reach his PT goal and you oppose it, the list goes nowhere.

It keeps developing more and more TA. The PC won't ARC break, because you are listing towards his future postulates, and unburdening the PT goal. By the above phenomena, you know that you have the PT goal.

6. You check this; make sure it is the PT goal.

7. List for the top oppterm, which may or may not be opposed yet. You could find out where the PC is on the GPM by asking him if he has started to oppose the goal yet. List to a clean needle, null it.

Don't have two RR's on the list, etc. Don't be too concerned with whether or not it is really the top oppterm. The top oppterm will most likely give lots of needle action. When you hit the top oppterm, the needle goes mad.

8. After you have given the PC his item, you sit still and let him cognite.

9. Put in big-mid-ruds on the item, as far as you can.

10. Call the item; you will probably see it rocket read. That is a fast, slippy way to get into the PC's current actual GPM, starting with R3SC. When you are on the goals finding step, check over any goals that the PC may have mentioned earlier, that were seen to fire then.

Having found the PT goal, you are ready to take the bank apart. That first RI accounts for all PT restimulation. The reason why we haven't been able to find goals on PCs is the overburden of the top terminal and oppterm accumulating all the debris of PT and masking the top GPM, or any GPM, for that matter. Because of this masking action, we used to have to find goals with ticks, instead of rocket reads. When the top RI's and their accumulated mass are gone, you are ready to roll right down the bank and back up again. The PC gets TA, TA, TA: Now he's got a new problem: We are in a new GPM and can go get it in the same way.

6309C25 SHSpec-310 Summary II: Scientology 0

[Note: Summary I was probably 6306C19 SHSpec-276 "Summary of Modern Auditing"]

In the material covered since 24Ju163, plus CCH's and touch assists, we have basically all the material in scientology.

Every level of scientology contains, in vignette, all the levels of scientology. Scientology 0 deals with the problems, confusions, and wrongnesses of existence, with the identification of those zones of chaos, falsity, and upset. People go around thinking that healing, including mental healing, is all solved. Scientology 0 points out that they are unsolved areas. This level is easy to work with, because all you have to do is to find falsities and wrongnesses. It is a matter of degree how much you reveal and point out. You don't want to open up too much Scientology 0 too fast. This requires judgment. It is a level that has no TA in it, unless you talk about false solutions. It is better to talk about solutions than problems. Don't imply that there are only problems. This gives the audience no TA. The last stable datum anyone can get in is a tolerance of a terrible condition. It is best to talk about false solutions, but this is Scientology I. Scientology I gets the false solutions off. Scientology 0 just recognizes existing chaos. A typical question on Scientology 0 would be, "Do you find your home noisy? Do you like your job?" The idea is to give the person the idea that his life might be better. That is the sole therapeutic action of Scientology 0: hope, instilled by identifying problems and giving a faint hope for change. This is quite workable. This level says:

1. There is a problem.

2. Maybe something can be done about it (hope factor). A view of Scientology 0 is a view of the world as it exists. We need this, as a legitimate level of inspection.

Scientology 0 is in processing, to the extent that, in order to find a service fac, you have to find what problems the PC has. That is the Scientology 0 factor, at that level. A little of this goes a long way.

In all auditing, you have to keep the H-factor in. Scientology 0 is very acceptable on a public level, if you keep it very mild, as far as the degree of hope you offer is concerned. If someone comes in with all sorts of problems, take only one and tell him that maybe you can do something about it. Pick out some small possible gain and put some hope in on it. A person can have this. He can give up just a little of his service fac, so this gets around the service fac a little. Don't promise the sun and the moon. That is too much. It is unacceptable. It threatens his service fac. So what you've got to do is to take one thing and put in a very little hope. That is acceptable. That is confrontable. You have to judge what is confrontable, and give him neither too much nor too little.

If you ever gave somebody a drill on Scientology 0. you would give him a long list of confusions and have him pick out the one or ones that people could confront. There always something that you can get a PC to confront, on any dynamic. The trick is that there is something to be done about any condition, that the person can do. The elements of hope are:

1. There is something that can be done about it.

2. There is something that you can confront and do about it. In processing, if the PC gets in trouble, just getting him to tell you about it can raise his tone level, because that is doing something about it. In Scientology IV, never force the PC forward. If the hill is too steep, don't push. Be willing for the PC not to do it. But at Scientology 0, find something that a person can do and get him to do it. Remember gradients when giving advice to people. If you advise people this way, your advice will be followed, and you will win. Don't ever suggest that they do something that they "know" "can't be done".

Nobody ever gives anybody anything they can do, in social work. Consequently, you get socialism and total indigence. And you get social workers who go terribly downtone, because they have given the client an overwhelm and ARC broken him by telling him something that he knows can't be done, because of some stable datum that he has adopted.

At Scientology 0, it doesn't matter if you put the itsa line in or he does. Even in R3SC, you can offer things to the PC that you noticed had gotten TA and run them. They may be quite confrontable things and therefore not really the service fac, but you could get TA running them. A person who can only confront getting mad at the auditor, can confront getting mad at him because he is the person's best friend. This is the secret of the ARC breaky PC. He is ARC broken in the world at large, and it is safe to get mad at the auditor. People may get mad at their friends, because that is all that is safe. [Perhaps marital squabbles exist by virtue of this mechanism.] The Scientology 0 aspect of existence is

that you don't tell people about problems that you know are unreal to them, that they can't do anything about, and expect them to be enthusiastic about doing something about them. People aren't even capable of observing an existing condition. They destroy one's stable datum that "seeing is believing", or that if people just saw something with their own eyes, they would believe. They don't even see. That's the trouble. Don't ever bother to try to prove anything to a person with a fixed idea in an area. Even if he sees it, he won't believe it. There is no ability to observe. There is only a generality or service fac, instead of observation and judgment. This person is incapable of asking, "What is the situation?" The easiest thing to relay, then, is an idea that doesn't violate the reality and confront level of the person who is receiving it. If he can't look, he can get something trustworthily looked at.

Someone who can confront only in a small area will be able to be effective only within that area. When his confront comes up, he will get larger problems to handle. He will solve these problems, if they are the real problems, and not some lower-scale mockery.

To have real justice, you have to have the real situation actually looked at, as unbiasedly as possible. If all during your career in this universe you had only operated on the real facts, you would be in fine shape.

If you are going to have a group operate on any cleared level, you've got to take the service fac out of the group, as far as you can. The characteristics of a service fac are:

1. Non-observation

2. A generality substituting for judgment. You can't utterly remove those on an absolute basis from all situations everywhere, but you can go a long way in this direction.

The formula for successful handling of a case or of a third dynamic is:

1. What is the situation:

2. What part of it is potentially confrontable?

3. What part of that can someone actually do something about? Neglect of this can give you case failures. That is the usual reason for case failure: Someone made an inadequate observation of the confusions of the case and didn't handle the case on the basis of what the auditor and PC could confront. The auditor should look over two aspects of a case:

1. Problems and difficulties that he can see in the case.

2. The ones the PC can see. These are often quite different. There is a certain level of PC difficulties that the auditor thinks is confrontable, and then there is what a PC thinks is confrontable. If the auditor pays no attention to the PC's view of problems and difficulties, he will have some loses. There is also the question of what the auditor can confront about the case, vs. the PC's view of what part of his problems, as he sees them, he can confront. Then there is also the level of doingness the auditor can confront and the PC's idea of what he can do about those difficulties he can confront.

Thus there are six factors in the auditor-PC relationship at Scientology 0:

1. Difficulties the PC is in that the auditor can perceive.

2. What the auditor can confront.

3. What the auditor is capable of doing about it.

4. The PC's estimation of his difficulties.

5. Which difficulty is confrontable for him?

6. What is he willing to do about it? You can get case failures by mis-estimation of any one of these. This becomes quite important when you can't get TA action. Then a little discussion with the PC can be very enlightening.

The greatest use of this survey is in odd advices to PCs. Advice is something we ordinarily ignore because of fear of evaluating. But Scientology 0 is the level of giving advice. Using the above survey would make you a very successful advisor, whose advice would always be followed:

1. Get an estimation of the problem situation.

2. Find what part, no matter how small, he could confront.

3. Get what of that he can do something about.

4. Get what he could do about that.

5. Tell him to do it. When you find out what the PC can do, be militant about his doing it.

He will think you are a genius. But you are just getting him to actually estimate the situation and do what he thinks he can do about it. When someone acts on that, he gets a larger reality, more confront, etc. The cycle can be repeated, after being successful once. The only difficulty is that PCs' confidence can rise faster than their real doingness. Sometimes PCs overestimate their confront ability, so undercut what they think they can do. Just get them to do that point that they can do, and you will have agreement, because you haven't told them anything that they think is false.

Scientology 0 is the level at which one gets an estimation of the case or situation. If you can get the other guy to estimate the situation, you seldom have to. Scientology 0 deals with confront. Life is successfully lived with Scientology 0 well in. You probably came downscale just because it was out.

6309C26 SHSpec-311 Summary III: About Level IV Auditing

Do not underestimate the difficulty of R3 processes that look for the PC's goal. What saves our bacon is R3SC, which permits unburdening of the bank by removing the two top RI's. R3SC gives you a variety of locks, which can be called possible service facs. You get perhaps five or six of these. Pick the one that gives the most TA to list goals on. It won't be the RI, but it will give you the entrance point for the goal. Then you can try to find a goal which that fits, by asking, "What goal would/might relate to (possible service fac, obtained from R3SC)?" The over-restimulation of the top RI's was what made finding the PC's goal difficult and prevented the goal from rocket reading.

To parallel with processing what the mind is doing has always been the basic mission of processing. The mind is holding in the PC's two postulated RI's, based on his most recent goal. On top of those, we will have locks. Finding the locks takes charge off the RI's. We list goals against a lock that gave good TA. Since it has been unburdened, the goal can rocket read. If you get the wrong goal, i.e. too early a goal, you can oppose it to get up to the PT goal. Note that a PT goal is not very high-toned. It tends to be a pretty degraded one.

When you've got the PT goal, you want the top terminal. This is hard to find, because the GPM is truncated, incomplete. You can find out roughly where the PC is in the GPM and get the terminal, by getting the PC to list, "What are you in PT that relates to (the goal)?" On all other GPM's, you can ask for the top oppterm, but not in the case of the PT GPM. This is the truncated GPM.

The programming for any actual GPM, whether a totally formed one or a truncated one, is to find the top RI's, go down through the GPM to the bottom, and take out the bottom-plus-one RI. You may have to find the next goal to get the bottom oppterm. You want the goal as an RI discharged, and you want what it opposes totally flat. You want the PC totally out of that bank before you repair it. You do it this way, because the goal as an RI and its opposition hold everything fixed and rigid in the bank until they are gone. Go all the way down; then come up. Check the items you found on the way down to see if any are still ticking. If so, they came from an incomplete list. Abandon that item and complete the list it came from. From this, you will get a whole new series of RI's to do.

The reason why we don't go from the bottom of the bank to the top is that the goal is part and parcel of every RI. It you listed starting at the bottom, from the goal as oppterm, you tend to beef up the whole bank. You throw every RI alive, and the PC can't reach them. He will have a very heavy time. You could find yourself getting turned around and heading for the bottom of the bank again. It is easier to go from the top down, partly because the PC has been implanted with thousands of GPM's

backwards. The main reason is that the PC is more interested in the later RI's than the earlier ones. Also, you are unburdening as you go down.

Coming up past actual goals, while doing the goals oppose lists [See p. 520, above], restimulates the PC more than if you just got the PT goal right off the bat, but this procedure is acceptable, so long as you don't try to run some far backtrack GPM. If you foolishly start to run one, you are committed to running it all the way out. And it will be difficult, since it is unreal and inapplicable to his PT condition. It is a great strain on the auditor and the PC. The only reason why you get old backtrack GPM's being restimulated in PT and coming up, for example, in R3SC would be something like:

1. The past goal may be some kind of dichotomy with the PT goal or with a goal near PT.

2. It seems safe. It is far from anything that is wrong with the PC. Even if the goal you were running turns out not to be the PT goal, finish running it. Then take another shot at the PT goal. When you have the PT goal, start listing for the terminal of the first pair of RI's. Then go right on down the PT GPM. Clean out the whole bottom of the GPM. When you have cleaned out the whole PT GPM, you have to find the goal of the next GPM down. Then [find] the top oppterm of this goal. That is easy. You just ask, "Who or what would (the goal as an RI) oppose?" Then, despite the PC's protest about it, go back and clean up the PT GPM, picking up any RI's that you missed on the way down. When it is all cleaned up, you can put a polish on it by prepchecking the auditing of it and prepchecking the goal. Sometimes the TA will go up and stick, because the PC's interest is in the next bank down. All you have to do about this is to call it to the PC's attention, and the TA will come down. If you don't finish up a GPM, it will give you trouble from then on. When you do your next GPM, do the same -- top to bottom and clean it up in reverse. When you get two or more items ticking on this step, always take the one nearest the top and work on it. Say you have three items ticking as you read the line plot. Take the top one. Then you won't have to worry about the other two. They will fly off and cease to be part of the list. Recheck for ticks, etc., until there are no more reactions.

Get the idea of a short-circuited electric blanket 35ft by 3ft by 10ft, coal-black, or fuzzy black with grey undertones. Sometimes it is grey. This object is one actual GPM of the PC's. It is made of ideas. Both a GPM and a block of concrete are "ideas". If you get an actual GPM out of sequence and get items out of other GPM's, they pile up on the PC and jam here and there. A PC can get GPM's out of sequence and maul them about. Say you have a carpet of these things that stretches about a mile. At the bottom is the earliest past. Say you take the third from the beginning of track and insert it between the third and fourth GPM's back from PT. Now criss-cross the items from the early GPM with the items from the fourth GPM back. When you do a case analysis, you park two of the GPM's over to the left. Now you find more items in the GPM that is ten back. You find wrong items, and it goes out of gear and is thought of as long in the past. It goes out with three that are twenty-five yards away. This is longshoremen's work. In livingness, the PC may have found a new use for an old goal. He may have pulled it out of line. So an auditor gets at it, goofs, and you have debris all over the place. It is a mechanical proposition, like diving into tar pits. It is that physical. When you run a GPM correctly, the PC will start getting repetitive rocket reads, as the GPM folds up. As the PC's perception comes up, he can start to see the GPM discharge and fall apart. Sometimes you have to run two or three GPM before he sees these things. The further back on the track GPM's are, the bigger they get. They are like black islands. The PC can energize the whole thing by raking his thetan paws over it, grubbing around in it. Sometimes he activates his own suppress, and it all goes black. Sometimes the PC gets into a "creak" of BPC in his vicinity, where he feels pulled or pushed into an odd shape by unidentified BPC.

When a PC is in trouble, you have a new tool to use: analysis of whatever you've got. For instance, when you find an RI, before accepting it do an RI analysis on it:

1. Make sure there are no bypassed RI's.

2. Find out whether it came off an incomplete list.

3. Find out whether the wording in it is correct.

4. Find out whether its position in the bank is correct.

5. Find out if it is from the right goal, i.e. not from some other GPM. If one of these reads, finding out now saves time and trouble. It is the same with a goal. We want to know if it is an implant goal or

an actual goal and whether it is in the right place, etc. Don't expect an analysis to be completely valid, however. The case can be so charged that nothing reads, or that not enough can be seen to sort out what is there, because of charge. So we have the rule: Complete process cycles of action begun on the PC, given available time. And when you do a case analysis, do it and then complete what you were doing before you did the analysis. E.g., you were opposing "catgut". The PC is in a creak. You do a case analysis and find out that you had a wrongly-worded goal. Fine. Now go back and finish opposing "catgut".

Case analysis has shown up the fact that auditors have Q and A'd by finding something wrong, going off to fix it, and then never completing the action they were previously on. This would be enough to keep PCs from going to OT. The case analysis is there to take the creak out, not to be followed. It is the same situation as with an ARC break assessment. You want to find the BPC, not to do something about it. If you get a case into a repair session with lots of incomplete cycles, which is now in the middle of something else, finish what the PC is in the middle of, because that is where his interest is. Or take the cycle the PC's attention is stuck in. Do that one first. This is not necessarily the earliest cycle left incomplete. However, sometimes the PC's interest is in the case analysis, and the auditor's interest is in the case analysis. It is more interesting than hod-work. The PC wants to lay bricks and make things pretty. If you find out that the item you are listing against is wrong, don't try to complete the list. Complete the earlier list that you got the wrong item from. The general rule of completing auditing cycles of actions begun on the PC needs to be applied, using one's judgment about importances and working from fundamentals.

6310C15 SHSpec-312 Essentials of Auditing

The relay of information from one mind to another is communication, education. Therefore, the ARC triangle operates. If you can take effort out of the comm line, you can normally get a fast, accurate comm line. But when a comm line loses enough mass, it becomes unstable. That is what happens with a verbal data line. Sometimes there is data on tapes but not in bulletins. This is unfortunate, since sometimes there is data in the tapes that could make all the difference. But you can't hold a duplicatable standard because it isn't down anywhere in writing. With no-mass data, e.g. verbal data, it gets altered in the relay. There is always some data that escapes the solid comm lines, so you can't get all the data. For this reason, you have to reduce things to their fundamentals, keeping what is important. You can always have communication of fundamentals, both for educational purposes and because to reduce something to fundamentals makes one understand it better.

The relay of data from mind A to mind B is susceptible to many alter-ises. There are almost as many sets of alter-ises as there are minds for the data to be transferred through. This also occurs on the time-stream. We probably have very little grip on what was thought in 1800. There was a tremendous change in manners in the U.S. because of the telephone, movies, radio, TV, and the automobile. You can overload a comm line by putting too great a volume of data on it, so that it doesn't communicate. The door to learning can be shut that way, too. Students sometimes feel overwhelmed by data and long for some fundamentals. An overloaded comm line is overloaded because of insufficient time to peruse the material being communicated. You can also have too little or too varied communication. Scientology's data is basically research data, at present. It is not yet sifted and clarified into fundamentals and less fundamental data. We started with the definition of an auditor as "one who listens and computes". Thirteen years later, it turns out that "listens" is the fundamental, not the "and computes" which was part of the original definition. In the meantime, a lot of other data got added which, in fact, was only added because there was insufficient understanding of the original definition. There is a datum in the sciences: A subject has arbitrary data in it in direct proportion to its distance from the actual comprehension of its basics. So you get into pure opinion and arbitraries, as in art. There is nothing actually known about a subject when the subject is nothing but opinion. Opinion present is proportional to knowledge absent. For instance, when psychological testing requires the opinion of the tester, you know that nothing is known.

A developmental line is an ambitious, self-critical line which is trying to achieve a parsimony of information. The data keep condensing and becoming more fundamental, with importances well evaluated. This evaluation factor is missing in other philosophies, e.g. that of Krishnamurti. krishnamurti on "time" is great, but it is not evaluated for importance by him. It isn't true that you are studying LRH's case. The struggle has been to rise above one's case and the colorations given by the condition of this planet, etc. This has been quite successful.

Whenever things get more fundamental, a bucketful of items drop out, which can make one wonder, "What is stable, from the past?" The stable data are the Axioms, the Logics, and Prelogics, the fundamental material of the Philadelphia Lectures, and the behavior of a thetan. The only thing changed was the idea of exteriorization. What will a person do, when brought to a point where he doesn't have to be in a body? We used to think that he would move out of his body. This is not what he will do. He will move his body off of him, because we have changed him upscale to where he could hold a position. The Factors, and ARC triangle, and scales of all sorts -- these are stable.

What has altered is applied technology, not the theory. Better, more efficient ways of applying the theory have been discovered. It is re-evaluation of data as applied tech that you are seeing. And because you are studying to become an auditor, not a theoretician, you need to know application. What gives you a headache, if anything, is trying to apply the theory to a case so as to get a result. All your bulletins are addressed to this subject.

The data that you are using to square away an aberrated student or PC has to be absolutely, fundamentally true. The Project 80 HCOB [Actually, HCOPL 21Aug63 "Change of Organizational Targets -- Project 80, A Preview", p. 1, where "Scientology" is defined as "The common people's science of life and betterment".] drew some criticism because of one phrase: "the common people's science of the mind". Oddly enough, this is the one inaccurate phrase in the bulletin. The critics didn't spot that fact. They just objected to the phrase. The mind tends to fixate on those things that contain an alter-is of truth. And an alter-is of truth is the thing that most resists the truth of the situation. It is an aberrated stable datum. Where you have a slightly altered truth that you try to give to someone who has already got an altered truth on the same subject, the two will come into conflict, which promotes all sorts of bad applied technology. It is like trying to drive a truck through a truck, when you have two alter-ised truths in conflict.

To try to understand an aberrated datum through another aberrated datum results in complications. So if you are studying a body of data that has any alteration from the fundamental that should be there, and you have an alteration that is contrary to the altered datum that you are trying to assimilate, you get a dog's breakfast. You never look at what is wrong with the datum that you are trying to assimilate. The conflict won't resolve, because you have a vested interest in trying to make it fit with an aberrated datum. You get conflict of aberrated data against each other, overlaid with opinions.

You have a PC, who is a gold mine of aberrated stable data. If any datum which you are using to solve that case is the least bit curved, the case won't resolve, but will develop new complications. Therefore the mass of technology that grows up in scientology is centered around applied technology. You get masses of data that subside when a fundamental is clarified. So the greatest possible truth has to be used in application. Hence research is directed at finding the clearest fundamental possible. We have gone a long way and have made great gains, but we still have to cope with the randomity in the person who is assimilating and trying to apply the data.

"If you, in assimilation of data, are assimilating, to the slightest degree, data, up against a miscomprehension or an allness, which you are putting in place of the auditor, you don't get an assimilation. You have difficulty assimilating the data. But you can assimilate the data. Your trouble comes when you turn around and take the data you've assimilated and altered in some fashion, and then try to apply it to the case that is sitting in front of you. The alter-ises in that data will then bring about a non-resolution of that case you are confronted with. The only solvent is truth. Even though absolutes are unobtainable, truth, in a very refined form -- the purest possible -- is the only thing that will resolve cases all the way, because it is the one thing that the aberrated case cannot argue with." Therefore you as an auditor, desiring results, have no business twisting the technology. There is, fortunately, a considerable zone of tolerance that permits the tech to work, even when it is imperfectly applied, as long as you stay within this zone of tolerance. But the tech has to be as nearly perfect as possible. The tech, heretofore, was too imperfect ever to work. It has been LRH's task to bring about a recognition of fundamentals that is sufficiently great and a tech that is sufficiently great to overcome a lot of this alter-is. This task is a thousand times greater than the task of simply presenting what is necessary to resolve the case. We have to present if so accurately that the PC can still alter it and the auditor alter it, and still have a resolution of cases. This is an heroic problem.

The amount of difficulty that you have with cases is directly proportional to the amount of aberration or alter-is that you are adding to the data that you are trying to apply. It is also [inversely] proportional to the purity and assimilatability of the material that you are asked to study. That is a tough one, but it is pretty well handled. The way you solve solutions is solutions. Wherever LRH has made a little

mistake or a wrong emphasis, there has been trouble, because the additional alter-is added by the auditor takes it far enough from truth to make it flukey to apply. [LRH, in describing some horrendous auditing error, says:] "It's a good thing, kids, that I'm almost indestructible. These things usually get done to me, first!"

Level IV makes an OT, but it can't be varied 1/18th of an inch from its procedure and still work. There was a hole in it that appeared when it was imperfectly applied: There are three types of goals that will rocket read:

1. An actual goal, with no GPM connected with it.

2. An implanted goal.

3. An actual GPM. Any GPM can have in it up to a hundred actual goals, plus the goal of the GPM. But there is another source of a rocket read:

4. A phrase in an engram. This won't necessarily rocket read, but it might.

Even a PC's life or session goals can be free actual goals. Every now and then, one will rocket read. It is probably a lock on an RI. If you run it as an actual GPM goal, you can even find items -- from the nearest implants, or other GPM's or locks. But there was no GPM there in the first place. So when you find a goal rocket-reading, you should check on the meter:

1. Is this an actual GPM?

2. Is this an implant GPM?

3. Is this no GPM?

Auditors have been asking, "Is this an actual goal?", etc., instead. This can wrap you around telegraph poles, because you will be trying to oppose it, when it is a lock on something. And you can do this, pulling things all out of place, for awhile -- until the PC crashes in flames.

The three comm lines in session include the itsa-maker line (the PC's line into the bank), the whatsit line, and the itsa line. It is an error to cut the PC's comm line to the bank in order to "put in the itsa line". This stems from a misunderstanding of the auditor's role as listener. The error could also have come from a failure to communicate the importance of the PC to bank (itsa-maker) line. Since it was obvious to LRH that that was what auditing is all about, he didn't mention its importance. It is where the itsa line comes from. Without it, the itsa line has nothing to carry. The auditor is actually there to get the PC to confront his bank. The charge blows off to the degree that it's confronted, and this is represented by the itsa line. The itsa line is a report on what has been as-ised, [that] gives it its flow." The reason why that communication wasn't accepted or didn't go through is the reason why the auditor is having trouble auditing.

Education is acceptable to a technical end only when it is conceived pretty purely and relayed well. Technical data must:

1. Be conceived purely.

2. Be relayed well.

3. Be received accurately.

Its test, in scientology, is results. Auditors can also have trouble because they have glommed onto some older datum and made it an "all", but there is this overriding fact that "no datum I give you is a substitute for you. That's the burning thing to remember as an auditor." A datum won't audit a PC. The only thing that can handle auditing is a live thetan, because that is all that can handle the complications that come up. You've got to have technology, but the live thetan in the chair is necessary to audit the PC.

6310C16 SHSpec-313 The Itsa Maker Line

The itsa-maker line is the line you are guiding as an auditor, which sorts out the things in the case and gets the material that is reported to the auditor as itsa. The itsa occurs at the end of this line. The line from the PC to the auditor is the itsa communication line. Itsa is the identification of isness (or wasness). It is a simple commodity. Until an itsa is recognized, it is only a potential itsa. Auditors can make a mistake by thinking that there is a potential itsa, where there is only a nothingness. This is the commonest method by which an auditor refutes itsa. The meter version of it is cleaning a clean. This is demanding more than the PC's got. If you repeat the question, this makes the PC feel as though you haven't accepted his itsa. When you do this, in effect, you deny the itsa that you have received. You have cut the itsa comm line by refuting the itsa that was offered. You may think that the ARC break was caused by your cutting the comm line, but it was really the invalidation of the PC's itsa that did it. The auditor is likely to try to cure this situation by asking whether he has interrupted the PC. That is also cleaning a clean, so the ARC break intensifies. You haven't interrupted the communication. You have enforced it; You have to keep in mind what you are trying to do, which is to get TA action. All the significance on the case will have to be handled at Level IV anyway, so at Levels I, II, and III, what counts is TA action. [For a description of these levels, see p. 462, above. See also recent tape on Level IV: pp. 524-526. above.] Everything wrong with the PC, except how and why he started to make a time track in the first place, comes out of his GPM's anyway.

Level IV is the scientologist's level. The preceding levels mainly set the PC up for Level IV. "I don't think ... that anyone will make OT except a trained auditor." A trained auditor's confront is up. He knows what he is dealing with. Etc. Probably the basic barrier on the track, in mental sciences, has been specializing in results without also trying to make everyone into a pro, a causer. PCs have been audited on Level IV in HGC's. They have no understanding of what is occurring. They ARC break easily. They don't have the confront. Mainly, they aren't educated enough to understand what is going on, so they get upset by reason of unknownnesses.

There is only one way that GPM's can be run. You must find and run the PT GPM first, then keep going on down the track to prime postulate, then repair. You can't do it as you have been previously told to because you will get items out of other GPM's. You can't repair a GPM until you have gone through the whole thing. But you can't afford to make a single mistake, because you will spend amazing amounts of time correcting it.

You've got tremendous processes at Levels I, II, and III. So you should be able to sit down with a raw public PC and turn out 35 divisions of TA in your first 2 1/2 hours, on any PC, anyplace. If you can't do this, it is because of lack of understanding of one of the basic points of auditing, like the itsa-maker line. You might have some wild idea about something basic. It might even be a scientology datum, magnified out of all proportion to its true importance. For instance, you may think, "PCs never answer the auditing command," so you always get the itsa from the meter and leave the PC out, thus destroying the itsa-maker line. You and the meter can act as a "substitute thetan", "perceiving" things in the bank that the PC isn't perceiving. At Level IV, the material is sub-itsa. You have to depend on the meter at Level IV, because the PC can't itsa what is in the GPM without some assistance. The auditor can undercut this with the meter and find out what the goal is, because it rocket-reads. But if we rely too much on the meter, we cut the PC's itsa-maker line. You still have to stay in comm with the PC and avoid invalidating his itsa and cutting his itsa-maker line. This doesn't mean that you should be very careful. It just means that you should know what you are handling and how to handle it. Get observant, so that you can tell when the PC is introverted, when he has said all he wants to say, etc. "In session" means: not only 1. Interested in own case, but also 2. With the itsa-maker line in on his case, not on the auditor, but under the auditor's control.

(The top of the GPM is hard to run; it is resistant to processing.)

Since the itsa-maker line is invisible to the auditor, the auditor has to "synthesize" what is going on. The itsa-line is not a unit area think-think-thinking. It is an actual line between the thetan and a real thing: the bank.

An auditor who attracts or rapidly shifts the PC's attention to himself has moved the itsa-maker line to himself, and it has become a whatsit: "What's wrong with the auditor?", etc. The itsa-maker is what makes TA occur. It is the PC's attention line. An ARC break is caused by a sudden shift of attention.

You should be aware that perfection in the control of the PC's attention and perfect handling of the itsa-maker line is impossible. You will make a couple of mistakes in this per session, even if you are an expert. What counts is how adroitly you can wriggle out of whatever you get into, not how careful

you are to stay out of trouble. It helps to spot the birth of an ARC break well in advance of its overt appearance. An ARC break is much easier to handle, early on, and you won't have audited over the out-rud.

If, even implicitly. you give the PC an order to shut up and let you write, the PC will do it and keep doing it. PC's and the bank generally do what the auditor apparently wants. Non-verbal behavior may communicate an auditor's desire to the PC. Auditors' main goofs consist of giving apparent orders that they aren't aware of and don't intend, like, "Stop inspecting your bank and put your attention on the E-meter." This may occur when the auditor fiddles with the meter a lot. Fumbling takes away the auditor's control of the itsa-maker line by shifting the PC's attention to the auditor and the goof. The bank always does what the auditor orders. It takes a combination of the auditor's orders and the PC's inspection to get the bank handled. Randomity will occur. The auditor who is allergic to unforeseen circumstances would do better to go to an old ladies' home.

To get a bank inspected:

1. The auditor must direct the itsa-maker line.

2. The PC must put in the itsa-maker line.

How does an auditor straighten these things out? For one thing, he can audit smoothly, getting good TA, so that he has a cushion [to use in working with the PC]. Don't fix something when the PC is running well. Something that upsets you does not need to be handled, if the PC wasn't concerned, as long as the itsa-maker line isn't affected. In other words, don't repair a nonexistent situation. If you try to repair something that didn't upset the PC, you are cleaning a clean, and you will get an ARC break. Sometimes the auditor gets conscience-stricken. This should not be. Remember that when you ask a PC about something, you put his attention on it. You can also put a PC on a whatsit by being so conscientious that you are always looking for what is wrong. You should only repair auditing when auditing isn't occurring. Case repair is otherwise an interruption of auditing.

6310C17 SHSpec-314 Levels of Auditing

Getting TA motion is a common denominator of all scientology activities. The state of case of the PC has practically nothing to do with your ability to get TA motion on him. Some day you will cognite that if you don't yank the PC's attention off of his case, and if you give him something to itsa, and if you don't stop him, he will get TA motion. You can reduce TA motion by being unpredictable as an auditor, e.g. by varying the form of model session. Keep the session drill constant and predictable from session to session, or the PC will start running a whatsit on the auditor. Then the auditor runs itsa on the PC, and you get no TA.

The auditor, not the PC, is in complete control of the bank. The bank always does what you tell it to do. The PC sometimes does and usually tries to.

When a new style of auditing is released, like "listen style", auditors at first go to pieces. They will start introducing some listen-style into formal auditing. You should let the PC itsa the item or goal, but that's all. If you let the PC itsa the bank, you will have a sick PC on your hands. The TA might move for awhile, but the over-restimulation that the PC could get into will lock up the TA pretty soon. The things that you are handling in the bank are the things that prevent itsa, so letting the PC itsa around in the bank isn't effective. The PC will restimulate that which prevents him from itsa-ing, so he won't be able to itsa. Level IV is all sub-itsa, but when you give the PC an item, do let him cognite and itsa on it, or you will stack up missed withholds, BPC, and high and stuck TA. This presents a bit of a problem, since, e.g., when the auditor stops the PC from wandering into the wrong GPM, there is BPC, which can produce a fierce ARC break. What you have to do is to audit fast enough and positively enough, so that the PC never gets a chance to wander.

The two great dangers in Level IV auditing are:

1. The tendency for a goals list to be underlisted.

2. The tendency for an item list to be overlisted.

When you fumble a command, you are not in control of the PC's itsa-ing of his bank. But you are in absolute control of the bank, so if you fumble a list, the bank will fumble. So the bank fumbles, unseen to you. The PC's attention line is on the point where you fumbled. Therefore, the bank has shifted under that scanner, and the PC's attention goes off onto other things, because you have shifted other things into his view with your fumbling. Soon after such a fumble, the PC will add something to the session -- some kind of yip-yap, not necessarily critical. You did something that showed that you did not have control of the PC's bank. You distracted the PC's itsa-maker line and shifted the bank underneath it with this goof. So you are going to get some other stuff. It isn't neat and clean. The PC's attention will now be somewhere you don't want it. If there is any BPC lying around, the goof, or cutting the itsa line, will key it in, and you will get an ARC break. You will get a dispersal of attention. The itsa goes all over the time track. There is always BPC in a session. You can't avoid it. The BPC is either from past auditing or from this session. "The key-in of BPC is always some communication failure", e.g. cut comm or refuted itsa, on the part of the auditor. You could even get a wrong goal, and if you audited very smoothly, you could audit without giving the PC a single ARC break, because it takes a cut comm line to restimulate any BPC, even when it is there. The fact that there is BPC does not mean that there has to be an ARC break, but the fact that there is an ARC break does mean that there was some BPC. BPC, via a rough spot in auditing, via a session key-in -- cut comm, etc. -- gives rise to an ARC break. A wrong goal may cause a very uncomfortable PC, but need not cause an ARC break. Whether there is an ARC break from BPC is entirely dependent on the auditor. Of course, the more BPC there is in the session, the tinier the mistake could be, that could key it in.

The cycle of any ARC break is:

1. Bypassed charge.

2. A rough spot that gives the PC a little dispersion.

3. A cut line on the rough spot.

4. The ARC break. Dead on the ARC break, you will find a little misdemeanor, but ten minutes to 1 1/2 hours earlier, you will find a nice nasty misdemeanor. For instance, you might find that some sort of forcingness was going on.

Guide the PC's attention; don't force it. The bank does move to whatever the auditor says. Running an engram is like developing a picture. Just have the PC look at it. You can move his attention over it repetitively. This procedure will develop his picture of whatever was there. LRH did this with a PC who was dead in his head. LRH moved the PC to a non-significant date and moved him through the next half hour, over and over. The PC got to where he was reading the mail that he had read at the time that LRH moved him to, word for word. If you get the date and duration of any picture on the back track, the picture will turn on. The only thing that fouls this up is:

1. The comm line is too lousy for the PC to report that he has done it.

There are several ways to prevent a PC from reporting what he sees.

You can also foul up the comm line by refusing to take the PC's data.

You could fail to believe that you were moving the date under the PC's attention.

2. The track is stuck in something.

You can demonstrate the above phenomenon by taking some non-significant date and getting the PC to pick up everything in it by moving him through it enough. This is even easier than getting aberrated incidents, since there is no charge debarring it. Running a chargeless incident is a test of an auditor's tech, because there is nothing there but the auditing. If you don't go goofy and demand more than the PC has, you can get the picture. You may not get the PC's state of consciousness [in the incident], unless you spend a long time on it. It would be a good test of auditing. There is no upset present, except what the auditor introduces. If your auditing is rough, you will find that when you are trying to get the PC's attention on the rough stuff of Level IV, his confront will be lowered, his confidence will suffer, and his ability to itsa will be lessened. The PC will only have difficulty on what he can

confront and do if you make difficulty for the PC. Additions to the comm cycle do make trouble for the PC.

So keep itsa where it belongs. When you've got a nice long item list (20 items long), give the PC his item. Let him look at it and cognite. When he has done so, you can show him the list and ask him how the other items relate. Now you will get more TA and more confusion blowing off.

Once you have learned how to audit Level IV, it will seem easy. The fast way to arrive at that point is to do it.

6310C22 SHSpec-316 The Integration of Auditing

Your difficulties in auditing are all made, manufactured by you In this universe, difficulty always has to be manufactured. Living beings are theta beings. They have to work pretty hard to be entheta beings. One may not be aware of the labor involved, but it is still being done.

There would be no mass in the bank if it were not being created in the instant in which it has an effect on the individual. A thetan creates his own bank. It is not that a thetan has created his own bank; it is that he is creating his own bank at this instant. There is no such thing as continued creation. All creation must be done at the moment it is perceived. There can be utterly unconscious creation. That is the source of the reactive mind. The reason a thetan is creating is contained in the things he is creating, trickily enough. The thetan creates the item, "creativeness", which then forces him to create. A person generally can't confront what it is that is causing him to create, or what he is creating to cause himself to create. He is not confronting the fact that he is creating it, so it is "gone" [not-ised, not as-ised]. The difficulty with this creativeness is that, in view of the fact that the thetan can create so much automatically, he cannot differentiate what he is creating, so he cannot as-is what he is creating.

The easiest thing someone can do is to create. An artist who is sweating over his creation has put some arbitrary barriers there, such as a time barrier (e.g. it must be done in a fortnight), or economic barriers (e.g. he has to sell it or he can't eat), and possibly material barriers (e.g. the paint he has must be used, even if it is sub-optimal). You could sort this out with him easily.

This action, taken to its final form, is R4. "You audit out all the GPM's and RI's.... You're auditing out the barriers which a person has put in his own road in order to prevent imagined oppositions from having an effect upon him.... A game of shadows." We tend to pooh-pooh the trouble that the bank causes him, because it is shadows, but the individual does in fact have to be bailed out if groups, etc., are going to be made effective. "Anything that's wrong with an organization is being created now by the organization." It is the same with the individual. Difficulties in auditing are all made. In this universe, difficulties have to be manufactured.

Except for the question of succession, a benevolent monarchy is the most nearly ideal form of government. People won't accept it because it might fail "next year". A benevolent people is preferable to a benevolent monarchy. You can't work with anything but the individual, if you want to succeed. The individual is the only thing there, and the only thing that will ever be there, so he's got to be in good shape. In any given organization, there is enough theta to make it whiz, unless someone is keeping it from whizzing.

Livingness is monitored by the amount of arbitraries to which it is devoted. The amount of livingness present is reduced by the amount of livingness invested in not-livingness, in arbitrary factors. It isn't really reduced, strictly speaking, because it is all recoverable by auditing, by as-ising the not-livingness. Auditing is recovering the water from the mud pies, the theta from the arbitraries (the entheta and enMEST). TA action is the flow of theta coming out of the mud. The "mud" is the bank.

Why can't you audit a PC who has screaming PTP's? Because there is too much attention (theta) invested in the PTP's (entheta). An auditor's action is to find some entheta and to invest it in an orderly fashion, to recover more theta from entheta. When there is never any theta present, you have psychology and psychiatry.

When there is no theta present, you have over-restimulation, and you get no TA action. There has to be some PC there. If the PC is unconscious, i.e. all mud, you have to run some CCH-type process to get him aware enough to be audited. Take a PC who is pinned down in a fox hole. He is out of food

and ammunition, with mortar shells beginning to bracket him in. That is how some PCs feel: They don't dare take their attention off of PT. All you can do is to find out what the mind is doing and parallel it.

In Routine 4, a PC can get so keyed in that he doesn't want to continue auditing on R4. A person with a heavy PTP on the perimeter of his consciousness that you have eased off [with lower-level processes] , who was doing fine at getting RI's before, now won't run as well. He gets fewer items; they don't fire, etc. This happens because the PC has attention invested in PTP's. The same thing happens at lower levels with the TA [being stuck]. There is no free attention with which to as-is aberrated stable data. At Levels I, II, and III, the PC can run into Level IV, when neither the auditor, the PC, nor the process are equipped to handle Level IV, because there is actually more potential over-restimulation of the PC's PTP on the PC's track than there is in his present time environment. When you look at GPM's and their RI's, there is more potential restimulation on the track than there is in present time. So the PC could be more restimulated by reason of keyed-in GPM's and RI's than by simply getting knocked off in present time.

This liability is answered by auditing goals with, "In this lifetime...." prepchecks. If the PC has given you some goal, you could get rid of the Level IV potentiality with such a prepcheck, probably. But you will find, while doing Level IV, that a prepcheck of this kind is messy to work with, when you have already found the PT goal. You get to the bottom of the second GPM and end session with the TA at 3.0. A week later, the PC comes in with the TA at 5.0. Something has keyed him in. Mid-ruds don't handle. 2WC on what has happened in the intervening week doesn't handle. So you go on to list for the next goal, and the TA goes down. It was the next goal that had the case restimulated. The PC went around talking about it. "I told Joe it was a _____ or a _____ ." One of them, at least, was a wrong goal! And finding the next goal was the only thing that would bring the TA down.

So auditors at Levels I, II, and III should be able to assess an ARC break assessment that includes "Goal restimulated" and "Item restimulated". If you hit one of those, the TA will come down.

PTP's almost always appear on the goals channels. The PC thinks that he is influenced by one or two RI's and that his character is formed by one goal. In reality, it is the whole bank that influences him. A PTP usually occurs as a key-in of an RI or a GPM, of one or another of the PC's goals. A chronic PTP is a keyed-in GPM, out of sequence. That can cause psychosomatic illness. An educated PC will respond to an L4 or case analysis that spots the fact that a GPM concerning that illness has keyed in.

If, with good, smooth, spot-on auditing, there is no TA action, then R4 has gotten in the road. Spend a session or two analyzing the case. Don't try to date a GPM, because it may span trillions to the X power of years. You can date the top and the bottom of the GPM. This will cause the GPM to move in. Find by case analysis what caused some chronic illness (An RI? A GPM? An Implant GPM? An actual goal?, etc.) Actual goals stick on GPM's as locks. By themselves they are not aberrative. GPM's out of sequence gives psychosomatic illness. RI's can pull chunks of GPM's along with them, when the PC gets into the wrong GPM because of some similarity.

The bank isn't all chaotic. It is actually pretty neat, basically. It consists of thirty "bricks", laid end to end, each composed of forty sub-sections (RI's). When you start thinking of the mind as a vehicle of thought, you are already licked in handling it. It is not a vehicle of thought. It is made out of things, like bricks and tar. The spots of tar on the bricks are the implant GPM's. Actual goals, thousands of them, are stuck onto each brick, like lumps of dough. The GPM's look like black energy masses. That's why thetans get restimulated by black energy masses. The GPM's can get shoved out of order. Say bricks five through eight have been inserted in between bricks 19 and 20, etc. Level I auditors don't have any business trying to straighten out GPM's. The meter is necessary, because a PC restimulated by the bank can't perceive the bank and can audit it. Hence, there are three essential parts of auditing:

1. The PC's body.

2. The E-meter.

3. The auditor.

Level II and III auditors should be skilled in ARC break assessments. They can prepcheck goals "In this lifetime ..." and can do Level IV-type ARC break assessments, if they can bridge the comm gap

with the PC. There is one case that cannot be patched up well at Levels II and III. A case that has been run badly on R4, that has been thoroughly loused up, can only be remedied by having a Class IV auditor straighten it all up. You could prepcheck or analyze a wrong goal and find out what it is and perhaps where it belongs, etc. Any case that has had goals run would probably do very well with a List 4 and a case analysis, to sort things out and slip them back into line.

The bank is full of pictures, but the GPM's are what need to be sorted out and gotten rid of. At lower levels, you don't disturb the GPM's as a rule. As you go up, you get closer to them, until at Level III, with service facs, you could get a rocket-reading goal, which you may or may not be well-advised to do anything with, since it may be the fifth goal back.

Everyone's ability to create is so good that they can keep creating a whole bank. They underestimate their own power to create and stop themselves. People get stuck in their own mazes and are now lost in their own creations. They will never sort themselves out of the maze by themselves. They don't want to be this way, even though they are creating what entraps them. Every now and then, a thetan in the between-lives area tries to sort out the stuff. But this stuff is all sub-itsa, and without a meter or anyone to itsa it to, it is hopeless. Even now, knowing all about the GPM's, one couldn't make it without a body or a meter. [Cf. the Buddhist conception that the only condition from which one can reach enlightenment is that of being in a human body.] LRH has tried meterless systems, but none has ever succeeded. An auditor is necessary, because a thetan restimulated by his own bank can't see it, but an auditor, not restimulated, can see it, with an E-meter.

As an auditor, you must realize how slight the barriers are, in fact, until R4M2 no longer seems difficult or complicated to you. LRH knows that auditing at this level can happen, because he has been through it, all the way from the complication to the simplicity.

So you start at the top and start going back, goal-oppose, RI's, RI's, RI's, making no mistakes. When things go all weird, you straighten it all out and come back up to PT with it all aligned.

There are different types and styles of auditing, but keep in mind the fact that it is the same bank, no matter what level or what PC you are auditing. Level III is the only level that is really dicey, since you are moving RI's and GPM's around in your search for service facs.

You can audit. The only reason you feel you can't is because of difficulties that you conceive to exist.

6311C05 SHSpec-321 Three Zones of Auditing

As an auditor, you can now be found out -- by the TA motion that you get on your PCs. An accomplished auditor can get TA at will. TA motion has to be prevented by the auditor, to keep it from occurring. It is prevented by:

1. Additive complications.

2. Failure to recognize basics. There are three zones of auditing and applied scientology:

1. Basic auditing.

2. Case analysis.

3. Routine 4. So there are three zones of expertise, which you should recognize as separate areas of performance. To be expert, the auditor must be good in all three zones. Someone could do technique perfectly, but, lacking basic auditing and understanding of what the mind consists of, he will not get anywhere.

LRH's auditing is perfectly mechanical and by-the-book, doing R4. He goes along, doing it until the PC either gets to the end of the processing cycle, or until the PC has fallen on his head. In the latter case, he becomes a case analyst, using a different set of data, namely, "How do banks go together?" The PC can say anything he likes about the situation, as long as there is TA. When the PC is done, the case analyst goes looking for why the list is misbehaving. Having done an analysis, the auditor knows that the accuracy of the analysis is subject to question because of the charge on the case, so any charge gotten off will make a more accurate analysis possible, until all charge is gone. Only factors

that are present now are analyzed. No former analysis is relied on. No analysis is valid after its date of inception, because more charge may meanwhile have been taken off the case. The accuracy of case analysis depends on the PC's ability to itsa. So case-analyses shift. They are always conditional and time-specific.

There is a trick of not speaking invalidatively, while not buying something the PC is selling. The PC says that X is his goal. You say, "Fine. I'll check it out. (Calls the goal) I'm sorry. That didn't read."

In a case analysis, you look at the source that you got a list from, as well as the possibility that the PC was ARC broken or not answering the auditing question, etc. When you find the right answer, you will get some TA action. It will correct to something like it should be. When you reach that point, you go back to being an auditor, being mechanical, etc., and you give the question. You go back to what you were doing. You never wear both hats at the same time. Just wear the hat that is needed at the time.

There is one hat that you wear all the time: the basic auditing hat. Lacking that, it doesn't matter how good you are at the other two. Basic auditing is giving someone something to talk about, letting him talk, letting him know that he has said it, when he has, and running an E-meter all the while. The basic auditing hat includes:

1. TR's. Acknowledge at the end of the complete cycle of action. If the answer involves only one itsa, ack at the end of one itsa. If it occurs after fifty itsas, ack after 50 itsas.

2. The Auditor's Code.

3. Metering.

4. Itsa line handling.

All basic auditing actions are co-ordinated with the PC. There are four elements to what happened in a session:

1. What the PC did.

2. What the auditor did.

3. What the bank did.

4. What the meter did. The auditor's actions in the session are relatively unimportant. The most unseen character in the world is an auditor in session. He is about as visible as a drop of water in a stream. This is an almost perfect example of a thetan with no mass. The important actions in the session are the performance of the PC, the PC's bank, and the E-meter. The auditor's actions only matter to the degree that they interfered with the PC's actions. An auditor's actions can be anything, so long as they are not destructive to the session. An auditor runs mostly on a lack of action. Auditing is a third dynamic activity. The auditor merely runs it. Basic auditing is like the firebox of the ship's engine. The-tech is like the generating equipment. The big engine is the bank. This is not so great an analogy.

All an ARC break means is that something has gone wrong in the case analysis department, not in the basic auditing department. A wrong goal found can be listed smooth as silk, but any later slip will produce an ARC break. Basic auditing can always be improved. It is not a bunch of do's and don'ts. It is a thetan sitting in the auditing chair, running the PC and the PC's bank, verifying it on the meter, and keeping up both the small and the large auditing cycles. There are no rules or tricks in it anywhere that solve all its problems, because it is not a complicated action. You make it far more complicated than it is.

The zone of auditing called R4, mentioned earlier in the lecture [p. 539, above], is really technique of any sort. These three zones of auditing apply at lower levels too, in the same order of use and importance: basic auditing, then technique and case analysis. If you get confused in your own mind about what's what, you will think that you need a new technique, when your technique is fine but your basic auditing is out. You think that you are being trained as auditors, when in actuality you are

simply being untrained from all the complications which, during the vast vistas of time, you have accumulated, with regard to human relationships and minds.

A person believes that if he takes too much responsibility for one of these sectors, it is liable to go wrong. That is just because he is unconfident. The think on it is, "It is best to let the PC run the session because (hidden datum) if anything goes wrong, then it isn't really my fault." And this is called, "Making the PC self-determined." Or the opposite think can occur, "The PC doesn't know what he is talking about. He will get himself in trouble and I will be to blame. So therefore I had better do everything in the session and not permit the PC to do anything in the session, because if you depend on the PC, that will make him guilty, and that is like blaming the PC. You really shouldn't do that. So we will relieve the PC of all responsibility. We will [get our itsa from] the meter." But what is all this worry about it going wrong? An effort not to have wrongness is not a session.

There is very little to teach in basic auditing. There is the PC's attention line. You keep it on some area of the bank until he has said all that is there, and when he is finished, you see that he is, and you tell him that he is done. You can produce TA action with, "Do birds fly?", with good basic auditing, surprisingly enough.

Auditing is doing basic auditing, running a process, and having an analysis of the case that justifies running the process and that tells you when the process is flat. Auditing is these three departments. The most important part of the session is the PC. The next most important part is the PC's bank, the next is the meter and its verification of what is going on, and the least visible part (though the most important part as far as the beingness of the session is concerned) is the auditor.

A session is an irreplacable section of time that will never occur again. So what happens in the session is important. The important questions for a session are:

1. What actually happened in the session?

2. Was there TA action?

3. Was the PC's ability to itsa and confront improved?

4. Was the PC's bank straightened out? Those are the important things, not whether you appear in session in costume, so long as when you appear in session, your appearance doesn't impede the session. Appearance is only important in that it could be distracting or disturbing.

Basic auditing training is simply the average action best calculated to produce a result in a session, with minimal impedance of session gain. There is no completely proper auditing action, except as measured against these elements. All your self-criticism is badly spent. It is whether you produce results that really matters.

6311C07 SHSpec-322 Relationship of Training to OT

You are very fortunate people, to come all the way down the track, having done all those stupid things, and to wind up here with a chance out. The chance is as good as you can audit, and not a bit better. The number of raw-meat PCs that will go out through the roof is nonexistent. Unless they become fully trained auditors, they won't make it. The raw meat case is very easy to audit, but what you are doing is auditing the charge off the top RI's. A scientologist appears to be a tougher case because the charge is off of those. You will have to find the two top RI's, now. and go on down the bank.

You can't go on and run the bank on someone who hasn't a clue about his mind, who doesn't know what is there, frontwards and backwards. The PC's RI's only disintegrate when found in their right locations, even though they can be found out of position. So don't worry about a case getting messed up by RI's being found in the wrong place. Goals which have already been run can mess things up. All you can do if an RI or a GPM has been run is to date them. Even after you have run an RI, you can verify it by dating. The reason for this is that, in running it, you pulled it a little out of its own time-sphere. So you can still get a bit of a bang on dating it and reorienting it. You are just getting the idea of it, which is still there in position. The mass is already gone.

Sooner or later, someone will take a lot of clay and work out the mind with the PC, an unusually smart PC, who will get it and go on being audited, with understanding, but this will be a very rare occurrence. Getting someone to be responsible for a session occurs on a gradient. The people who start on an HCA course, etc., are already pre-selected, just by the fact that they enrolled. Any of them, including any upper-level auditor, including LRH, gets nervous over PCs, wondering if the TA is moving, the PC doing OK, etc. That is to be expected. People who persist into upper levels of training are further pre-determined by their willingness to continue in the face of struggle and disappointment.

There is an additional problem: Where do you take over the PC's itsa, so as to allow him to itsa just enough, neither cutting it short nor letting the PC wander around mucking things up. These points vary from PC to PC, and with the same PC, as he gets more able. Some PCs have good perception, and if they say it is so, it probably is so. With other PCs, you can count on it. that if they say "It's a _____ ," it isn't. You should be increasing the PC's perception of and confront on his own bank. So as the PC gets closer to OT, you should have him in good enough shape so that he can perceive what is there to be run next. Where you can deduce change in the PC, you are, of course, changing the values by which you audit. Also, the PC's itsa can deteriorate, if he has had some loses and the case is going sideways and backwards. You will have to take over more responsibility for directing his attention, until he is fixed up. Cases are always different from one moment to the next.

Low-level cases "run on 'fat'.... They have charge leaking out of their ears." When you have gotten off the "fat" that exists on the two top RI's, you have got the whole bank to deal with. Now you have to be a genius to find some "fat" to get off the case, and the case is more likely to get ARC broken from the aspect of cleaning cleans. This makes you a very good auditor. What happens when someone is in the position of doing R4? They are probably somewhat trained by now, but they will need more training. The surest way to get to be OT is to be a highly trained auditor, for various reasons, including the aplomb that it takes to confront the bank. A case is on its way to OT when the first GPM has been run out. This can take up to two years after finding the first (not necessarily the most recent) goal. Running out that first (top) GPM is more Hell for the PC than anything the thetan has thought of confronting, and this is true for several reasons: the state of the technology, the hazards of the auditing, possible errors, previous errors, the lack of the PC's perception of the PT GPM because of its PT restimulators, etc., etc. Raw meat, not understanding what is happening, won't put up with it. They can't confront it.

Even though a goal is an incorrect goal, it could be that only its position is incorrect, not its wording. You can get wrong items, a wrong line plot, for an implant GPM, without turning off the rocket read. But if you take an actual GPM and try to run it on an implant pattern, it turns off the rocket read right now, and it turns off any other meter phenomena as well.

There is another horrible datum: An actual goal, invalidated, will now behave like a wrong goal. It will turn on the same creaks as a really wrong goal. The PC will ARC break the same way. It will read as a wrong goal. It will turn off ARC breaks when indicated. And so forth. So now, after you do a case analysis, prepcheck everything found, so that you don't discard an actual goal. It is possible that a wrong goal, sufficiently asserted and validated, might behave like a right goal. One thing will still be the case: any actually wrong goal, or an actual goal run as an implant goal, will turn off the rocket read within two or three items. This saves you from running a wrong goal. You won't have any rocket read to run it with! What is dangerous is that an actual goal, thoroughly invalidated, will be consistently discarded by the auditor. He and the PC agree that "to spit" is a wrong goal, and they continue looking for the next GPM in line or the PT GPM, but they will never find it. Many are called, and few ever hit the top of the bank. These are the sorts of errors that can occur and that make R4 Hell for PC and auditor. Nothing will make it easier, because that is happening with all the data, the best-trained auditor, and the most educated PCs. R4 takes a high degree of skill, compounded with a phenomenal degree of luck.

With hindsight, one can see how things got off the track, but as one proceeds, one is walking in the dark with a thousandth of a millimeter peephole. What takes time in R4 is the mistake. The worse R4 goes, the harder it gets for the PC and the auditor to see what is the true state of affairs. However, don't put attention on not making mistakes, because the effort not to make mistakes will produce mistakes, directly and indirectly. Most of the auditing time is consumed in handling mistakes, and most of the mistakes you make are in trying not to make mistakes. Anything that can make a meter go out, or any condition that can get you an erroneous read, is then susceptible to throwing out a case analysis, and your own efforts to straighten out a case analysis are susceptible to throwing out a case

analysis. And a case analysis can be wrong in the first place. OK. Those are the nerves with which you live. So the only questions for a case analysis and the only points of randomity should be:

1. Exactly what is happening with this bank that I am handling?

2. Exactly how is it going together?

3. What are the contributive data I have, with which to make up my mind about the situations in this bank?

So you have to have basic auditing and techniques down to the no-attention state, because there are enough hazards and difficulties in case analysis, so that you have no attention to spare for anything else. The ideal scene with the auditor and the PC is still going to be a porcupine-juggling act. You should be able to "think bank", so as to be able to parallel the PC's mind well enough to figure out what is happening with the bank in front of you. That is plenty to confront and handle.

Therefore training is a vital part of becoming an OT. Thus, in the short run, many are called, but few are chosen, though eventually all can make it by the training route.

6317C27 SHSpec-330 TVD 25: Auditing Demo and Comments by LRH

[LRH critiques three student TVD's, during and after the TVD's. The sessions are ruds and havingness sessions.]

If a PC gives himself the auditing question, he is self-auditing, so the auditor should reassert control by giving the question.

Half a dial havingness isn't enough. The needle should bounce twice, for a Saint Hill student. If the havingness isn't that good, then it is too low for the PC to be audited. The PC is hungry, tired, has PTP's, or (mainly) he has withholds. So run some O/W, run havingness, and fix it up. Missed withholds cause low havingness, as well as environmental and other causes.

On auditing in general, modern faults fall under not knowing model session well enough. Letting the PC itsa is one thing, but sitting silently and inviting itsa, without having asked a question, is another. There is a happy medium between cutting the PC's itsa and doing nothing at all. You clean a clean by sitting and looking at a PC who has nothing to say, or who has said all, or when you haven't asked a question. The PC will ARC break.

Failures in basic auditing are the usual reason for no progress of a case. You cannot apply a technique, in the absence of basic auditing.

6311C28 SHSpec-324 Seven Classifications of Auditing

Scientology will go as far as it works, not as far as it is administered. Therefore, LRH has focussed on full technological development first, with the administrative picture to come later, when the technical data was completed. The administrative pattern could not be let out without having the technical data together. The tech data turned out to be an account of a highly precise, coordinated activity. It turned out that people couldn't be audited at high levels unless brought there gradiently. This turns out to be true at lower levels too. People have to understand what is being asked.

There is always a repercussion to any stimulus-response cycle (or cause-distance-effect cycle), the response being a new stimulus-response (cause-distance-effect) cycle. So every stimulus response cycle has a return stimulus response cycle, where the first response acts as the second stimulus. The philosophic conundrum is that you cannot act without consequences in this universe. The Buddhist answer to this conundrum is, "Cause nothing." [I.e., by not building up Karma] We have another solution: audit it out. But only a trained scientologist will grasp this. The questions of "What is right conduct?" and "Can you ever really cause anything?" come up. here. If you try to trace back the cause of something, you can get into difficulty. Say a guy is shot with a rifle. You can try to trace back the cause to the finger tightening, to the thought or intention behind this, to the motive, to early childhood,

to mother, ad absurdum. To solve the problem of where cause started, you could say it started nowhere. But that doesn't really solve anything.

People get so interested in the cause end of the cause-distance-effect line that they never look for the other end. They never look to see what cause comes back from the effect point. For instance, Oswald fired a rifle, and twenty-four hours later he is shot dead. "A cause-effect cycle always leads to a cause-effect cycle." There is room for lots of think about it, but one simple fact applies in this universe: you can't cause something without receiving some sort of effect in return, in this universe. The magnitude of the effect may differ. There is the question of how much you can confront. How much you cause is monitored only by how much you can confront. If you can confront getting shot, shoot. Moral conduct would consist of only causing those things that could be confronted by those to whom it is caused. That is a route around the overt-motivator sequence: [Cf. the "two rules for happy living" in Scientology: A New Slant on Life, pp. 23-28.] [Cause only what others can confront." If you do this, you lead a rather unrestimulated life. If you are causing things that others can't confront without great detriment, such as starting a war, you can expect to get your head knocked off eventually, even though you think you could confront it. An overt is the generation of effects that are unconfrontable, and the motivator will be someone causing an effect that you can't confront. That is the story of this universe.

Self-determined thought is "not permitted" in this universe. The message of this universe is "All thought occurs by association." But this is not true. What is omitted from this is that at any moment, a thetan can get an idea, totally independent of all other ideas, by an independent postulation. [Not by stimulus-response; by prime motion.] That is what puts randomity into the whole picture. Psychologists and earlier philosophers didn't believe in independent postulation, or they missed it. Lacking independent postulation, there is a trap. They will argue that you can't think of an independent thought because whenever you do, you will find that there is another thought with which it is associated. In trying to disprove this, you go into agreement with it, so you can't disprove it. This is the old "hippopotamus" mechanism: "Don't think of the word, 'hippopotamus'," was part of the alchemists' formula for the transmutation of baser elements into gold. [Cf. the "Think a thought" process, in PAB 54, pp. 2-3.] People want to predict human behavior, so they never look at the fact that human behavior can be unpredictable and take this datum into account as part of their predictions. This denial of the human being's ability to be unpredictable takes away self-determinism of think in this universe.

Now we get up to the question of how much think a person can tolerate. Running overts on the man in the street, we get motivators instead of overts, all put forward as "overts on self". This relates to the concept of responsibility. The man in the street thinks that it is all being done to him. That is why Book One has such appeal. In scientology, the emphasis is on "You done it." Thus scientology has a higher responsibility level than dianetics. This makes scientology higher-toned. However, it is harder to attract people to scientology, on that account, than to dianetics. Irresponsibility is very popular. People prefer to think that they never started an action, that they never really caused anything.

This relates to the thinkingness of a criminal. The criminal "knows that nobody owns [anything] anywhere, but 'they' have entered into a conspiracy [by which] they pretend that people think People own things. And this is done for only one reason: these other people pretend this to get [him] in trouble [and to] be nasty to him.... Courts ... exist, not because there is such a thing as crime, ... [but] so that they can pretend outrageous and unreasonable things, so that they can get [him]." So criminals have a total reality of the uncriminality of criminal acts. Criminal acts aren't criminal to the criminal. The cops have picked up some of our think on this, e.g. the idea that criminals can't work. But they don't realize that the person they arrested for overtly stealing a car knows that the police are a bunch of frauds. The car never belonged to anybody, and the police are fraudulently pretending that cars are owned, in order to get this fellow in trouble. MEST goes to pieces around criminals, because they "know" no one owns anything. The criminal's reality is basically a neurosis which, at lower levels, becomes a psychosis. For instance, another characteristic of the criminal is the notion, "I didn't shoot anyone because there is no one there." Everything is a figment of his imagination. [Solipsism]. His imagination gives him a universe, which he knows is delusory. Even the guy in the street has the idea that something was done to him that accounts for his condition. He feels that all responsibility for his state of beingness is exterior to him. The common denominator of most thought is, "It was done to me." Responsibility lies without, not within this individual. Failed or would-be writers used to get LRH's goat by saying, "I always wanted to write, but I didn't have the education." They were saying this to LRH, who was trying to get rid of the phobias had instilled in him:

When you disseminate scientology, you err by not estimating the amount of cause that the person is willing to accept. You are willing to assume some degree of cause, but he is not. And he will find the thought of overt causation and responsibility to be unreal. He believes that he is the total effect of life. There is some truth to this: the PC can be the effect of a tremendous number of things, to the extent that he can't see himself as cause. You might be able to reach him at this level: "At some time in life, in some area, if you look it over very carefully, you may find that you had something to do with what happened. For instance, perhaps once you decided to read a book and did it." That he might agree with. You give him a rule he might apply, e.g. communication, or how to do a touch assist right, and he will find that he has caused something, by experience. This approach is more effective than that of giving him the theoretical, philosophical data. He realizes that he is causing the effect.

People mostly want "the comfortable agony" of being at effect. Catholics get to thinking, "Heresy:", if you tell them that they can cause effects or create things. They are the toughest nuts to crack: people who are saddled with religious superstition are the hardest to bring out of this rut. In Ireland, the lecture on creation laid an egg every week for this reason. "Create" is the wrong word to use. "Cause" would be better, though even that is hard for people to admit. The areas where one knows everyone fails are those of communication, relationships with people, and health. Those are desirable effects, so if you give the individual tools and let him find that he can cause an effect in these areas,   you have snapped him out of the cycle of "Be nothing but an effect. To cause is impossible," etc. It is not that the man in the street isn't interested in philosophy. It is just that he has failed at it. The savants have made the field seem unapproachable, but what they are concerned with isn't live philosophy, anyway. The real philosopher is the little guy in the street, who actually is concerned with questions like, "Who am I?", "What am I?", "What am I doing here?", "What are people?", "What happens to me when I die?", "Why don't people like me?", etc. In short, the real philosophers are people like you and me. And those are the basic questions that philosophy hasn't answered, but pretends to have answered at an unattainable level. For many, this failed attempt to arrive at answers to these basic questions led to the service fac, "God made everything." [Cf. "The why is God."]

We come to no full stop in this search until we realize that every being is an independent being, who is himself capable of expressing a thought or intention independent of any other thought or intention at any moment. The idea that Man is or can be cause cracks the back of philosophy. When we recognize that every individual is capable of being causative, we have no scarcity of answers. When we realize that it is the degree to which an individual can accept or execute causation, independent of other influences, that brings about his state of case, we have then cracked the whole riddle of philosophy. And training a person gives him the idea that he can cause an effect.

As soon as we've got a time stream, then all "befores" influence all "afters" [Post hoc, ergo propter hoc fallacy]. Then we can prove that nobody can be cause, because the time stream exists. This holds water, until we realize that the time stream itself is capable of being influenced by postulate. The time stream can both be caused and escaped from. It this is possible, then we have a level of cause that is senior to the time stream.

In disseminating scientology, if you only tell people things about it on which you yourself have excellent reality and which you have experienced, you will find that you communicate like a shot to everybody, because the R-factor in you is so high that you cannot help but put it across to others. Complete truth from the point of origin does get across, with effect. It isn't the startling thing you say; it's the real thing you say. And it isn't whether it is real to the other guy. It whether it is real to you.

The classification scale is a scale of "willingness to accept cause over one's destiny and that of others." It gives the degree of being at cause. Madmen get into obsessive cause, as a lower-scale mockery. But you could find where someone is on this scale every time, by finding what he has done and withheld and feels responsible for -- i.e. what his O/W's are.

Cause is not expressed in actions in life, but in case responses. It is cause over one's own case that is important, where we are concerned. People make progress in processing or they don't. If they don't, they set the same goals, session after session. If the PC's goals change violently, from one session to the next, there was an ARC break. Cases don't leap from one case state to another. They gradiently and smoothly become more at cause over more matter, energy, space, time, and other beings. The person isn't necessarily becoming more causative; he is more capable of cause. He can handle his mind better. He is therefore capable of handling other things better. His responses in processing are your best possible indicator. This is not a quick test, however, so it tends to be neglected.

Case progress is a direct index of cause. You don't realize how far you have come until you ask someone on the street whether he has any problems, and you find that he is living in a madhouse, from his viewpoint.

The seven classes of auditor are really eight, because they start at zero, an unclassed class, plus seven classes. [See HCOPL 26Nov63 "Certificate and Classification Changes: Everyone Classified" for a description of the classes.] A person could be a Class Zero and have a certificate, without being of a class. That is important, because there are always some people who work very hard and pass their checksheet [but don't make the grade]. They get a certificate, showing that they were there. Classification means more than just getting the certificate. A Class Zero certificate is not a sign of being classed. There are all sorts of valuable processes lying back along the line, and they fit into various slots. For instance, a Class II will be studying comm lags of equal length, as a sign of when to end a process.

This is all an effort to graduate cases on up the line. LRH has found that they do not advance further than they are trained, so this is the creation of a bridge from lower to higher levels. This increases information and skill and auditing availability right on up. The way it is now, people don't know where they are or where they are going or what is expected of them. There are professional PCs from 1950, waiting for someone to process them to OT, whose cases haven't improved much.

There will be a chart with all the processes and training skills of each class on it, all the way up. At some late date, there will be a textbook all the way up.

6312C03 SHSpec-325 Certifications and Classifications

[See HCOPL 26Nov63 "Certificate and Classification Changes: Everyone Classified"]

Why have we put in the classification and certification system? The original method of dissemination, a very successful one, was to gather a group who "had troubles" and wanted processing, and give them some training, setting up co-audits, and supervising them, charging a small fee for the supervision and having them pay only for patch-up sessions, as needed. The textbook was The Original Thesis, distributed in mimeo. The auditing was clumsy, but some fantastic things would happen.

When the Foundations were formed, not at LRH's instigation, there were lots of bosses around, and many schools of technology developed. They started training on the basis of letting someone hang around for a month or so, to pick up what was going on. That was Parker Morgan's idea. This started the Academy. These first auditors were trained to audit others, not to co-audit. LRH taught them straightwire. The same fault turned up here as in the earlier group: people wanted only to be processed, not to process anyone. This is a destructive action, because it denies training and dissemination and neglects the people who keep it going. If you want lots of auditing to do, get lots of co-auditing going. There are always lots of patch-ups to do.

So the central organizations of 1950 went into the processing business. And everybody they processed who wanted only processing and who didn't want to give anything for it, introverted. The purely PC person doesn't ever disseminate, despite all his gains and ability, because he never mentions his auditing, unless you do something wrong. This is the phenomenon of negative gain. If something is eradicated properly, the PC never says anything about it, because it is gone. The "pure PC" remains at the effect point and needs to be moved to the cause point, to some degree, with respect to scientology. People who co-audit, disseminate. A central organization can also make the above mistake: They can concentrate on income from the HGC and neglect training auditors.

Co-audits do produce a lot of randomity -- all sorts of goofs do occur, but that means repairs, which can be done in the HGC.

The individual who is helping someone else while he is being helped gets his attention extroverted and introverted during the time the co-audit is on. Life gets off the first dynamic, often for the first time. It puts a person in a better frame of mind to combine both flows. Furthermore, a person can progress only so far without an increase of understanding, which comes from training.

The PC starts, at Level I, with itsa, just talking about his problems, etc. [Assists and R1C are at this level.]

Then he changes, gets better, and moves up to Level II, where repetitive auditing gets used, and where it is the number of commands per unit of auditing time that determines the PC's progress. This principle carries through to the highest level of OT processes. The PC no longer gets TA from wandering around in itsa. So now you have to start pounding TA out of him with smoothly run repetitive questions. [CCH's, straightwire, and O/W are at this level.]

Then the PC moves up to Level III: R2H [See above]. The auditor has to be able to get the PC to spot things, like BPC, and if the PC has no reality on it, he will drift around. You may have had the idea that the higher the process, the more it would do for the case. Well, the process that does the most for the case is the one that is realest to the case at his state of case. That is a new look, a technical revision. The PC will get maximal gains on the process that is the most real. The further his case is from optimum, the more tiny little things are real and the more big tough things are unreal. We were running people over their heads in 1950. They couldn't confront engrams, but they did fine on straightwire processes. A PC who is being asked for self-determined changes for a prepcheck [See Problems Intensive procedure, p. 292, above.] may not believe that he has ever decided to do anything. He may need to be run on some lower-level process, like, "Get the idea of deciding to change/not to change," until he cognites that he can decide and, eventually, that he has decided. It takes an educated PC to run ARC break processes, because you are asking the PC to look at a complicated area. Unless he knows something about it, it is too confusing and there is too much charge in his way.

Then, at Level IV, we handle service facsimiles. The service fac is a very esoteric thing to conceive of. The PC has to take over responsibility for his own illness. That is impossible for lower-level cases. Missed withhold running is at this level, because missed withholds take a higher level of responsibility to run than O/W. At this level, we also get ARC break assessments and case programming.

At Level V, the PC gradually starts getting reality on the idea that he has had other bodies and other identities, with some acquaintance, at first with the past 2500 years. [At this level, he works with implants, engrams, whole track, and gets whole track case analysis.]

At Level VI, the PC gradually gets reality on track, back to trillions to the eighth power, where the earliest implants are. [At this level, he runs OT processes, his own (actual) GPM's, and old R3 and R4 processes.]

Then, at Level VII, he will get reality on track back to trillions to the 200th>s. That is a real sweep of time. Here, he finds that one GPM will cover from trillions 29 to trillions 21. Dating gets crude when the numbers are that large. At this level, when the PC has all the bank run out, there are various drills for OT's: Route 1, Change of Space Processing, etc. [For Route 1, see The Creation of Human Ability, pp. 33-43. This includes Change of Space processing, done in connection with the Grand Tour. The Grand Tour consisted merely of getting the PC to be at different places in the physical universe. The change of space aspect added an alternation of being at these different locations with being in the auditing room. The PC is made to run Change of Space on any area until that area is in PT. This process is also known as R1-9.] It is questionable whether any of these drills are necessary. LRH has found that if he is exterior, all he needs to do is to itsa to an auditor for awhile to get over feeling queasy about whether he can hold his position in space.

As far as we are concerned, the whole problem is one of dissemination, smooth processing, and keeping the bridge open behind us. The smoothest way to do it would be to insist that the individual doesn't outstrip his training level with his processing level. How do you guarantee that someone will make it all the way? That is an important question. There is the economic question too. If it would take 1500 to 2000 hours, at $10.00 per hour, just to be processed, then even if it were possible to go OT in this way, it would be too expensive for most people. How much would training fees add up to? Let's say $5000 to $6000. That makes it more possible. This cost could be decreased further by requiring that each preceding course be very thoroughly done, so that each subsequent course would be shorter. The student would, of course, get unlimited processing, provided he was expert enough to keep his co-auditor. Thus the reality level of advance is cared for, which takes care of dissemination.

So any HCA/HPA could train people at HAS up to Class I. This would give this individual a co-audit area that he could cope with. Level II training would be given in some district. It would not be too expensive, nor too long. About thirty days is the most that most people could spend. Then you would have higher levels of co-audit going. You would need textbooks for each level, with all the relevant technology, question and answer sections, and exams, that would really ensure that the person has got the data, etc.

The system of the private scientology practitioner who takes people in, processes them, and ejects them hasn't been generally successful, although a few have done it. This system is following a system set forth by the healing professions, which we aren't. It took the healing professions a long time to get this going, anyway. Private clubs also have privileges which are denied to members of the public, who have "government protection".

The certification system handles people who do the theory part of the course, but not for classification. Classification is shown by Roman numeral. If a student is studying for the next class, he can do the processes of that class, provided that he has the next-lower classification. But he can't do any higher processes without getting a higher classification.

What about Class 0 and Class I? Class 0 has to be double. The person is being trained for the HAS certificate, and you have to consider him a class of some sort, going for the HAS certificate. Then you have HAS Certificate, Classed [Class I]. That condition doesn't occur again. After that, the student always has a certificate to put a class on.

There are cases all over scientology that are parked because they skipped one of these levels and tried to leap into upper-level processes, while still worried about the environment. It is true that only at the upper levels do you really resolve what is wrong with the case. It is also true that you have no chance to get at that without getting what is on top out of the way. This also reduces the randomity and dangers connected with processing results.

6312C04 SHSpec-326 TVD 24: Basic Auditing

[This is a combined lecture and demonstration, to show the presence of auditing and what basic auditing is.]

Auditors have misunderstood what itsa is, giving rise to awful results. They are getting their PCs to draw pictures, giving the PC nothing to do, and handling nothing. The place to get your basic auditing together is at Class II. Basic auditing handles the PC, handles the session, handles the auditing comm cycle, and handles the meter, regardless of what else is occurring. It is no different at Class II than at Class IV.

LRH has been improving his own auditing for the past few months. Basic auditing should be very smooth. LRH has been improving his basic auditing in the area of observing the PC to see when he has said all that he is going to say, then acknowledging him. One can play it safe by saying nothing, but that is cleaning a clean, comm lagging, inviting more itsa when there is nothing there. Stringing out a bunch of unnecessary acknowledgments is also a comm lag. Keep the session rolling. That is what gets good TA. Just sitting there listening is Level I auditing. It doesn't work at higher levels.

LRH found that he was causing the PC's dirty needle. He also found that he had to increase the PC's ability to itsa by using the meter to get information only when the PC couldn't supply it. He found that it is necessary to remain silent, while the TA is in fast motion. But one doesn't wait after that to see if the TA will move again. At Level VI, the motion you get after the BD on an item is coming from the next level.

Taking up and handling the PC's problems, at session start, during the session, or at end of session, is part of basic auditing.

Basic auditing is:

1. Getting the PC to itsa.

2. Promoting and increasing the PC's itsa, by letting the PC find data, not relying on the meter to do it. However, don't give the PC the feeling that he is getting no help.

3. Not talking while the TA is in fast motion, but not waiting for the TA to stop jumping around.

4. Handling any PTP's at session start, as they arise, or at session end.

[The TVD tape follows, with LRH auditing MSH. The tape is intended to show basic auditing, as well as technique. It starts out with ruds, then gets into a goal-oppose list. LRH finds the PC's PT goal, finds where the PC is in the GPM, and finds her top terminal. He finds the wrong top oppterm.]

Technical note: The top oppterm of the PT GPM, unlike any other in the whole bank, should blow up and shouldn't keep on reading. It should just go, and it didn't. So the auditor knows by now that it is a wrong item, since it didn't blow, and that the PC is "selling" it. So here we get into a tremble and scramble. The PC is getting ARC breaky because the PC has a wrong item. If you missed the itsa once, here, you would get a screaming ARC break, because the out session rud would key in the BPC of the OT process.

[They do some more work with the top oppterm. PC still won't agree that the top oppterm is incorrect. However, they do verify the correct terminal.]

Listing it straightened it out. The top oppterm turned out to be "Being disobedient".

LRH points out the basic auditing of the session: letting the PC itsa; not leaving the PC with nothing to itsa. The PC should have been ARC broken by taking the wrong top oppterm and abandoning the right terminal.

The PC's ability to itsa is the road out. Keep the session driven. Keep it going. Take action. Promote and increase the PC's itsa. It is the auditor's job to make a session out of it

6312C05 SHSpec-327 Basic Auditing

[Some of the data in this tape is also to be found in HCOB 26Nov63 "All Levels Star Rating: A New Triangle: Basic Auditing, Technique, Case Analysis".]

The problems of auditing are divided into three categories:

1. Basic auditing.

2. Technique.

3. Case analysis. "Technique" means the exact patter and procedure for getting something audited on the PC. We have dug up lots of old processes. All of them are still valid, except mock-up processes. Processes like, "Spot three spots in your body/in the room," run long enough, tend to exteriorize people. Another exteriorization process is, "Where aren't you?" These processes are OK if they are not run to exteriorization. Exteriorizing someone tends to result in his coming back into his body more solidly, because he becomes alarmed. He is unstable. This occurs at higher levels, e.g. Levels V or VI. The PC tends to come back in and hold harder. Actually, what upsets him is the energy masses that he is going through, which exert certain emotional responses upon him.

The liability of these old lower-level processes is that they run the PC into GPM's and can pull RI's out of line. E.g. the liability of "Tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting," is that you could run into the RI, "forgetting". But such an occurrence is very rare. People coming up through Level III are in the charge of the top RI's, but they are getting destimulated, as they get more oriented and wiser in their environments. Just remember, when running a repetitive process, that there is some danger of restimulating an RI, especially if the process has a fancy or oddball wording. You even run this risk at Level I, when you ask, "What solutions have you had to that?", since the track is just a series of solutions. What saves your bacon is the PC's lack of reality on other lifetimes. Starting at Level III, you would be wise to preface processes with "In this lifetime...." Do this for sure at Level IV, since the PC's awareness has come up, and he will slip back on the track pretty easily. Your main problem will be the manic at Level I, who insists on running only past track.

This came up in Elizabeth, N.J., with the first Foundation, when a couple of co-auditors could only find past-life engrams to run on each other. Joe Winter, Parker Morgan, and John Campbell tried to pass a motion to make research on or mention of past lives off-limits, because it had bad public presence. They found out then that LRH could get mad. Public presence has nothing to do with the truth. There is no such thing as acceptable truth. That is really just a lie. There is no room in "PR" or public image for truth. PR is nice, but don't build on it. Build on truth.

With most PCs, any attempt to go backtrack before their PTP's are handled will produce nothing but disaster. You are asking them to confront a big new datum, when they can't even confront their environment. Most processing failures come from the attempt to process someone higher then his class.

The classifications are laid out on a gradient scale of increasing responsibility for self and the dynamics. The processes laid out in any given class form a gradient scale, too, plotted against increasing responsibility. So it starts with motivators and ends with overts. All this is still techniques. The programming of techniques is based on case analysis. Every level has its own case analysis.

The three basic steps of case analysis are:

1. Find out what the PC is sitting in.

2. Get the PC to tell you about it fully. Get any lies off.

3. Handle it by locating and indicating charge as accurately as possible. That is the pattern that you would use at any level. This delivers the whole world of healing to us. It was a research target set last January, and it has been met.

At Level I, this could consist of getting the person to talk about some illness that they have had. At Levels II and III, you would find what incident the person was sitting in. In dianetics, this was done with an age-flash. At Level VI, it is done with all the tech of case analysis, asking if it is an actual GPM, an implant GPM, etc. At Level 0 it is, "How do you feel today? What have you done about it? Do you feel better?"

As a PC runs actual GPM's, the sub-itsa and the PC's ability to itsa come closer and closer together. On case analysis, they fold over about half way to OT, where the PC's ability to itsa surpasses the meter. If the PC doesn't say itsa, the meter won't read. The meter depends on mass and short-circuits in the mass. You will eventually reach a point where the person is self-determined enough that unless they think it, it isn't so. Somewhere along the line, you will also run into their recognition that they are creating all the mass. What you will do there hasn't been worked out. You will have to get across it and back to the beginning and the earliest postulates with regard to the making of mass and the creation of all this type of bank. It is a rough go, unless your basic auditing is superb.

Your basic auditing at Levels II and III has to be magnificent, because the PC doesn't know what you are talking about. He has no nomenclature. He has no reality on it. He can't put these things together smoothly. The whole burden, therefore, is on basic auditing, on handling the PC's itsa, improving the PC's itsa. Never give the itsa to the PC on the meter when he can give it to you. Don't refuse to check the meter if he asks, but wean him off it.

The only things that vary in basic auditing are the addition of more complicated metering, as you go up the levels. Note that at Levels V and VI, you never use a sensitivity higher than 8. Other wise the needle is too loose.

Improving one's basic auditing is the way to improve the amount of TA that one gets, given a particular technique used. Dirty needles come solely from out basic auditing [see HCOB 25Nov63 "Dirty Needles"].

On Level VI, the TA moves around so much that you can't wait until the TA stops to say something. You have to talk when it slows down. The PC will get heat, during BD's, which will be suppressed if you talk, so that you will have to get the suppress off the heat to get it to turn on again. If there is nothing going on, it is up to the auditor to start something. If there is something going on with the PC, then there is no need for the auditor to start something.

At the upper levels, basic auditing had better be as free from attention as walking. This sounds obvious, but it is horribly true. You've got plenty to do, with the meter. You don't have time to record TA, except when you give the question and when the TA blows down, when the PC gives the item. Apart from that, you need a TA counter to keep record of it. Just don't move the TA while the PC is moving around, or you will get a falsely high count.

You've got to stop the needle at set with your thumb, in order not to cut the PC's itsa while centering the needle. You will put in a comm lag if you delay while centering it, and the PC's attention will go to the meter. There are numerous tricks that you can do with meters. For instance, you can brake the needle to stop it from wobbling. Know the needle well enough to be able to spot a missed withhold without asking for it, or to repair havingness without having to run any, by getting the PC to spot what upset his havingness, etc. You can know TA behavior well enough to spot trouble before it arrives, so that you are not startled when the PC erupts. At Level VI, technique is an all-devouring monster. You can spare no attention for the meter or for basic auditing aspects such as the comm cycle. There is no zenith on how good your basic auditing can get.

You could probably make some mistakes with techniques and case analysis (not many), but you can't afford to make any mistakes with basic auditing, especially if you do make a mistake in another area. Nothing very serious will happen to a PC because of technique or case analysis errors, especially below Level VI, but basic auditing errors will pitch the PC on his head. The only serious things that can happen to a PC occur because of out basic auditing. PCs feel badly when basic auditing is out. Invalidation is the only way to turn on somatics at Level VI. OT processes are as rough as there is invalidation. It isn't that items turn on pain. It is that if you invalidate a right item or goal, the PC can get good and sick. This makes the steps of case analysis mandatory. But if your basic auditing is in, such that the PC's itsa is in, you are less likely to make these mistakes, because the PC's opinion and knowingness are consulted.

The greatest dividend you can get from training is improvement of your basic auditing, to a point where you can relax and get technique and case analysis to hum. Get it perfected, and your tone arm motion will triple.

6312C10 SHSpec-328 Scientology 0

It works out this way: Having completed scientology research all the way to the top, LRH has had to undercut it all, to find a new series of processes and a new processing theory on which to build the edifice. That is quite a trick! Knowing the upper strata only makes it harder to build the lower strata, because you see it so clearly that it is hard to see how someone else, lacking your knowledge, could miss it. You can know exactly what is wrong with somebody, but if he knows differently, you can't get him to see your solution or your view of the problem.

LRH finally has a Scientology 0 to undercut Scientology I. It was a description of the environment and what is wrong with it. It has nothing to do with the person's mind at all. Scientology I is the isness of things, and it takes care of the mind as well, but Scientology 0 takes care of the environment. It is summable up as The Dangerous Environment. That sums up:

1. What you are talking about.

2. The frame of mind of the person talking with you.

Look around and find something that isn't threatening you or pushing a PTP on you or trying to exteriorize you. This will help to pull your attention out of the threatening environment. It allows differentiation to come about instead of identification.

Many people are professional dangerous environment makers. The "chaos merchants" push dangerous environments on people in a sensationalized form. This includes politicians, newspapermen, policemen, etc. They spread confusion and upset and breed fear of the environment. This is the same thing that a blackmailer or an extortionist does. They make the environment seem more dangerous than it is. They sell the dangerous environment 100%. The avidity of their sell can be used by the scientologist, by means of a sort of "theta-judo", practiced on them. Understanding Scientology 0 includes understanding how to use the enemies of scientology, the chaos merchants.

Toynbee, working out of libraries, came to a tremendous understanding of life. He says that the reason that the Mexican, for example, does not succeed is that he has insufficient challenge in his environment. Toynbee has obviously never talked to any Mexicans. It is a myth that primitive peoples get apathetic because of insufficient challenge in the environment. The challenge of the environment is actually overwhelming to downtrodden peoples, primitive peoples, etc. The environment is too dangerous for a fellow to have ambition. This is actually true of anyone who lives on earth. The individual on this planet, if he has not been able to achieve his destiny, is in an environment that he finds overwhelming. His methods of dealing with it are inadequate, and his existence is as apathetic or as unhappy as his environment seems to him to be overwhelming. Get those principles down, and you will have Scientology 0.

A lot of people spend their time worrying the people around them to death. They spread confusion and upset, while wondering why their victims don't get ahead. These are small-scale chaos merchants, compared with newspapers, but they are more intimate.

Doctors get paid, not by the number of people who are well, but by the number who are sick. The police would go broke if the prisons didn't make more and better criminals. Police chiefs would be unimportant if they had few police under them. Newspaper reporters dream of a "big story", meaning a good disaster.

The environment is never as dangerous as it is made to appear. A solution to the threat of nuclear war could undoubtedly be found, especially if there were a profit in it. But anything that tends to make a calmer environment meets and makes a ridge with anything that has a vested interested in the fact and idea of a threatening environment. The expansion of scientology will lessen the amount of fear. It will lower the stress perceived by people as emanating from the environment. Scientology would make for a calmer environment. It would not be a less interesting environment, but a calmer one, one that is in less turmoil. This could permit resurgence of the individual, because he would be less enturbulated. You would get a beneficial spiral, where the threat of the environment would be dying out. The chaos merchant doesn't like calming influences. They threaten his livelihood and survival. On an individual level, a domestic chaos merchant gets upset when his or her victim gets calmer, with exposure to scientology. It is very disconcerting to a chaos merchant to be met with humor, instead of seriousness.

The true story of scientology is simple: A Ph.D. develops a philosophy. People find it interesting. People find that it works. People pass it along to others. It grows. That is what the newspapers are trying to make a story out of. From their viewpoint, there is no story, because there is no conflict. You can amplify the story and get some statistics, but anything else is distortion and lies, added on to make the story disturbing and sensational. But all disturbance folds up in the face of truth.

In a universe kept going and continually disturbed by lies, all the basic facts have been covered up, particularly those relating to life and death. Many contrary data have existed. Fundamental questions belong in philosophy, but philosophy has become so decadent that it is no longer a source of truth. It is, at best, a limited truth, and in going for truth, you have to go all the way [see 6211C01 SHSpec-207 "The Road to Truth", above]. The clean blade of truth cannot be stopped. But if you talk truth, you had better have your hands on it. Socrates talked truth but didn't have a good enough grip on it.

When you start to introduce scientology to anyone, the first target would be the environment, not the person's mind. You could dream up processes, based on the assumption that the person believes that the environment is too dangerous for him. Any relatively sane person will agree with you on that. We know that it is being made to seem more dangerous than it is. This is a key point of Scientology 0. So the person could be brought to perceive that this is so by his own perception. It is also a key point that the person's:

1. Health,

2. Sanity,

3. Activity level,   and

4. Ambition are monitored by his concept of the dangerousness of the environment. From these factors, we can draw up an improvement program for any person. We can therefore improve these things in the individual without reference to his mind. We have dealt with this before, under the heading of controlling environmental restimulation. We know that to handle his problems

terminatedly, we will have to handle the mind. Nevertheless, we can get very marked and noticeable gains and improvements by handling his environment, since we know that most of the threat that he is worried about is imaginary.

The therapy could be as simple as, "Don't read the newspaper for two weeks, and see if you don't feel better." At the end of two weeks, have him read the newspapers for a week. Get him to see whether he then feels better or worse, so that he can decide.

If he gets too upset or confused, tell him to look around the environment and find something that isn't a threat to him. A good havingness process [at Scientology 0] is finding out what is a threat to a person, and running it as a negative havingness process. This is actually very sophisticated. It could be used at upper levels, run against some particular fear. It is an improved version of "Take a walk and look at things." This is positive education. The reason, "Take a walk; look it over," works is that the individual sees that the environment isn't threatening him to the degree that he thought it was, when he has inspected it. So you could use a process like, "Look around you and find something that isn't going to fall on you." At Scientology 0, you are trying to get the individual to inspect the environment and find some greater security in it.

The general auditing approach would be, "Look around you and find out if the environment is as threatening as it appears to be," but each person would have to be handled individually. You could get a person to look at the papers on his desk that are threatening him, and find something in them that isn't a threat. That is "taking a walk" while he is sitting at his desk. For a person who feels that everyone is hostile to him, you could use, "Find something that people say or do around here that isn't hostile to you," or "Find one person in the organization that isn't actively hostile to you," or "Was there anything said today that wasn't immediately and directly hostile to you?" This could also be played in the direction of exaggeration, but then it goes up to a higher level, in a mental direction: "Get the idea of a Chinese in every corner, shooting at you with Cong hatchets." You could use, "Look around here and find something that isn't trying to exteriorize you." Etc.

All this runs on the single auditing command, "Look." There is no effort to get any itsa about it. Almost any inspection of the environment is helpful except a negative one. If the PC has a secondary; if he has lost an individual, in an environment where he has been with the person a lot, e.g. in a love affair, you can use, "Look around here and find something that isn't reminding you of (the ex-lover)."

The mechanism here is that the person has identified everything in the environment with his unrest. Everything in the environment has become identified with the threatening things in the environment. The person's charge on the environment can be destimulated by indicating things that are not so threatening, thus getting a person to differentiate. When identification becomes differentiation, intelligence and judgment can return.

An interesting commentary on the character of Man lies in the fact that if you really want to interest people, at a lecture or P.E. course, you should give them something that they can use to help others, rather than something that will help themselves. Man is basically good, and this is a proof. Therefore, your supplementary advice should always go on the basis of "Who are you trying to help to discover that the environment is less dangerous than it seems? You had better understand the data well enough, so that you can give it to him well enough, so that he can use it and see a result, and then use it on himself. If you do this right, you will often get the cycle:

1. The person finds out something to help Pete.

2. It works on Pete.

3. He decides to try to use it to help himself. "Take a walk and look at things," is about the mildest advice you could give someone. It would be quite effective if he actually did it. LRH did this, and found that by putting tension on the beam with which he was looking at things, he could pull himself forward, without having to walk. This got intriguing. He went skimming his heels on the pavement until he noticed a cop looking at him.

The master question is, "What part of the environment isn't threatening?" This question gets the person to differentiate. You can also get him to arrange his life a little. If you can get a person to just plan a life in which everything is calmer and less threatening, the life he is living becomes calmer and less threatening.

When you move this up into Scientology I and introduce communication factors and show the person how to communicate with people, he will find that he can produce an effect on people and that people are less threatening. If you keep havingness in mind, as you go up the levels, you never lose the benefit of having the environment being less threatening, which you started at Scientology 0.

All people are trying to:

1. Get out of the environment, or 2. Master the environment, if they can't escape.

Any thetan has these intentions, and has had them all the way up the universe. These are the only totally common PTP's of an environment. The individual would also like to find something to help his friends. What you need is a level of help that requires practically no education at all. This would become real to the individual. Just the concept that he considers the environment dangerous and would like to find the source of threat is an enormous piece of wisdom to him, since before you identified it for him, he was being it. If you provide a therapy by telling him to stay away from the things and people, etc., that upset him and find and associate with the things that aren't a threat, he will make amazing progress. This pushes a whole new philosophy under the structure of scientology.

6312C12 SHSpec-329 Summary of OT Processes

This is a fast and rapid summary of OT processes. This is a matter of record, not so much a matter of education. This gives the record of the final technology of bank running, which is now complete and unvarying. The technology is very precise. It is extremely crisp. You do not vary from it. Some PCs become fixated on parts of the bank and argue with you about structure. For instance, seeing two RI's, the PC may think that he has two and only two GPM's. There are variations, as far as which implants someone could have. Someone might not have the Helatrobus implants, for instance. But everyone on this planet has the Train implant. There is a whole set of implants around trillions 2, which are similar to the Helatrobus implants, and for which we don't have the pattern.

You can get variations at Level V, but none at Level VI, or the person wouldn't be here. One person has not made different types of actual GPM's than another. You don't get variations at Level VI, but lack of data and an overburdened case could bring about an apparent difference in the case. The differences are only mistakes made by the auditor and/or the PC. Every actual GPM is similar to every other actual GPM in basic composition. "The goal as an RI is always the first RI in the bank. It then runs on up the line on a 'solve' basis, not on an "oppose' basis." Each item is a problem with its opposite item, going on up the bank, but those masses are actually very huge spheres. They are all the accumulated energies that anyone ever had anything to do with, on this particular subject. They have been lived through, and they have been accumulated.

Now an actual GPM has varying numbers of RI's. On the middle track, the GPM's have 16 to 18 RI's in them. Late on the track, closer to PT, they go to 22 to 24 RI's. Each one has a cross-over: the middle pair of RI's. If a GPM has 20 RI's, at number ten you will [generally] get the cross-over. The cross-over is very important. That is where the PC ceases to be for the goal and starts to be against it. On the oppterm side, you get a progression up through the cross-over point from the bottom oppterm, which is dead opposed to the goal, to the top oppterm, which is dead for the goal. And "on the terminal side, you have the goal as an RI at the bottom, and it progresses, up to the cross-over, for the goal and then, on a gradient scale, goes against the goal. The top terminal of actual GPM is dead against the goal." If the goal were "to be strong", the top terminal would be something like "weak" or "being weak". That pattern has to be understood, or the PC will get in trouble.

The patterns are all similar, no matter what the GPM's position on the time track is. As you go earlier on the track, however, there is this change: You get more items for the goal, i.e. the cross-over point drifts higher. But the position of the cross-over is also monitored by whether the PC as a thetan liked the goal or not. The cross-over would occur very near the bottom of a GPM whose goal the PC detests, e.g. "to be obedient". You can have the cross-over appear almost at the goal, on a goal that the PC detests, perhaps in the first couple or three pairs. But this is not an important eccentricity. Don't be alarmed by it. That is the only variation in cross-over.

Another variation in actual GPM's is that earlier on the track, the time span for a GPM is longer. E.g. a "modern" GPM could span only a billion years. An early GPM could span trillions 20 to trillions 30 years. There are about (as a guess) 26 GPM's in a bank: very few. The closest-to-PT GPM can be

expected to be truncated, which makes it difficult to enter the track, because the PT GPM may have any number of items in it.

In a case analysis, you can only count on what blows down the TA. The E-meter is not wholly reliable, here. The meter is only of relative use. If all is perfectly correct on the meter, you have a chance of being right.

A GPM, when found, will read, if not forever. It does give you nice long rocket reads and blowdowns, when you find it. But don't expect it to read forever.

Now the PT GPM being truncated, will have less than a full [complement of RI's], which makes it hard to find its top. The present GPM has some top short of total attainment of the goal, on the oppterm side and short of total opposition to the goal on the terminal side. How short is the PT GPM? Don't cut your throat if you find after 75 hours that it only had two RI's, or if you find that it is really the second GPM and is there in full. You may not find out that this is the case until you reach the eighth GPM. You cannot be sure that you have the PT GPM (or any other particular GPM). You do the best you can and always suspect that there are more RI's into PT, once the thing can be repaired. And you are getting charge off all the way. It is not fatal to make mistakes in doing this. But don't underestimate the ability of these processes to nearly kill the PC, if mishandled. Say you skipped two GPM's and started to run out the one below it. The PC would feel like Hell. A PC never feels worse than on R4 done wrong. But he can live through it. It is the auditor who is in danger.

A wrongly worded GPM will shut off the RR.

The PT GPM is the one you are working for, but it may not show up until you have run an earlier GPM.

The programming is done only one way, in running these things. That is: You find the PT GPM. You find its top terminal. You list the top terminal for two items: the first oppterm and the second oppterm. From the second oppterm, you get the "solves it", by asking, "Who or what would it solve?", and you go on down the bank. So it is always the same: "You find the PT GPM. You run all the items out of it. Then you do a goals-oppose list and find the next GPM and get its top oppterm, and then run all items out of it, and find the next GPM ... , etc., until you get to the beginning of the time track." You can cut in and find the second GPM first, by accident, and find out later on that it is the second GPM, and then by doing goal oppose of it, you can find the actual first GPM. But that is at the risk of the game. That is just fixing a mistake. Properly, you find the PT GPM or something that you could believe was the PT GPM. You then run all the items out of it. Then you do a goals-oppose list and find the next GPM. You get its top oppterm and run all items out of it. Then you go on down the bank to the beginning of track. And that is the only program that is successful. Taking any GPM that fires and then trying to goal-oppose it to PT is not hard to do. It is impossible! You end up with a messed-up track.

You do this same program on every case, including cases that have had goals found and run out in various ways. You start with listing for the PT GPM: "What is your present time actual GPM?" This can be a long list. It follows a "goals list" format. When you get fifty items past the last RR seen on listing and you are getting no TA while listing, the GPM is on that list somewhere, and you find it by elimination.

This sounds impossible, but this pattern has been successful whenever tried. PCs come up with the PT GPM every time. Of course, it has to be an educated PC. If not, you don't have a prayer. It takes terrific stability on the part of the PC to hang in there when things get tight. An untrained person wouldn't stand for it. It is not that he couldn't be gotten into it, but he will panic when things go wrong and he feels terrible. He won't have the security of knowing that he can get out of what he got into. It is basically understanding that will carry him through.

[Here is a tabulated summary of the R4 procedure, as outlined in this tape:

1. Do a PT goals list and get a goal. List for the PT GPM using, "What is your present time actual GPM?" You use a goals-listing procedure.

That is, you list fifty items past the last RR seen on listing. If the TA is all run out, then the list is complete. You then find the item by elimination.

2. Try to count the number of RI's in the PT GPM, then plot it up accordingly, and observe where the top of this GPM sits in relation to the cross-over point. E.g. say you've got 12 RI's. Then you know that the top pair is one pair past cross-over. So the terminal is just a little bit against the goal.

3. Find the top terminal by listing, "What terminal are you sitting in now?"

4. List two lists from this same top terminal to get the top oppterm and the second oppterm of this truncated GPM. Charge will expire on the top oppterm, so then you will get the second oppterm, because that is the way the pattern progresses, going down into the bank. After getting the top oppterm, list "W/W wd solve (top oppterm)?" and get the top terminal back again. Then take it down to the second oppterm

5. Solve this across and continue to the bottom of the GPM.

6. Do a goal-oppose list to find the goal of the second GPM, using goals-listing procedure.

7. Take the goal as an RI from the PT GPM and list, "Who or what would it solve?", to find the top oppterm of the second GPM.

8. Take this top oppterm and list "Who or what would solve (the top oppterm)?", to get the top terminal of the second GPM.

9. Solve it across to get the second oppterm of the second GPM.

10. Run all the items out of that GPM in a similar manner, and continue on down the bank using steps (6) to (10), above, to the beginning of the track.

It is the PC who comes up with the answers. He finds out what is going wrong. If you can get off any BPC, he will start giving you some good data about what has gone wrong. E.g. the PC's next GPM is found but won't read. So a GPM has been missed. There is so much inval on the goal that it reads as a wrong goal. So the PC says that some inval is present. So the auditor prepchecks the goal and on [the rocket read] comes, and off they go. But repair is too complex to do without help from the PC. However, a PC can "sell" an item, and if the auditor buys it, it can land the PC in the soup. Also, if the RR doesn't pack up in the first five items down the bank, don't let the PC sell you on the idea that it is a wrong goal, wrongly worded, or misworded. LRH once let a PC sell him on the idea that a goal was a wrong goal. He listed and found two new goals, without realizing that the PC had merely gotten into a dramatization of one of the items of the goal's GPM, and therefore so despised this goal that the PC wanted nothing to do with this goal.

Rule: If it is running all right, keep running. Don't make trouble until trouble happens, since it is trouble that consumes session time. Take up trouble as it comes. If the PC does get in trouble, don't try to force the PC on. Stop and find out what is wrong and fix it. Otherwise, you can invalidate goals and items and make them read like wrong goals and items.

The read you get on listing actual GPM items (and goals) is like nothing you have seen elsewhere. It is not an RR and it is not a fall, and it is not anything else you have seen elsewhere. A tick will never be the item. The real item hits a "rubber bumper" and forces its way through, like breaking through a stone wall, and then falls on through to a BD. These are item reads. Only an item read looks that way; nothing else does. It goes the whole dial and brings about a blowdown. The rule in item-finding, is to list as long as the PC wants to list, and then find the item on the early part of the list. That has variation. The item could be wrongly worded, early on the list, and reappear correctly worded later on the list, so that it looks as though it actually appears later on the list. The item lists are short, especially compared to most goals lists. You might have shorter goals lists, however: When the PC gets pretty educated, he can spot the goal right away. The meter blows up, heat comes off, etc., etc.

Here is an example of an LRH bank: The goal-oppose question, "Who or what would "destroy' oppose?" gave the next goal, which was "to worship". "To create" was a rocket-reading implant GPM. "Worship" had nothing to do with religion. It was too early. The earlier you go on the track, the simpler and more direct the goals and items are. As you go later, the items get more dispersive and complicated. Items like "certainty" and "predictability" and solved by "unpredictability". It will be a less neat pattern. The thetan is thinking more complexly, more involvedly. He is in a more dispersed state. On the middle and back track, the thetan is simpler. As you get back to the middle track, a word

like the goal appears in 80% of the items. On earlier track, a word with the sense of the goal appears in almost 100% of the items. Close to PT, you get tremendous variation in items and more complex goals that are hard to get oppositions to, with the goal almost never appearing in the items. The hard end of the track is the PT end. The thetan has less scope. [The gap is] less wide between opposites. There is more dispersion. The thetan is nattery, picky, and so forth. You can see the dwindling spiral of the thetan, as you look   over these GPM's. The chances are far against getting simple goals in PT. Middle track goals are simple. When you get two or three GPM's back, you start getting simpler goals. On the middle track, for instance, you get goals like "to do", "to think", "to postulate".

In later GPM's, there are more items and greater complexity. The items disperse more quickly from the basic goal area. As was said earlier, the goal word appears less frequently in the items. But the pattern doesn't change. The top oppterm is definitely the goal and the top terminal is definitely against the goal.

The hard things to list are the top terminal and the bottom oppterm. That's shootin' into the blue. The top terminal is very often, but not always, controlled by the goal that you are about to get, i.e. the next goal up. The top terminal may or may not be similar to the next goal. It could be quite disrelated. You can get fooled here. The pattern might not hold, e.g. the next goal might be the goal, "to postulate" and the top terminal might be "sitting". You can't predict the top terminal, except that it is opposite to the goal of the GPM that it is in.

The bottom oppterm is the "reason he done it". Of course the real reason he done it is the GPM he just lived through, but his particular penchant is usually expressed in the bottom oppterm, because it is opposed by the goal as an RI. The bottom oppterm is going to say what the person is mad at, in the PT GPM, like "civilization", or "financial institutions". This one is hard to get. So the PC might miss it like mad. The two bottom oppterms and the two top terminals in the GPM forecast some difficulty. The toughest to get are the bottom oppterm and the top terminal.

How do you list one of these things? First, do your PT goals list and get a goal. Then try to count the number of RI's in that GPM [the presumptive PT GPM]. Then plot it up accordingly. Observe where it sits in relation to where the cross-over point is. Say you've got twelve RI's. So you know that you are one pair past the cross-over. So the terminal is just a little bit against the goal. You can get the top terminal of the PT GPM by listing, "What terminal are you sitting in now?" If you want to ask, "Why don't you list for the top oppterm?", it is the same as asking, "Why don't you try to list the bank?" It's the same question. The PC doesn't know what's there, relative to the top oppterm. But he is sitting in and intimately connected with, as himself, this top terminal, because that is the one that he is living through life in. Therefore it is easy to list for the top terminal. So list for the top terminal and find it. Then list two lists from this same top terminal and get:

1. The top oppterm.

2. The second oppterm. You are able to do this because charge will expire on the top oppterm, when you have found it, and therefore there won't be any more charge on this oppterm. You then get the second oppterm, because that is the way the bank progresses, going down into the bank. GPM's always proceed downwards from the top oppterm. Why this pattern for running the GPM? Because if you get this higgledy-piggledy in the first GPM, you are going to be kitty-corner from the oppterm to the next terminal below it, and that doesn't solve! The bank doesn't run that way and it doesn't solve that way, and you will be in trouble. So you get the two top oppterms, #1 and #2. Sometimes you almost wreck yourself by getting both oppterms on the same list, both firing: But you really need two listings, so you can tell which is which. So after getting the top oppterm, do "Who or what would solve (the top oppterm)?" and get the top terminal back again. Then take it down to the second oppterm. Solve it across and go on down the bank that way.

Now "items always solve; goals always oppose." Never do a goals solve list, e.g. "What goal would solve (a goal)?" The goal as an RI sounds like a goal, but it is an item. And that would be an item solve list for the next lower top oppterm.

So after you get the whole of the top bank, now do a goal-oppose list to get the goal of the No. 2 GPM. You now assess by elimination to get that goal. That's the end of all oppositions [until you are up to the point of getting the goal for the next GPM]. But you still have an unsolved RI, which is the goal as an RI at the bottom of the top GPM. Opposing the goal as an RI is the most critical action in the whole operation. Take the goal as an RI and list, "Who or what would it solve?", and get the top

oppterm of the next GPM, using a nice, beefy, long list on this one. That is the touchiest part of the bank. If you get it wrong, it will be wrong from then on out. If you get a wrong top oppterm, you will go all over the place. You will have the wrong GPM. It is also the easiest to get wrong because it looks the simplest. The top oppterm is the final achievement of the goal that you have just gotten from the goal-oppose list. The PC is now against it. E.g. on a goal "to sneeze", the top oppterm would be "sneezing" or "people who sneeze", or "sneezers" or "having to sneeze", etc. If you get the top oppterm slightly misworded, you have had it. So do a nice long top oppterm list. You want a 20 or 30 item list. So don't take an item as the top oppterm just on the PC's say-so. You can tangle the whole bank. Don't promote the PC's itsa on this one! If you buy the PC's delighted itsa, you are likely to get the third terminal from the bottom and get the whole bank upside down. The other place where you disregard the PC's itsa is when you are halfway through a GPM with the RR still on and he tells you that it is not his goal. So get the list, on listing for the top oppterm, null it with the PC's attention on it. Ask which item had heat. Look around the area of that item, on the list, especially a few items above the item that he mentioned. See if you can get that area to read. Get the top oppterm and check it out. Mow be very careful, when you get the top terminal. The wording is critical.

The terminal has an opposite meaning to the bank at large. When you have the two top RI's, make sure that both of them are absolutely correct, before you go on. The alternative is to get a circular invalidation going, where you are leaving wrong items behind you and listing from wrong items, correcting, and going ahead into messed-up areas. As you correct one item, another gets messed up. When you find a wrong item behind you, accept no items that you found after you found the wrong item. Re-do all the later lists.

The way you check out a bank, when looking for a wrong item, is to go back over it from the top, reading the items off with mathematical precision, with the session ruds in. The wrong item that you left behind you will tick or rocket-read. That is a proven rule. If it reads, it is a wrong item, invariably. It is not that it wasn't opposed. Being wrong, it reads and throws into question all succeeding items. Any items that occur after that, if they are right, are so merely by coincidence. So you have to list again, through a muddied-up bank. To correct the wrong item, take the list you got it from and look earlier, or later, if it was the first or second item on the list. Or the list could be incomplete. But two items reading in the same items list -- means nothing. Listing rules don't apply to items lists. Listing rules apply to goals lists and only to goals lists. You can have six items reading on an item "solve" list, and it doesn't mean that the list is incomplete. One of the six reading items is the item, and you don't continue the list.

On a wrong goal, everything you write down reads for awhile, then nothing reads. The only thing that shuts off an RR is a wrong goal. A wrong item will not do so. You can overrun the GPM and run into a GPM for which you have no goal. The only thing that shuts off an RR is not having the goal. What shuts down the RR is not having the goal, and this is the only way to shut off an RR. Even a slightly misworded goal will turn it off. So if the RR continues, you've got the right goal, so relax. And once you get your goal, don't call it again, until you get to the goal as an RI. Refer to it by number, and don't use the wording, "How does this RI relate to (the goal)?" Use, "How does this RI relate to this GPM?", or " ... to GPM No. _____ ?" The reason for this is that every time you call the goal, you pull the goal as an RI up towards PT and disarrange the bank. You save it, so that if you have to use it later to prepcheck off inval in straightening things out, you can. Or you might want to save it for use in later cleanup. Even then, you still say the goal as little as possible. If you are prepchecking a GPM goal, use "On this goal...." Don't keep repeating the goal, as this will drive the PC to the bottom of the GPM.

There are lots of things to know, lots of indicators, but only a few simple rules, and they are dead on. For instance, you ask, "Is this an actual GPM?", after you have found the goal. You always check it out. When you have run five or six GPM's, you get no response on the meter until the PC says it. Then it reads. As you go down the bank, the items will read when the PC says it, not when you call it. At first, [when the case is unburdened with R3SC, etc.] the sub-itsa comes up towards the surface. However, further on down the line, you lose the sub-itsa again. The sub-itsa line reverses with the itsa line, eventually.

Basic auditing must be very well in and the PC must be easily auditable. You've got to promote his confidence and itsa, so that when you run out of the E-meter, the PC can handle it. You've got to be able to talk to the PC, and the PC has to be able to talk to you, because in a few cases, itsa is all that you will have to guide you through.

The only thing that makes a bad basic auditor is a person who is afraid of becoming OT or who sees a great deal of harm in being exteriorized or in being set adrift alone without a body. Or, the idea of setting people adrift or alone without a body restimulates all those people that they have held down and Stuck spears in the stomachs of. That is exteriorization too. Someone whose basic auditing is poor at Levels II, III, or IV will have it fly out at upper levels, because he gets so restimulated at the idea of exteriorizing. Exterization restimulates murder, so you get the idea that he doesn't deserve to be clear, etc. Don't look for the significance to explain fear or terror of exteriorization. It is just GPM's shifting around and colliding, caused by the thought of exteriorizing. You can set someone up so they will do flawless basic auditing for one session by running O/W. This shows that they consider auditing to be an overt. This was first tested in Melbourne in 1960.

There are no ARC breaky PCs. There are only bad basic auditors. The PC who is dangerous is the one who goes into propitiation or lower when ARC broken. Such a PC is harder to handle than one who screams. Any PC, audited beyond an ARC break, will go into the sad effect. You could audit the auditor on O/W for a short session, and he would give flawless sessions.

This is a very important tape. The exact patter is on the demo tape of last Wednesday. [Probably 6312C04 SHSpec-326 TVD 24: Basic Auditing, pp. 551-552, above.]

[LRH also mentions a color movie with all the tech in this area, and the area of GPM's]

6312C31 SHSpec-1 Indicators

This was the year in which we achieved the technology of OT, and in which we laid the bridge, with all the older processes from dianetics on. It is the year in which we had our hardest attacks since 1950. These attacks are losing or have lost. The IRS lost its suit on LRH and MSH. "IRS" means "Infernal Ravening ..."! The work for 1964 should include codification of materials, writing textbooks for the different levels, etc. Several techniques have been developed for a higher-classed auditor to run on a lower-level PC. We are ready to open the door wide on the subject of psychosomatic healing. We could put it on an ethical basis by saying that if you don't get results on a patient, you refund his money.

Anybody who is receiving Level VI auditing [See above, for a description of this level.] from an auditor who flubs, goes through more illnesses and psychosomatics than anyone can count. LRH understands the phenomenon of psychosomatics and is consequently a little contemptuous of doctors' treatment of these conditions. It is rather horrifying, from an auditor's viewpoint, to see what is thought of the illness and how it is treated. The auditor would like to be able to see what goal it is, what RI, what service fac, etc., when chaos reigns, caused by misalignment of the psyche. This is fascinating in its complexity and disillusioning in the simplicity of its cause.

The technology for handling the bank has finally been worked out. It is complex, it takes expert auditing and an educated PC, but the result is an OT. This is a far higher result than was expected before 1962, to a degree that it is unreal to most people. At times, it is even unreal to LRH.

Even when the auditor and the PC have tremendous skill, they can make huge mistakes. For instance, LRH has been looking for his PT GPM for months. He has found seven so far, each one thought to be the PT one. He has been unburdening the track by running them as they were found. He is aware of good case advance since starting out. Now his goals lists go for five or six items, one rocket-reading, then it goes on by stacking it up, putting the GPM on top of it, listing in to the top oppterm, to see if there was anything there, to see if there was a GPM closer to PT. "We handled four of them like they were old sacks of straw." He finally got the PT GPM. For the first time, he looked forward and saw nothing there. He woke up, wondered if a couple were backwards: "Creak:" Got his considerations: no creak. This is a far cry from a few months ago, when he was wrapped around a telegraph pole with regularity.

You made the early GPM's without having a body. So it is tough on bodies to run into RI's, etc. It is nice to be "outside", not subject to the body's intolerance of temperature extremes. The problem LRH ends the year with is "As an OT, how do you drink Coca-Cola?" It doesn't evaporate like liquor, and LRH is too big to get into the bottle. He thought of putting it in a tub, with ice.

If you have wondered whether you will ever make it all the way, while you are making it all the way, you will have many other periods when you will be certain that you will never make it all the way. That is the greatest certainty that LRH can give you. He has "known" many times that it was impossible for you to make it. But he has recovered. The final end product of scientology or of a thetan in this universe has been achieved in 1963, whatever else can be said for the year. Indicators

This is a new subject. Routine 6 [This is probably the procedure given in the last tape. See HCOPL 5May64 "Summary of Classification and Gradation and Certification" p. 4. See also above, for a summary of this procedure.] cannot be run without knowledge of indicators and of the proper actions to do when certain things are present or not present. Indicators are present at every level. There are good indicators and bad indicators. To know about bad indicators, you must know what good indicators are. One needs to know both, in order to have a datum to compare with. For instance, you don't cut the PC's itsa, because you want the good indicator of smooth needle and cheerful PC, not because of fear of instructors. In the field of, say, music, one has some standards and expectations of how it should sound on hi-fi equipment, etc. That is the comparative datum, the good indicator, the standard. A test for hi-fi equipment is, "How should it sound?" Poor hi-fi equipment sounds like you are in the lobby of the theater when the aisle doors are closed. If you walk down the aisle to about the center of the theater and listen, that is what good hi-fi equipment should sound like. People, watching LRH's auditing on demos, have shown that they don't have a standard to judge the session by. LRH worked out good and bad indicators to make the standards known and explicit. If you know what is right with a session, you can tell what is wrong with one. Good indicators.

People should be happy in session. "The only frame of mind that you can as-is in is a cheerful, high-toned [one]. The PC should be cheerfully itsa-ing to the auditor. If he runs a secondary, he runs grief off of it and comes out of it, etc. We get a picture of what the session should be, with good indicators. If they are not there, then bad indicators are there. These bad indicators should be handled, so as to get the good indicators back. GI's mean that the auditor should continue what he is doing. BI's show that the auditor should so something else. The particular BI's that are present determine what the auditor must do. E.g., if the PC makes a critical remark about the auditor, pull a missed withhold, do a session ARC break assessment, or run O/W. How the PC should look and sound; how the bank should respond; how the meter should behave -- all these are the good indicators.

(Note that at Levels V and VI, the male and female clear reads no longer apply, since a thetan doesn't have a sex.)

The time to do something about a bad indicator is when you can't go on, with good indicators, not just whenever a bad indicator shows up. The broad range of optimum TA range is 2.0 to 4.0. The common range of TA excursion is 2.75 to 3.5. There are three grades of bad indicators: light, medium, and heavy. They compare to the suddenness with which you must take action.

1. The light indicator shows you that something is wrong, so that you can be alert for a need for action, but nothing necessarily needs to be done.

2. On moderate BI's, action must be taken as soon as it can be comfortably done.

3. On heavy BI's, emergency crash action must be taken right now. An example of a grade 3 BI would be the PC not wanting auditing.

4. A grade 4 BI would be something like a car going over a cliff. You hear a dwindling scream. This PC is never going to be audited again.

GI's mean expected, not extraordinary. Wanting auditing is more common than you would expect. It is a GI we take for granted. If a lot of GI's are present, a few BI's don't matter too much.

An ordinary BI, not a VBI, would be the fact that the PC has a PTP. You tend to it promptly, since a PC with a PTP makes no progress. A PC with an ARC break gets worse with auditing, so that is a VVBI. That is the only time that auditing worsens a case. So the GI's are: "PC in session, with no PTP and no ARC break." This is something that one should know for auditing supervision. You cannot supervise by BI's; only by GI's, because when GI's cease to exist, your action must be directed towards recreating them, not just at eradicating BI's.

You could base your expectations of case progress on how many GI's are present. For every GI not present, some BI is present. Do the appropriate thing to remove the BI, and get the GI back. Know GI's more by heart than BI's, since if there is a BI, you can always go to the textbook to figure it out. For instance, you notice that the PC keeps having PTP's. You eventually think of the datum that when the PC keeps having PTP's, his goals must be totally divergent from the auditor's goals, and the session itself becomes the PTP. Don't act when BI's are not present. Only correct what needs correction! Don't let a win on repairing one PC's BI's become the stable datum for all PCs, who don't have the same BI's.

This disposes of the idea that some PCs are auditable and others aren't. You are an auditor, and the standard procedures on which you are being trained are the way in which you materialize GI's in a session. They are all calculated to bring about GI's in the PC. The gains of auditing are astonishingly automatic, these days. You just audit the PC on a standard program.

If BI's pop up, always take care of the worst one first. Naturally you want to get the heaviest BPC out of the way first and keep patching up the case only until you can get back on the road. The GI on an auditing question is:

1. The PC has received something to inspect.

2. He inspects it.

3. He tells you what he has inspected. He answers the question fully, as far as he is concerned.

4. Then you acknowledge.

It doesn't matter if you gave him one command and he inspected fully and took a half an hour to answer, or if you gave him many repetitive commands and he fully answered the question. He is going through an electronic circuit, and he comes out the other end free of it, having inspected it. If you cut his itsa along the way, he gets lost in the middle of the labyrinth of electronic material. This gives rise to a dirty needle. Just keep the PC going, with GI's, building his confidence and not cutting his itsa, moving him along up the line.

6401C07 SHSpec-2 Good Indicators

[Some of the material in this tape is also contained in HCOB 28Dec63 "Routine VI Indicators -- Part One: Good Indicators".]

The good indicators listed in HCOB 28Dec63 don't all apply to all sessions, but most do. They don't just apply to R6 sessions. [For definition of R6, see above.] If you learn what good indicators are, you can spot bad indicators.

An auditor tends to look for wrongnesses. That is the nature of scientology. Because if there weren't something wrong with Man, he wouldn't be here. Unlike other "-ologies", we see an individual as basically good, able, and powerful. This is the reverse of most people's approach, so the way have to improve Man is also different. We have tremendous evidence that our concept is true and that the opposite one is erroneous. For instance, we found that children's I.Q.'s drop more and more, the longer they spend in school, because the longer they stay there, the more false stable data get shoved down their throats.

Truth is demonstrated by workability, though some dispute a truth because its workability challenges their favorite theories. All present sciences have built up to their current state on the basis of workability. The idea of deleting something in order to bring about a recovery from a bad condition is not new with us, but the simplicity of asking someone for solutions that he has had to the condition is a new departure. You can ask what solutions and decisions a person has had, relative to his lumbosis, and get a recovery, from deletion of additives. This is all part of the idea that adding something to a being makes him feel worse. Take a being who is feeling blah: When we put in mid-ruds, we are subtracting actions. We are subtracting the livingness of some period, and he will feel better. LRH has made a more extreme test of this theory. He subtracted an insane being's body from him, by exteriorizing him. When exteriorized, the being was immediately sane. Back in his body, he was insane again. This is not therapeutic. It is just an experimental technique.

The good things of life are havingness at one's own choice. The individual's power of choice is the only thing he had to begin with, which gave him power, capability, etc. That power of choice has been consistently and continually overthrown by giving him things he didn't want and taking away from him things that he did want.

Someone who solves something and fixes the solution instead of just confronting the thing is putting himself down in power. In scientology, the only right we have to educate anyone is that we are teaching things that are as close to fact as they can be made. And the technology of how it is put together is so close to how it is put together that it runs itself out. This is the reason why scientology education doesn't have to usual bad effects of education. Scientology education runs itself out because it is so close to the truth. Whenever you have a solution to a problem, it gets stuck, except in the case of scientology. Scientology is the only solution in the universe that erases itself. You can do almost anything with scientology because of this. When scientology solves something, "it solves what has solved it." Its truths are shown to you so that you can reach other truths. The data of scientology is so minor, so sweet, and so pure, compared to all the other types of solutions -- GPM's, RI's, service facs, electric shock treatment, etc. -- that we don't come under the heading of adding aberrative data to the individual as a solution to his difficulties. Even if scientology data sits there for awhile on top of some aberration, it will eventually reach through the thing on which it is sitting, uproot it, and the truth of the data will cause it to blow (as-is) along with what it "solved". You are all sitting in some RI [that could behave in this way]. An individual becomes aberrated by additives. His experiences in this universe are calculated to degrade and depower him. All you have to do is to pick up, to as-is, the mess, and you will return him to power. If you handle his school "education", for example, his I.Q. will rise.

The data of scientology "is a restimulation of more basic and fundamental truths, which, restimulated, tend to blow later data." Some people can just study scientology and leap out of bed, well. This adds up to the fact that Man, to date, is an added-to being. Everything that has been added to him has decreased his ability to cope. We have gotten him dependent on tools and that sort of thing. The more you give a person to work with, e.g. the more machines, etc., he is supposed to work with, the less he works. His ability to work is reduced by these additives. Primitive cultures, with minimal tools, work long and thoroughly to create aesthetic elements as part of ordinary workaday objects. Someone with lots of tools doesn't get much done. For instance, the Esquimo, with very simple tools, elaborately decorates his spear, whereas the person with drill presses, lathes, etc., says, "I can't do this thing, because I have to have that other thing first." There's a relationship between having to have and getting things done. The more you have, the less you tend to get done. "Have to have" becomes "never do". The fellow who has to have and have in order to get anything done does very little. The Chinese carpenter, working with hand-made fish bone dowels and a bow-drill, didn't have to have anything elaborate to drill a hole, etc. Yet he was able to get more done, by a good deal, than his western counterpart with his elaborate tools. You could have added to the universe of this Chinese carpenter the postulate that "You can't do without certain tools," (Think about that wording:), to the point where he could no longer do. That is an aberrative side to some thetans' bent for collecting havingness, e.g. LRH and his cameras. In collecting cameras, he has paid less attention to any one of them, so now he gets fewer pictures with more cameras. There can be a minimum amount of equipment needed to get a job done. But an overwhelmed being has to have and can't do. The more you add to the workman, the less he can accomplish.

"Because we are in the business of deleting wrongnesses from the individual, we seldom look at rightnesses. That is what is wrong with most auditors." The recognition of the fact that a truth is present to be amplified or increased is a vital part of auditing. If you don't notice the rightnesses present, you don't see the truth present, that can then be used to promote more truth. So nothing gets done. If you only recognize wrongnesses, you won't be able to pull anything up a gradient, because you won't think that you have any rightnesses to work with. Our only purpose in finding wrongnesses is to increase rightnesses. You have to look at wrongnesses to remedy them, but you have to look at rightnesses to increase them. Progress is built on a gradient scale of rightnesses by which you delete wrongnesses, and they drop away." Processing is an action by which wrongnesses can be deleted from the case to the degree that rightness is present in the session." You cannot take a case that has no rightnesses present and delete any wrongnesses. Auditing is the process of maintaining rightness so that you can delete wrongness. You are trying to get a right being. If you don't continuously encourage right beingness, you will never get a right being. To correct a wrongness, you have to have at least as much rightness present. If rightness and wrongness are equally balanced, it is a dangerous situation. You are better off if the rightnesses far outweigh the wrongnesses. This will give you an easier job of auditing. The PC's ability to as-is is a rightness of

varying magnitude. A PC who is pretty overwhelmed can't handle or as-is a large wrongness. If you delete good indicators from the session, the PC won't be able to as-is anything.

"A PC's ability to as-is or erase in a session is directly proportional to the number of good indicators present in the session, ... and his inability to cope in the session rises proportionally to the number of bad indicators in the session." If the good indicators have dropped out of the session, the PC's ability to handle wrongnesses is much less. You have got to get GI's back in before you can expect the PC to handle what you want him to handle. You have to retrograde the process to match the state of the PC, if he becomes BI's. For instance, you may have to run the PC on a touch assist or havingness.

You must watch, and if a good indicator goes out, you look for the bad indicator (if you are slow), find out what happened, and correct it. Bad indicators don't necessarily appear when good indicators disappear. They are separate breeds of cat. The auditor must always find out what is wrong, in a session, before the PC finds out. That is how you maintain altitude. To maintain optimal altitude, handle the scene when the good indicator goes out, but before the bad indicator comes in. Spotting the absence of a good indicator and remedying the situation with a remedy of appropriate magnitude will avoid the expense of auditing time on expensive repairs. A light indicator means that you should be alert; a medium indicator requires correction; a heavy indicator means, "Emergency!" Any process has its own series of bad indicators. Bad indicators come in when good indicators go out. Don't spend your time looking for bad indicators. Just know the good indicators so well that when one of them goes out, climb on and handle. Be alert. But don't always be looking for wrongnesses.

Good Indicators in Routine 6 and Lower Levels

1. PC cheerful. In R6, no misemotion is allowable. At lower levels, for instance, the good indicator would be the PC getting more cheerful. In R3R, misemotion should be diminishing. But at Level VI, the PC should be running like a grinning idiot.

2. PC cogniting. This should happen sometimes on any level. Lack of cognition indicates that the PC has a PTP or an ARC break, or that he is running at a level above his reality. At lower levels, the good indicator would be the PC cogniting. At Level VI, the PC should be cogniting on RI's and goals.

3. PC's items found are the ones that the PC thought they were. At lower levels, it often turns out that what the PC thought was wrong is what was wrong. The PC's fundamental rightnesses assert themselves.

4. At Level VI: PC listing items briefly and accurately. At lower levels, the good indicator is giving things to the auditor briefly and accurately. The PC is finding things accurately and speedily.

5. A properly-reading meter. At Level VI, items found are not rocket-reading. At lower levels, things found give the proper meter responses.

6. At Level VI: short item lists. At lower levels, it doesn't take a long time to get things done.

7. Items found without a lot of wrassle. At lower level, this translates as being able to get data from the PC without a big hassle.

8. TA continuing in motion; TA not stuck. This good indicator can be overridden by the good indicator of the PC easily and rapidly flattening processes.

9. Active needle. The needle is fluid or fluent, moving, not stuck. A Mark V meter can be set at too high a sensitivity, giving the appearance of a more fluid-looking needle than you really have. It moves around. On the other hand, you may need high sensitivity for pulling withholds, etc., where it doesn't matter if you clean a clean once in awhile. On the other hand, if you leave the withhold, by using too low a sensitivity, you have had it. For R6, sensitivity 8 is maximum for listing and 16 for mid-ruds. You can have TA action with a gummy needle. Watch for that. This is still a missing GI. The needle should be swinging cleanly.

10. PC not being troubled by pains and somatics when answering auditing questions. Or, any somatic the PC runs into discharges very rapidly. A somatic that stays there and gets heavier is a bad indicator. You want change somatics.

11. TA goes down when PC cognites. You should get a further blowdown of the TA when the PC talks about something.

12. PC gets warm and stays warm in auditing or gets hot and unheats in auditing. The PC doesn't get chilled. Getting chilled is a BI.

13. PC's somatics turn on occasionally. This is a GI at lower levels. It is a BI in R6.

14. TA range 2.5 to 3.75. TA range 2.25 to 3.0 is excellent. This applies at any level.

15. Good TA action on spotting things. The expected TA action for any level is the best indicator.

16. Getting reads on what you and the PC think is wrong.

17. PC has no PTP. This is a good indicator, unless the PC is in total propitiation. The bad indicator would be the PC's developing PTP's about the session, in session.

18. PC satisfied after auditing and staying certain of the auditing solution.

19. PC not critical or ARC breaky -- always GI's.

20. PC happy and satisfied with the auditor, regardless of what the auditor is doing.

21. PC looking younger by reason of auditing. This is not common, but it is a good indicator.

22. PC without weariness.

23. PC without aches, pains, or illnesses developed in auditing.

24. PC wanting more auditing.

25. PC confident and getting more confident.

26. PC's itsa free, but only extensive enough to cover the subject under discussion. If the PC's itsa is too extensive, he is trying to stop the auditor from auditing. The PC should itsa, but not too much.

27. Auditor understanding why it is the way it is when the PC explains it, or how it was the way it was. The PC is saying things that make sense. The auditor should be able to understand the PC.

28. PC there under his own volition. (Taken from next tape). If all these good indicators are present, you know that you are doing a good job.

6401C09 SHSpec-3 Bad Indicators

In trying to relay truth, it is always necessary to break it down into a system by which it can be communicated. The system that breaks auditing down into basic auditing, technique, and case analysis is a useful one. [See the tape 6 11C05 SHSpec-321 "Three Zones of Auditing". Case analysis now breaks down into the general subjects:

1. Case analysis.

2. Good indicators.

3. Bad indicators.

Case analysis consists of keeping a continuous eye on the PC's indicators. Case analysis is:

1. Noting when the GI's are still present.

2. Being alert and noting when one has dropped out.

3. Looking to see what BI has appeared.

4. Programming to remedy the BI with some appropriate technique. Actually, there is a shifting back and forth between technique and case analysis. Case analysis contains programming. [See The Book of Case Remedies.]

Bad indicators include the fact that the PC is in a body, not an OT: The corresponding good indicator would be that he is there of his own volition.

The first bad indicator is that the PC looks like he doesn't want to be in session anymore. That is, a good indicator is gone, namely, the PC's being there of his own volition. The bad indicator is unwillingness to be there. That is our first hurdle: no free choice, not there of his own volition. That ends the case analysis.

The above is a simple example of case analysis. From there on, it is a matter of selecting a process to fit the case level. What technique to use to handle this BI depends on the level of the PC and the auditor. So case analysis starts out with the observation that the expected indicator or behavior, i.e. the natural behavior of a being, the good indicator, has gone out.

Good indicators are actually the natural behavior of a being. "The world [particularly since Freud, with his idea of the censor] has been crashing along on this ... lie ... that inhibited behavior is social behavior and that any uninhibited behavior is anti-social. So the criminal is 'uninhibited', so you have to ... punish him and put him in a cell ... , and if you inhibit him enough, you will make a social being out of him. [Actually, super-inhibition brings about] social catastrophes." If you can't fix behavior, you can always inhibit it. You are suppressing it, though, and a thetan's forward actions and desires do not fade away. They only submerge. "Impulses do not fade away; they only submerge." This is Axiom 0: a thetan never gives up trying to create an effect.

("Holding a grudge" is a 1.1 characteristic. E.g. Henry VIII got even with the pope by creating the Church of England.)

This gives you a better understanding of people in general -- seeing what happens when impulses meet with inhibition: people get even. You will understand history, teen agers, criminals, and everything a lot better if you realize that a thetan never really gives up. This is the secret of behavior. This is why teen-agers so commonly reject their families: The child never forgives the parents for certain things, often tiny things. You have to find the source of a "rejection" or a "revolt". Auditing easily brings this to the fore. The child rejects his parents to get even. Besides, forgiveness, per se, is propitiation. The source of Man's ingratitude and the secret of leadership is just the fact that a thetan never gives up. "As an auditor, you are just auditing all the nutty, aberrated, inhibited times when [the PC] never gave up, when he postulated something silly, when he tried to do something stupid." You can actually graph how some innocent goal or impulse goes through this process of degradation:

1. It becomes inhibited, submerged, and warped.

2. It emerges at a lower level as an overt.

3. Below that, it emerges as a withhold. You could graph that on any ambition.

4. Below that is unawareness, which submerges down to

5. Unconsciousness.

6. Humanoid. That is how a goal becomes an overt, a withhold, unawareness, unconsciousness, and, below that, humanoid.

So when a being comes in for auditing, his being there of his own volition is the biggest good indicator there is. He is surrounded by bad indicators, which you are going to eradicate. The hope factor is put in by validating whatever good indicators are present. The next best indicator is that the PC is getting better. "Betterness", to us, means "less present, in the sense of, 'My ankle is getting better.'" The pain, confusion, etc., is less present. "Betterment ... is the lessening of a bad condition." So the PC getting better, wrongnesses less present, is a good indicator. This is negative gain. If all you did in a session were to validate the good indicators that were present and attack and

handle, one by one, the bad indicators that were present, thereby restoring more good indicators, you would get amazing results; you would be enormously successful. The PC would approach Native State.

Don't try to train or audit someone against his own volition, assuming that you have tried and failed to change his mind. It is a bad indicator. All you need to be able to do is to spot GI's, and when GI's are not present, to spot the bad indicator that is present, and to go ahead and handle it. If a case goes on talking about something, he hasn't gotten rid of it, and you haven't yet achieved negative gain in the area. All your lower-level gains are based on destimulation and removal of BI's. Progress on a case is measured by the number of GI's that you are restoring. This applies to Level IV or below. [Note that this is the precursor of grades auditing.] Bad Indicator No. 1:

PC nervous about auditing. Level 0: At the lowest levels, you assume that the PC is not there on his own determinism and work on fixing this up. You want to have a PC who is not nervous about getting auditing. At Level 0, discuss scientology with him. Let him know what it is about. Try to get him there under his own determinism. Get him to decide. Level I: Discuss auditing, healing, therapies, etc. Get his ideas about these things. Reassure the PC that you are not auditing him to make him guilty. You are only concerned with making the able more able. Get what others' ideas or opinions are about treatment and what it might do to him. Try to cope with the PC intellectually.

Get into a general discussion of his being audited. Level II: Here, you could run a repetitive process, which could go as follows: "What have you had to do which you didn't want to do?", or "What orders have you had to follow about your health?" General O/W would also be runnable at this level. Level III: Pull missed withholds on auditing, past auditing, or treatment.

Prepcheck any of those, or something like "On auditing goals ... " or "On being forced to be audited...." You could run R2H [Now renamed R3H]. You could do ARC break assessments or find the PC's basic ideas about being audited -- how he originally felt about it. Level IV: Here, you've got service facs, ARC breaks with auditors, practitioners, ARC breaks that the PC has had in past processing, etc., etc. At Level IV, we can find one session that the person didn't want in the past, because of a withhold or something. That would be a key point to knock out of the way. You could run, "How would refusing to be audited make you right/others wrong?." "Why shouldn't you be audited?" is a crude but workable process, at this level. Bad Indicator No. 2: PC unfriendly or cool towards the auditor; unappreciative of the auditor or auditing.

This opens the door to a large area of withholds, overts, cut comm, cut itsa, etc. You can run out of itsa by specializing in solutions only, not problems, even though the TA motion comes from solutions. Thus, you sacrifice some present TA motion for a greater amount of future TA motion. You could spend fifty percent of your time on problems and fifty percent on solutions and get more TA by not running out of itsa. It is a fifty-fifty proposition. This is because GPM's are fifty percent terminals (fixed solutions) and fifty percent oppterms (fixed problems). Both give good TA.

Unfriendliness to the auditor could stem from the auditor's keeping the PC from itsa-ing as area of interest, including problems. You must get into problems somewhat, so that the PC has something to talk about at all. The PC will get unfriendly if the auditor never gives him anything to talk about.

Level 0: Get the PC to discuss what damage the auditor might do to him or her. This is a lousy solution, since it asks for more "critical", but it is better than nothing. Get the PC to explain why he shouldn't be audited. This can get him quite friendly and right into session.

Level I: Another low-level remedy would be, "How could you help me?" This raises the ARC of the PC. You could also get the PC to explain any trouble he has gotten into by imparting confidences or talking too freely. That also gets off a few missed withholds. You could use, "What are you willing to talk to me about?".

Level II: You could use similar processes here, as well as general O/W on auditors.

Level III: You could pull withholds missed by auditors. You could prepcheck auditors, practitioners, help, or failed help, as indicated.

Level IV: You work on help and failed help on a service fac basis, using: "If you were really helped by auditing, how would that make you wrong?" "If you weren't helped by auditing, how would that make you right?"

When PCs at Levels V, VI, and VII are unfriendly to auditors, there is some foul-up in the root of the bank. Bad Indicator No. 3:

PC nervous about being audited in a particular auditing room. That's the auditing environment. These things always run down to some horrendous PTP or ARC break.

Level 0: Discuss the dangerousness of the environment.

Level I: Discuss dangerous environments in general, the trouble he has had in auditing rooms, in practitioners' rooms. Get solutions off -- how he has solved it. Level II: Finding things that are safe.

Level III: Havingness.

Level IV: Get associative restimulators.

Here is a suggested exercise: Make a list of bad indicators that could be present if a homo sapiens were dragged in chains into your auditing room. Then figure out what you might be able to do about these things. Given enough time, perhaps over a course of months, you should be able to turn him into a high-flying PC by:

1. Seeing a good indicator missing.

2. Noting all the bad indicators.

3. Selecting the one that is most in the road of auditing.

4. Eradicating that one first.

5. Continue handling the BI's, one by one, by getting considerations off, etc., until no more BI's are present. Using this procedure, you could get anyone, no matter how initially hostile he was, to want auditing, on his own determinism, and not by overwhelming him. Auditing is converting BI's to GI's.

As you work the case, remember that the person has had some impulses. somewhere along the line, that got inhibited and submerged. Handling those by getting back to them will give a resurgence of the case.

6402C04 SHSpec-4 Auditor Self-criticism

Enough of this goofing off as auditors and students. The subject of self-criticism of auditing is very misunderstood, because it is too simple. LRH has been researching R6 [See p. 568, above.] during January, on the theory that it is better for him to get the body knocked off than for the rest of you to get it. R6 is incredibly complex, but totally necessary. You need very smooth basic auditing in order to make R6 work.

Self-criticism simply means taping your session, listening to it, and spotting what needs improvement. One gets amazing responses to the question, "What happened in the session?" Self-criticism of auditing is vital from Level III on up. The deeper you go into a case -- the more "reach" the processes have -- the more nearly perfect your basic auditing must be. Flubs impinge to the same degree that the auditing does. At Levels 0 and I, the auditor isn't impinging very much. Hence his flubs don't impinge much either. At Level II, with repetitive processing, there is more impingement and less tolerance of flubs. At Level III, you are using the meter to reach deeper than the PC's unaided itsa. Here, we have moved into an area where we can get hold of things that the PC wasn't ready to give. There is more impingement, so the auditing must be better, since the flubs impinge more, too. The greater the charge you are dealing with, the greater the bypassed charge can be. The meter "mines" sub-itsa. It increases the impingement of processing. There is one thing that always happens when you run somebody above his level and get him into areas that he finds hard to confront: You will get more BPC and ARC breaky sessions. The level of impingement of an error is greater than a PC can

tolerate, when the PC is audited above his level. So up to Level IV, the best handling of an ARC breaky PC is to reduce his level. This certainly doesn't apply at Levels V and VI, where the BPC comes from a wrong goal, a wrong item, or whatever. At these upper levels, reducing the PC's level will just leave the wrongness, and the PC will go into a sad effect. If you give a person a wrong goal, he will dramatize it more than the right goal. This happens consistently in psychoanalysis. "The only thing you get off a psychoanalyzed PC is psychoanalytic computations ... a bunch of bunk ... invented items." A wrong goal doesn't as-is; it beefs up. Find the person's right goal, and he will dramatize is less, which makes a somewhat goofy test for rightness of a goal. A person tends to dramatize a validated error more than a genuine aberration. Someone who has had errors validated also tends to be very careful all the time. This comes from some old advice he got. You can find the error by finding out what the person is being careful of. If you scan someone through his psychoanalysis, you will turn on all his old symptoms. If you keep it up, they will turn off by erasure. Analysis cured its patients by inventing new evils: the id, etc. It is an alter-is, a negative itsa. Then analyse and examine things that never existed.

An auditor can wrongly date a somatic. Then a later auditor can date that somatic getting the same wrong date, and he can in fact get some improvement of the somatic, by getting off some of the charge of the somatic's being wrongly dated. But he may be deceived into thinking that he has the right date. A person dramatizes a validated error more than an actual aberration that has been contacted. If you find that the PC is selling something to you, do a case analysis:

1. Find out where he got the idea; where he is sitting.

2. Get his considerations off.

3. Find out where it really is, or whether it is really true.

The reason why one attacks process errors in upper level processes instead of since mid-ruds is that everything that happened between sessions is sitting on top of the R6 error, and it is much quicker to find and correct the error than to do the mid-ruds.

At Level IV, you are dealing with service facs, assessments, etc. The PC has to be able to spot and as-is his own wrongnesses and overts by that time. By Level V, auditor errors impinge, and any piece of BPC left lying around will get restimulated. At Level VI, the amount of charge you are handling, RI by RI, is huge and ferocious. Now that the precisely correct commands have been formulated, you have gotten away from some ARC breaks. But if the auditor fails to clear the command, it can act as giving the PC a wrong goal or item. Or if the auditor fails to understand what the PC said, you can get immense ARC breaks. For instance, the PC said the second RI from the bottom. The auditor thought it was the seventh RI that the PC was talking about. He asks about the seventh RI to repair it. The PC has a huge ARC break.

New demands are placed on one's basic auditing, as one moves up to higher levels. So, as he moves up the levels, this can make the auditor feel as though he is auditing terribly. The division into levels is primarily based on what is demanded of the PC and secondarily on what is demanded of the auditor. But the two are almost parallel. It is not possible to self-audit R6. R6 requires the impingement of an auditor calling the items to get the charge off. There is a point where a person becomes total cause over his own mind. Up to that point, an auditor is necessary. If you have an ARC breaky session, you can straighten it out by running O/W on the auditor to yourself. You are in perfect order to use assist-type processes on your own mind. But solo auditing doesn't produce TA action, because of the two-terminal nature of the universe. In this universe, one terminal all by itself is inert. A thetan has become so enmeshed in this universe that he has taken the physical universe laws to apply to himself.

There are two things that chain a thetan down:

1. Mass, including space, energy, and time.

2. Significance.

Since 1950, we have known that someone could either dramatize nuttiness physically or in thought. The mass gives you somatics, and the significance makes you think that you are nuts. A GPM contains both thought and mass. When you get the right mass and significance aligned with other

masses and significances, it vanishes, amazingly enough, as the thetan stops creating it. It doesn't dissipate into energy, although you do get heat. It vanishes as a no-create, without fireworks.

If you keep changing only thought and not mass, you cannot make a change in someone's condition. You can't handle the mass which is causing, e.g., an illness. The levels are approaching the GPM by cleaning up charge on all the locks and ramifications that are hung up on GPM's. The levels are a familiarization with what could blow your head off. At the very least, the levels familiarize the PC with heavy somatics.

The auditing cycle is the basic discovery of dianetics and scientology. All the way from Level 0 to Level VI you are using the same auditing cycle. This is a two-pole universe, and without an auditor, or if you don't use the auditing cycle properly, you don't get TA action adequate to a case resolution. In comm courses, the comm cycle does things to people, all by itself. It is so powerful that by itself, it produces results. The auditor should recognize it as his main tool. It has to be as polished as you have charge that can be bypassed on the case. It has to be better and better as the auditor audits higher and higher levels. "The auditor's auditing must be adequate to the level he is running. His handling of the auditing cycle is the only thing which is [creating] tone arm action." Only somewhere in Level VII does the auditing cycle cease to be necessary.

If you haven't got an auditor, you don't have TA action. If you haven't got enough charge off your case, you won't be able to do anything with it. If an auditor is aware that his handling of the auditing cycle is the only thing that gets charge off the PC's case -- because the auditing comm cycle is what makes him an auditor -- then he also knows that his auditing comm cycle must be adequate for the level he is auditing. Auditor self-criticism allows him to see whether it is adequate. You have a tendency to over-complicate the auditing comm cycle for the level you are running. TR-2 is the most important, if not the only important, TR for a raw PC, since if you can let someone know that you have heard him, that you have really received his comm, you could get a big result. The other TR's have to come in as the PC progresses up the levels.

Here is the auditor self-criticism procedure:

1. Do a normal session.

2. Record it. You should have 1 1/2 hours of tape, with the voices well discernable. This is because the auditor's error is always earlier than a rough spot in the session, so you want to be able to listen to a good stretch of time.

3. As the session goes forward, the auditor notes BI's in session very carefully: meter misbehavior, any criticism by the PC, dirty needles, any worry, etc.

4. After the session, the auditor notices, in the session record, when in the session the BI's, DN, etc. appeared.

5. Listen to that area.

6. Go backwards, bit by bit, a few inches at a time, to find the breakdown of basic auditing that caused the BI or DN. This should be a few minutes or seconds earlier.

7. Find what the auditor failed to communicate or carry out.

8. Do that with every rough spot, every noted BI. If you follow this procedure, you will find the errors and see that you didn't get away with the breakdowns in your auditing cycle, although at the time you may have thought that you did. You will find that if the PC snaps or snarls, there is a rough auditing comm cycle just before that.

"A PC never has a reaction in the session, independent of the auditor." Anything that happens in a session, good or bad, happens with the auditor as cause. The auditor is the source of the session, 100%. LRH found that, as he moved up in levels of auditing, his auditing had to improve. So other auditors can improve too. Knowing what is wrong, one can put it right, both with one's auditing cycle and with the PC at the time, before the ARC break hits: "You're as good an auditor as you can handle the communication cycle," and you are as skilled an auditor as you can choose the right process to put onto the auditing comm cycle.

6402C06 SHSpec-5 Comm Cycle in Auditing

The magic of communication is all that makes auditing work. If you sat down at a one-hand electrode E-meter, You would be amazed at this fact: You would get no tone arm motion beyond, perhaps, a brief residual flurry at the very start. With another auditor, you would get 175 TA divisions; with yourself, you would get two. It works this way because the thetan in this universe has begun to consider himself mass, so he is subject to the laws of physics. Consequently, he can't as-is much mass. He has to have a second terminal to discharge the mass, or energy, against. If an auditor thinks he is MEST, he is apt to get the condition of the PC, because he mocks up or envisions the PC's charge in himself, making himself a matched terminal. But that is not what makes auditing work. It is all consideration. No backflow actually hits the auditor.

The ability to hold a position in space or to hold two terminals apart, is a definition of power. In the auditing situation, there is an apparent exchange of energy, from the PC's point of view, which doesn't hit the auditor, but because thetans think of themselves as terminals, you get an exchange of energy going on. Nothing hits the auditor, and it as-ises, as far as the PC is concerned. But you have set up a two-pole system, and that will bring about an as-ising of mass. It isn't burning the mass; it is as-ising the mass. That is why there is nothing hitting the auditor. The magic of auditing is contained in the comm cycle of auditing. You are concerned with the smooth interchange between these two poles, which is necessary for as long as the PC considers himself to be matter and therefore considers that he must discharge against something. Eventually, the PC will get up to a point where he no longer considers himself matter. When a lot (half) of the bank is gone, the meter will no longer "read on a sneeze". When a PC cognites that he is not MEST, the auditor can't knock any energy off, and the meter goes dead. Running R6, the meter only reacts when the PC decides what something is. You have to ask the PC if that is it. When the PC looks and decides if that is it or not, only then does the meter read. The PC is advancing away from the automatic physical energy manifestations of the physical universe. You get to a point where you have intention.

A GPM is just "a method of limiting the person's ability to intend." That is the whole idea behind implanting: to foul up intention by fixing it so that every time a thetan intends positive, he gets negative, and vice versa, so he can't decide. If you talk to a person, and every time he says, "Yes," you say, "No," he will get to an indecisional state of mind, where he can no longer intend, "Yes," fully. This wears him down; it breaks his spirit. This is the whole idea behind implanting: to get a being unable to effectively intend or determine anything successfully. "He intends to write, but something is intending that he not write." Therefore, he can't write. All ideas of power of choice, self-determinism, etc., stem from the ability to intend something. The more enMESTed someone is, the more trouble they have with intention.

(With the two-pole arrangement, a person can be influenced without his knowledge.)

The difficulties of auditing are just the difficulties of the comm cycle. You can hit the parts of the comm cycle as buttons. The auditor must permit a smooth flow between himself and the PC, if matter is to be as-ised by the PC, using the comm cycle. When you don't permit a smooth flow between yourself and the PC as terminals, you get a no-as-ising of matter. Part of the trick is knowing what has to be as-ised, but that is a matter of technique. If the auditor is capable of getting the PC to be willing to talk to him, he wouldn't have to hit a particular button in order to get TA action. Basic auditing and the comm cycle is senior to the technique. The fundamental entrance to the case is not in tech, but in the comm cycle. In case supervision, you can look at the points of the comm cycle that are missing in the PC's case and heal those points up. There can be the comm cycle between the PC and the auditor, and between the PC and the auditing room. You can address the PC's comm between himself and the environment by looking at what he is worried about. With an unconscious person, pick up his hand and have him touch the pillow, your arm, etc., giving the command at the same time. You are just getting him in comm with the auditor and his surroundings. But now you are into technique.

"Communication is simply a familiarization process based on reach and withdraw." When the auditor speaks to the PC, he is reaching; when he ceases to speak, he is withdrawing. When the PC hears you, he is a bit withdrawn. He reaches towards you with the answer. He is in a withdraw, as he looks for the answer. He reaches the answer and reaches the auditor. It is a communication exchange that as-ises energy and registers on the E-meter. No meter action occurs in the absence of that exchange, namely the comm cycle. If the comm cycle isn't in, the PC self-audits, and you get no case gain and no TA.

435

That is the fundamental discovery of dianetics and scientology. It is so simple that everyone has overlooked it, because MEST is very complex stuff, being composed of atoms, molecules, wavelengths, etc. It is so complex that nobody can understand it. People who are ploughed into matter, who think as matter, think very complexly. "They cannot observe the simplest things with which they are confronted. They observe none of this."

"The ease with which you can handle a comm cycle depends on your ability to observe what the PC is doing." Your inspection of what you are doing should have ended with your training. Now all observation should focus on the PC." The comm cycle you watch is the PC's." The true touch of genius, that makes an auditor that can crack any case, is the auditor's ability to observe the comm cycle of the PC and repair its various lacks. This consists of asking a question that the PC can answer, observing that the PC has completed the answer to it, acknowledging the PC, and then giving the PC something else to do. That is the auditing comm cycle. [See also p. 450, above, for an illustration.] This includes clearing the auditing command, so that the PC can answer the question. Ask the question in such a way that the PC can hear it. And know whether the PC is answering that question. "You can tell when the PC is finished....[It is] a piece of knowingness, ... an instinct." You should know, without having to ask the PC if he is finished. Then, knowing that he is finished, you use the acknowledgment to tell him that he has said it, using only the right amount of stop to stop that cycle, not the whole session. Then you give him something else to answer. When you don't see when he is finished and therefore fail to acknowledge, he thinks he is not done and looks for more. He even takes up humming! If you don't give him something else to answer, he will go on automatic. He will self-audit, with no TA action. The degree of lack of TA action measures the degree of self-audit that the PC is indulging in. Get your comm cycle good enough so that you don't have to pay attention to it, and give your attention to the comm cycles of the PC. Spend your basic auditing doing nothing but repairing the basic communication inabilities of the PC, and you will be a genius: You will crack 99% of the cases that walk in. For instance, the case that goes on and on with his comm. You may think that you are acknowledging him, but he never gets it. It is up to you to get that communication acknowledged, so he knows that it is heard. Or take the PC who takes twenty minutes to answer the auditing question, and then, in that answering, doesn't answer it. The very smart auditor knows that he would have to do three processes, because:

1. The PC cannot have an auditing question. He didn't answer it, so he never got it. This gives you the first process: "What auditing question wouldn't you mind being/should you be asked?"

2. Since he can't have auditing, he is wasting it, so after you have a comm line going, you can run wasting auditing. Run it as a concept, since you can't expect such a case to recall anything. You could use: "Get the idea of you wasting auditing," or "What could you do here that would waste auditing?", or "What could an auditor do here that would waste auditing?" and maybe get him to waste communication. Elementary havingness is the ability to do.

3. Run, "Who would I have to be to audit you?"

4. After that, perhaps you could work on his memory. You would see the whole case change.

Take a PC who is sitting there not saying anything. Find what the PC is doing and dream up something accordingly, e.g., "What could you say to me?" You get a long comm lag, then he says something. Build it up until you've got him in communication with you. Then inspect the rest of his comm cycle for other wrongnesses. Maybe now you have to find out whether he can have an auditor. It is what the PC isn't doing that the auditor might be able to get him to do that determines the auditing question. If you are alert, you will see these little disabilities showing up. For instance, someone stammers. Obviously, he is having trouble communicating.

"Don't ask the PC to do things the PC can't do." For instance, the auditor asks, "From where could you view catfish?" The PC says, "Uh ... I'm sorry, I've never viewed any catfish." The auditor has asked the PC a question he couldn't answer. He is guilty of not having cleared the question. Clear questions beforehand to make sure the PC can do it, before asking it. Always respect the PC's saying that there aren't any more answers. Otherwise, you give the PC loses. Your entrance point to the case is where the PC breaks down in his comm cycle with the auditor and with the environment. For instance, if the PC can't look at the auditor, you could run, "If you looked over here, what would (or might) you see?" These are the ways you crack cases. There are tons of processes that you could use.

Suppose you are running SCS on a PC who, you find, can't stand still. Don't ignore the disability. Take something else to remedy it, e.g. "Stand still/Don't stand still," which gets rid of automaticities. If the PC knows that he has the disability, he can itsa about it, because it is real to him. But often what the person is worried about is not what he is bugged with. You could still trigger the bank and run it out on an automaticity, as in dianetics, but then you would get a PC who gets better and doesn't know about it. PCs will run off a total automaticity of what is wrong with them, and they won't even listen to themselves talk.

An auditing session is highly artificial. But it is only artificial because it approximates, to such harsh, staggering reality, the exact points of contact with beings and existence, like a Lycoming engine in a Model T Ford. Auditing highlights the exact important points of communication.

Here is a capsule version of what is wrong with the mind: The only thing really wrong with people is that they have withdrawn from communicating. The individual has gone out of contact. He has stopped looking. The last time he looked, there were three sabre-tooth tigers ready to bite him. Of course, he believes that there are still three sabre-tooth tigers there. He does this throughout enough trilennia, and he's got an awful big stack of tigers, all of which have left. But he doesn't know this fact. He can't be sure that they have left. A person who withdraws from contact with tigers all the time and refuses to contact the area doesn't see whether the tiger is still there or not, but keeps mocking it up just to be sure. The tigers, actually, are gone. But this individual is in a condition of total withdrawal. He is "safeguarded" with automatic bank, with automatic beingness. A valence stands where he ought to be. Total withdrawal is a capsule summary of aberration. A thetan has, as his remedy for safety, shortening his reach. When he gets to the point of zero reach, he inverts it, into an inverted withdrawal, and you get the cycle of the dynamics, coming on down. He comes away from actual reach to zero reach, but he still has to reach, so he figures out some other way to reach. A zero of what he is doing always has a remedy that is lower. So you can get an inversion of an inversion of an inversion of withdrawal.

This shows up in an auditing session right away, in the PC's inability to talk to the auditor about pertinencies. So you must remedy his communication by reaching him, in order to get him to reach. With a person who is on a compulsive outflow, you have to get him there, before you can run anything, e.g. by "Touch that chair." You have to have a session before you can have a technique. This is how to get one: you use, observe, and remedy the communication cycle. And after you have remedied it, notice that it has been remedied. Note that the PC is now able to communicate with the auditor, and notice what else needs to be done. Sometimes the remedy of the outpoint happens so fast that you are astonished. Don't overrun it. If things are going all right, don't remedy them. If things are going all wrong, find what you can fix up and fix it up. "If the PC is fully in session, you can run almost anything, and [he will] sail." But no technique by itself will put the PC in session. The auditor has to do it.

6402C25 SHSpec-6 What Auditing Is and What It Isn't

LRH is the first survivor of the Battle of the Goals Plot. GPM's contain trickery and treachery. That is why no one, hitherto, has figured them out. Routine 3 didn't bite deep. Even running "oppose" didn't get much depth of bite. When you move it into "solve", you are beginning to get into dangerous areas. The tiger can bite your head off, but you can't get back at him. In R6, you are handling pure starving tigers. [For definition of R6, see p. 568, above.] Someone who could handle the oppose line easily will find enough aberration to make a powerful being unpowerful on the actual GPM line, quantitatively and qualitatively.

The data of this lecture is valuable at all levels, but it is vital at Levels V and VI. It is so simple that you may think that there is nothing there to grasp. There is also confusion that blows off as one attempts to grasp it. The following is a pure piece of data that is incredibly difficult to TR-3 over to somebody. I am going to tell you:

1. The difference between auditing and assessing.

2. The difference between destimulating and erasing.

3. The difference between a PTP and an ARC break.

4. The targets of the auditor, which are:

a) The PC.

b) The bank.

The auditor speaks either to the PC or to the bank. Auditing and the auditing cycle is addressed to the PC. Assessing is addressed to the bank. When the auditor talks to the PC, he often restimulates the bank; he has an influence on it, but he is still talking to the PC. Sometimes, during an assessment, the PC talks, and the auditor must acknowledge the origination, but these are separate actions.

Auditing ... has only two products: destimulation and erasure., [See also pp. 486-487, above, for illustrations of destimulation and erasure (or "discharge").] You can get the PC out of it, or you can use the PC to wipe it out. The first is destimulation; the second is erasure. Destimulation gets the dogs that are barking at the PC to lie down and be quiet, and the PC to "come away from there". Auditing wipes out the dogs. Don't try to erase a PTP. That requires auditing, and PTP's prevent auditing. You destimulate PTP's, so that you can audit. You can get the PC to dust himself off (destimulation), or you can use the PC like an ink eraser (erasure). Some auditors specialize in trying to erase everything but never really get anything erased. It is OK to erase anything, as long as you complete your cycles of action. But the lower levels of auditing are practically all destimulation, not erasure. If an auditor can't destimulate a PC, he can never take up his own cycle of action, because the PC's restimulation takes charge. If the PC is elsewhere when you start the session and the cycle of action, you will never complete the cycle of action that you start. Destimulation is the only action that you can undertake to get a PC located and oriented. Don't try to audit, when all you should, or can, be doing is a destimulation. "Where did it happen? Where are you now?" is a destimulation. So is a prepcheck. Since an auditor can't complete his cycle of action unless he first destimulates the PC, destimulation is a very important skill. Running engrams, RI's, implant GPM's, etc., are all erasure. Even in destimulation, a tiny amount of erasure takes place. Just the PC's attention on the subject for a short time brings about erasure of a bit of it. The fact that a certain amount of the incident runs out during destimulation is shown by the fact that a PC experiences somatics during assists. We just hit the key-in [and erase that]. You can also destimulate something and then run out the incident. You could use effort processing, or run the engram. [Cf. running locks, secondaries, and engrams on subjects.] If you do this, though, complete the cycle of destimulating first, or you will leave some attention stuck on what you were destimulating, which, in the course of destimulating, you also restimulated somewhat. Not completing the destimulation cycle will make it that much harder to erase what you wanted to erase. You don't want the PC to come out of a destimulation attempt involving Mata Hari with his feet still all tangled up in silk stockings and old German documents. Complete cycles of actions, once started. If you start to erase something, erase it. Don't abandon it in order to go erasing something else.

In Level VI, ideally, when you get a GPM, you erase it. This is complicated by the fact that that GPM is connected to the one above it and the one below it. But you could erase the middle. In practice, you consider the whole first series of goals one action and erase that, or half the first series, then the rest of it. [See below, for an explanation of the goals series.]

"The heart of certainty is arrival [at the end of a cycle of action]. The anatomy of uncertainty is a failure to complete a cycle of action."

Rapid methods of destimulation are necessary. For instance, since-mid-ruds are needed to keep incipient BPC cleaned up and out of the road for the rest of the session. Life is restimulative. The purpose of ruds is destimulation. When the PC brings up something that is not in the auditor's main line of action, the auditor destimulates it and goes back to his main action. Case analysis is the tech that destimulates unwanted resurgences of case. Its purpose is handling PTP's as they arise. The activity of figuring out where GPM's fit, which has been called case analysis, we now call track analysis. Case analysis is a wide-level activity that can be used at any level. It is just finding what the PC is sitting in and getting his considerations. So while you are working on one GPM, if the PC gets his attention on another one, destimulate it with case analysis and go back to the first action. Otherwise. leaving him stuck in one mass, you let him go to another mass, and he will get over-restimulated. The rule applies to all levels. Make up your mind about what you are doing and complete your cycle of action.

What is auditing? Auditing is "the action of asking a PC a question which he can understand and answer, getting an answer to that question, and acknowledging him for that answer." And then also, when the person originates, auditing involves understanding and handling that origination. That is all auditing is. It is TR-0, 1, 2, 3, and 4. When that occurs, TA action occurs and sanity occurs.

Auditing is not assessing. Auditing may have the purpose of making someone feel better, but that has nothing to do with the definition of auditing or with what auditing is. The fact that someone feels better after an assessment does not mean that it was auditing. Therefore, from the above definition, you can't have self-auditing. "The technique is scientology, but auditing is this one ... action." If you understand the above to apply to all auditing, you will be fantastic as an auditor. You will find gold at the end of the rainbow. Nothing is very difficult about getting a result, if you just do what is in that definition. What makes the PC better is not the technique you use. It is simply the auditing comm cycle. "Auditing is a cycle of action.... And that two-terminal aspect, which is what this physical universe consists of, is what gives you tone arm action and is what makes a PC better. It's not a technique that makes a PC better, and it never will be.... Auditing is the "carrier wave' ... that handles anything and everything" for the PC.

There is another activity an auditor can do, besides auditing: assessment. Auditing goes mainly to the PC; "assessment never goes to a PC." It goes to the bank. Therefore, by definition, it is not auditing. You can never assess a PC who thinks that he is being addressed. If you are trying to assess and the PC is trying to communicate with you, or if he thinks that you are trying to communicate with him, you will get messed up. When the auditing cycle is out, assessment cannot occur, in that the PC hasn't understood that it is not an auditing cycle that he is engaged in, and he can't just sit there and be assessed. He is nervous and restimulated, and his mind is darting all over the place. Even so, if you ask the question just where the mind is, it reads, through all his mental busy work.

R2H is not really an assessment, even though you go down a prepared list, because you are really asking the PC those questions, and setting up 2WC about things that have occurred in the comm cycle. If a PC gets ARC broken during an assessment, it is because he has originated something, which you haven't acknowledged. He does not get ARC broken because you are assessing. Sometimes you sandwich auditing in with the assessment, but they are still two separate activities. The TA action that you get when you find an actual RI occurs when you have an auditing cycle going. It does not occur without the auditing cycle. An assessment, even of a correct RI, is not what gives TA action. It is the auditing comm cycle that gives TA. That is why, when you ask, "Is that your item?", you get TA action, in the form of a big blowdown. It is not because the PC contacts the item. He is already in the middle of it. So on solo auditing, the PC would get needle actions but not TA action. Assessment doesn't give you TA action.

An ARC break assessment is given when the PC has an ARC break. This assessment list has other uses, but the ARC break assessment simply consists of assessing the list, getting the read, and indicating it to the PC. During an ARC break, you must not audit! "An ARC break is when the auditing comm cycle cannot take place.... It isn't anything else." The PC is upset and accusative. He won't talk to you. If you force a comm cycle at that time, you will only deepen the ARC break. At that point, you do nothing else but an ARC break assessment. When you have a real ARC break, you assess it, always. Know your tools so that you can do the right assessment, whether it be a session ARC break or an ARC break from the particular action that you are on.

As long as you are addressing, with auditing, an area of disability in the PC, you will get TA.

6403C03 SHSpec-7 Auditing and Assessment

The most complete body of knowledge there is is at Class VI. It took fantastic amounts of auditing to get it and codify it. Fortunately, it is codified, unlike other levels. For instance, prehav levels are mostly items out of actual GPM's or locks thereon.

You are used to regarding assessment as something you use to find something to audit. More recently, you have regarded assessment also as a way to find the source of an ARC break. "Assessment is an activity which is totally independent of auditing." As you move up from Class IV, you find that assessment commingles with auditing. ARC breaks can occur because of the auditor's failure to recognize the difference between assessment and auditing, and failing to shift his gears from one to the other, or schizophrenically trying to do both at the same time. You must keep them separate. For

instance, if the PC originates during your assessment, you must instantly shift into an auditing cycle to handle it. Then you return to the assessment.

"Assessment is addressed to the PC's bank. It is not addressed to the PC." When auditing occurs during the assessment, it is because the PC got restimulated by something assessed. So the PC is now in need of an auditor to duplicate it, so that it can as-is. The auditor must really understand, duplicate, and acknowledge, so that the PC knows that he has been understood. All bad assessing, where the meter isn't operating properly, comes about because the auditor can't shift gears smoothly and rapidly enough, between auditing and assessing.

An auditor can get the idea that assessment is impossible, if he has made mistakes in assessing that resulted in the needle tightening up. The failure, in this case, is really an auditing failure, e.g. the auditor's inadvertent question of the PC, "Is it all right if we assess this list?", an auditing question, since it has not been fully handled, will now get in the way of a successful assessment, in some cases. The question went to the PC, an analytical being. The PC now expects to answer. He may also be insufficiently indoctrinated not to think that he should answer the assessment questions too. But if you don't complete the question cycle, you tend to direct the rest of the assessment at the PC, not the bank. Now the PC feels as though he should be answering each item assessed. You will be assessing through the PC's withheld comm.

When the auditor starts to assess, many PCs go on an automatically withholding state of mind. They got into this state of mind because the auditor disobeyed certain tenets, e.g. the rule that when you ask the PC a question before you assess, you should be sure that the PC has answered it to his satisfaction and that he gets acknowledged, and that everything is handled first, before you start the assessment. And when you have assessed and have gotten an item, and you ask the PC, "Is that your item?", this is an auditing question, which may take awhile for the PC to answer. You have just put him into the middle of his long-standing whirlpool, so don't be amazed if it takes awhile for him to complete the cycle. He could be going, "Yeah: Yeah: That's why ... etc., etc., etc.," without having answered the question, Is it your item?."

"Assessment must never interrupt the auditing cycle, but the auditing cycle may at any time interrupt the assessment.... Therefore the auditing cycle is the senior action." That doesn't mean that you necessarily spend more time auditing than assessing in any given session, especially in R6. Auditing is senior because auditing errors can wreck assessment.

The auditor has two lines going out: one to the PC and one to the bank. When these lines cross, you get sparks. In assessing, you might use the form, "Is it ... ?", which has the form of a question. But don't expect an answer, during the assessment. There is no one home in the bank. Don't fool around with entities. Using questions in assessments can bother a PC. Sometimes it works better to use statements, so as not to make the PC think that he should answer. "You won't get any reaction from the bank if the PC intervenes," but you don't want the PC on a withhold or a decision not to be involved or something that gets in the way. The PC has to sit there with his ruds in and no co-operative "assistance", and in good comm with the auditor, if his bank is to be addressed. Keep in comm and keep your cycles complete. If the PC is in good comm with the auditor, you can then address the bank easily. Therefore, the way to put yourself in good comm with the bank is to put yourself in comm with the PC. But the PC being in good comm doesn't have to mean that the PC is talking. The auditors who assess PCs well are those who are in good comm with the PCs. Repairing assessments, when what is wrong is out-comm, will make things far worse. It invalidates things found on assessment, etc. If assessment goes out, repair the comm cycle. Don't just look for BPC in general. Clean up the comm cycle.

On any case, there is always BPC to be found. That doesn't mean that you should spend much time looking for it. You could spent a lot of time trying to clean the question, "Have I misassigned the bypassed charge?", because the read you would keep getting is from your assigning the BPC to bank phenomena, not session outnesses. It could go on reading for twelve hours: In the presence of a session ARC break, you can go on finding other BPC continually without the PC feeling any better. And you will invalidate and suppress all sorts of auditing work that was done. So "ARC break assessments should begin with, 'Is it a session ARC break? Is it an R6 ARC break? Or is it an R4 ARC break?" It can be as crude as, "What list do I use...." Present-time upsets always seem more important to the PC than past events, however tremendous the past events may be.

(Never use heavy steel electrodes.)

Ninety-nine percent of your assessment trouble is really auditing cycle trouble. Assessment errors, themselves, can be so productive of upset that the fact that there can be another source of ARC breaks can easily be ignored. Even with the comm cycle in perfectly, with the auditor and the PC in complete rapport, the session can go up in smoke because of an assessment error, especially on a wrong goal. For instance, if the PC's item has been bypassed, all you should do, if the PC ARC breaks, is to assess. Don't try to WC it with the PC. "You must not audit [or] address remarks to the PC in the presence of an ARC break.... You never ask the PC a single question, nor do you acknowledge anything the PC says." Experience has taught me that you cannot communicate with somebody who is out of communication. Don't audit in the presence of an ARC break. Don't ask a question; don't acknowledge what the PC says. You assess. If you get confused and go into shock when the PC suddenly throws the cans at you, take a break. That is better than sitting there, slack-jawed. Don't stay near the PC. Don't try to talk to the PC. Get your wits sorted out, find where the ARC break started, and go assess. Find the BPC, indicate it. Get back in comm with the PC, and go on doing what you were doing. "The meter will read during an ARC break, [but only] on what is causing the ARC break." If you find some BPC on a case ARC break list and the PC doesn't go VGI's, know that there is something else. There is a session ARC break or some different case ARC break.

R2H can be done either as an ARC break assessment or as an assessment for BPC, where you stay in comm with the PC during the assessment.

Everything from Level IV on up depends on accurate assessment. So the auditor must be able to shift rapidly and smoothly from assessment to auditing. Just because R6 is mostly assessing, don't think that you can delete auditing from the session. If you try, you will have a disaster.

"You assess when you assess. You audit when you audit.... Don't ever do them both at the same time.... Assessing is straight from ... auditor to bank."

6403C05 SHSpec-8 Case Analysis -- Healing

Ian Tampion audited PCs on TV for the benefit of the Victoria legislature, at some hearings in Australia. This is the ultimate TVD! The legislators were very interested.

LRH has started running his goals plot: the research activities have left holes in his bank.

There are [about 350] different goals series, in sets of 42. Since the same things went in, over and over, if you run one too deeply, you can drop through into the next series. You also get awful somatics if you do this. The goals series are consecutive, and it just goes in, over and over again, with different GPM's. Same line plot; same goal series. They just go on and on. So if you run out one, you are convinced that you couldn't possibly have run it out, because it is sitting on one of the same GPM's of an earlier series, so it looks like all the goals are still alive, there. So if you run one too deep, you fall through, into an earlier goals series. So you can leave BPC by going on to the earlier one, which gives you bad somatics. You've got 42 goals in a series, for a total of 15,000 GPM's. They get bigger and bigger as you go back. Early track RI's are about the size of a mountain. If you don't get the first (PT) series right, the PC will go into a sad effect of great magnitude with great speed. It will take only four or five seconds, from where where you found the wrong GPM to start from, to the toboggan. This can happen because you may well not have completed the current series. Only some of the 42-goal series closest to PT is formed [because the current series has not yet been completed]. Therefore it is easy to fall back into the next series. Also, the PT GPM itself is truncated, so you can get the first actual goal, but it is hard to get the first actual GPM. Everyone has the same actual line plot in common. We learned our lesson well before the track began.

The consequences of running these GPM's out of order and with wrong line plots are pretty horrendous, which is why we are not broadly releasing the line plots. Incidentally, there are no 2D goals on the actual GPM line plot, as far as LRH has been able to tell. There are plenty of implant goals on the 2D, however.

Case analysis tells you how to become a healing wizard and upset the AMA. Man has no real tradition of healing. There is a lot of charlatanism. The AMA is into plumbing, not healing, anyway. Of course, doctors are necessary -- like plumbers. They never reveal their stats, or -- not often enough. You hear that 600 people have received kidney transplants. What you don't hear is that all of them were dead within two years. Previous attempts to heal overts have consisted of things like calling for

repentance. This is not an adequate process. Man got healing closely associated with structure and became successful, where structure is concerned. He knew nothing of disease. Infection may or may not have to do with bacteria. There are too many variables to say for sure. The fact that you can see the bugs under a microscope is insufficient. LRH has found that infection many be the result of a GPM. Healing is done by the body. The doctor merely arranged the parts so that they could go back together and hoped that the individual would do the rest. Until you have solved the problem of how the individual influences his own healing process, you can do nothing broadly about healing. So the healing professions have tended to be monopolists or frauds. The modern medicos and psychiatrists have gone towards a monopoly. They have also made research a lucrative profession, but they tend to keep the door shut on a real search into healing by others, not part of their club. Authority has become "fact" in courtrooms. We don't communicate with the medicos, not so much because they are evil as because they have certain stylized ways of thinking into which we do not fit. They use research as a way of raising money, which is another incomprehensible. We would have been incomprehensible anyway, because we have gone forward on the basis that there is such a thing as truth, and that using what we know of it, we can help our fellow man.

Our real goals as scientologists are unreal to the public, so there has to be a bridge. We do want some way to bridge in to the fellow on the street. Healing can be a part of the lower part of such a bridge, because it is real to people. Freedom from psychosomatic illness is something that we can produce easily at lower levels, even though healing isn't our main interest. This makes the monopolists attack us. The second thing that we need to know about healing is: if you are going to heal, heal. Don't heal "in order to _____ ." You would gain great acceptance in a community if you worked on that, avoiding or handling the attacks of the monopolists, and escaping the wrath of the frauds.

If you do go in for healing someone, make sure that you also teach him a little and broaden his horizon beyond his goal of getting rid of his lumbosis. You do have a technology for healing any chronic disease or illness, provided that you can read a meter and keep the auditing comm cycle going. A chronic disease is a disease that exceeds its expected duration. But don't assume that because you can see that someone is sick from something, you should heal it. To say what someone is suffering from is very adventurous. The person's mental mechanisms can bring about and perpetuate virtually anything. Actually, all illness is psychosomatic, even broken bones. It shows poor judgement to put one's body in a position where its bones can be broken, after all. The genus of psychosomatic illness is in suggestion [the hypnotic variety]. And suggestion comes down to postulation. Nothing can be suggested to the individual [with any effect] that he has not earlier postulated himself. Thus an overt would be to key in something that the person had already postulated for himself. The person must have willed the destruction of bodies before he could get his body in bad shape. It really isn't what has happened to a person that brings about a psychosomatic illness. It is what the person is willing to have happen [e.g. to another]. But it is neither possible nor necessary to trace a psychosomatic illness back to the individual's basic intention to have it, to cure a psychosomatic illness. Though all psychosomatic illnesses are self-caused and stem from early thetan postulates, the key-in of such an illness can be other-determined. He doesn't have to have a key-in to make his postulates come true, but when one of his early postulates sometimes mysteriously materializes in the physical universe and he doesn't know anything about it, it is necessary for something else around him to key it in. He did it himself and knew he did. But if it is happening and he doesn't now know that he did it himself, it must be the result of a key-in. Hypnotism, for instance, is merely a key-in of a person's earlier postulates. [Cf. HCOB 10Aug73 "PTS Handling"]

To keep an environment calm, you must be careful of what gets keyed in. For instance, a war environment is restimulative enough to cause the keying in of a lot of brutality. A thetan is unbelievably numerously pre-postulated!! With 15,000 GPM's, each containing 16 RI's, with locks galore, there is lots to be keyed in.

So when you heal psychosomatics, you are not dealing with the thetan's basic postulations, unless you are auditing at Levels V and VI. Below Level V, basic postulates are out of reach of the thetan. They are neither necessary nor possible to use, in handling psychosomatic illness. It is fortunate that you don't require them.

Here are the steps in the formation of a psychosomatic illness:

1. The thetan postulates it, i.e. he postulates that it could be done or that it could happen. This was trillenia ago, probably.

2. Then he did it to someone else.

3. Then he could and did have it keyed in on himself, and he got the experience.

The key-in could be anything. It could be something quite mild: a symbol, for instance. Step (1)would be taken up at Level VI if anywhere. But trying to handle illness at Level VI is too restimulative. Someone who is sick is probably not up to any part of it, and you don't do Level VI partially, anyway. Handling Step (2), getting the basic overt on the track, is equally a matter of going 'way back and is therefore probably impossibly difficult to get at.

But you can easily handle Step (3), picking up the key-in in PT, which is some tiny motivator or a small overt that keys in the big overt, and you can make the person well by using it. To cure somebody, find the most recent key-in that you can get your hands on, or "the latest overt on that subject." [Again, Cf. HCOB 10Aug63 "PTS Handling"] Don't try to heal with heroic methods. Take care of the key-ins, even though you know, correctly, that there is far, far more behind it. You want the lightest key-in that you can approach. By the nature of the case, you won't be able to reach that big postulate, until the case as a whole is up to Level VI. Try to pick up the key-in that is as close to present time as you can get, not as far back as you get. If the recent key-in is too heavy to confront, e.g. if it is something three lifetimes ago, you can even pick up the key-in of the key-in. Go easy; use a feather duster: The lightest of methods is what succeeds in healing. Curing bunions is not the same game as restoring to a being his full powers. But it is a useful skill, and a very "lightly-lightly" one. You are not trying to get to basic. The "heroic" measures indulged in by desperate doctors are just physical dramatizations of a needless search for basic. Cutting out the brain to handle things is the effort to arrive at prime postulate dramatized as a physical action.

The mystery is how something can be keyed out. But it can, and it heals the PC to do so. He is likely to get the somatic back when he gets up to Level VI, but there, you will be running it out.

6403C09 SHSpec-9 Summary of Lower Levels

There has to be a bridge between Level 0 and Level V. Level V is becoming a catch-all level of everything necessary before Level VI. We are in danger of getting up to the esoteric levels of VI and leaving no bridge, resulting in thirty to forty OT's and nothing else. Someone off the street is in no position to recognize any part of an actual GPM. "Scientology progresses on reality.... The lower levels are the contest of achieving reality." You have to achieve a reality before you can make anyone better. There has to be a bridge to clearing. "It's done by gradients." The PC must be walked from a position of no-recognition of reality through recognition of some reality, eventually to an ultimate reality, by gradients.

If you skip a step in a gradient, you get an unreality. Unreality is associated with charge. They are the same thing. An RI that is too overburdened with charge (inval, suppress, etc.) will be unrecognizable to the PC, no matter how obvious it may be to the auditor. A person with too much charge on his case can't understand or achieve reality. He must have reality and understanding to go free. Understanding is related to reality, per the ARC triangle. Therefore, understanding is related to charge, which you have to get off a case first in order to clear it. Someone who has got lots of charge will do very silly things. Stupidity comes about from charge, i.e. unreleased, unresolved, stored masses of energy. For this reason, you can't get a person to solve his problems by mere significance. The significances don't enter into it. It is a person's overcharged environment that makes a person too stupid to solve his problems.

The way out of the problem of not having a bridge is to attain consistency of result. It breaks an auditor's heart for results to vary from PC to PC. To get a consistent result and to get a reliable bridge to clear, you have to attack the common denominator of aberration in all PCs, not the particular quirks of particular PCs. Otherwise, results won't be consistent. And the least common denominator of all aberration is charge. If charge is what causes stupidity, then obviously what we should attack is charge. So the lower levels, Levels 0 through IV, have to be aimed at getting off charge, in the absence of any ability on the part of the PC to face the actual source of the charge and erase it. We can't get anything but trouble from trying to put the PC into the actual cause of the charge. So, at the lower levels, you don't erase much charge. You get the PC out of the charge. Destimulation is what we must aim for at Levels 0-IV, so that the PC will be moved out of masses of charge. We destimulate by attacking key-ins. We are not trying to get rid of the charge. We are trying to pull the

person out of it. The person can't recognize the actual goal until he is separated from the key-ins that stupefy him. To get the pea under the mattresses, i.e. the bank under the key-ins and upsets, you have to move the mattresses out of the way. [Another analogy: There is a drain at the bottom of a murky pool. The PC can't see it or find it, but he can drown trying. What you have to do is to clean away most of the water and guck. Then the PC can find the drain and let the water and muck drain off.]

You have to understand an RI for it to blow, since it is a thought, not the symbols that represent it in English. That is why session ARC breaks, inval, or whatever can prevent RI's from blowing.

Life is all jammed up for a person with RI's and GPM's. "The guy with his attention gruesomely and howlingly concentrated on some little [tiny piece of mattress ticking (see above) must be shown that he can do something about the mattresses.] He can do something about it, and he gets a big reality and a hope factor, and his confidence resurges on this basis: if he could get his attention off just one [piece of mattress ticking] for a few minutes, it would make him feel so different and so interestingly alive, compared to how he has felt, that now he gets a big upsurge in reality, and you can get him to tackle [a lot more]. You've got a gradient." In some cases, the environment is so charged that the person can't take any attention off of it. In this case, you have to give the person a change of environment, to a non-restimulative environment. Here is an analogy: Say you have a lion tamer faced with four ferocious lions, and all he has is a weak chair, and he is running out of blank cartridges. You are trying to interest him in a bite-proof suit, but he can't put any attention on it. You have to handle the lions first, lion by lion, and then sell the overwhelmed trainer the lion-proof suit. [This would be a Type 3 PTS handling.]

The next level up, above total overwhelm [Level I] is the person who is so engrossed in his PTP's that he is obsessively solving everything, solving his PT. Such a person goes around with wild strings of sol5ti/.s i. hi1 haadann the time: "If I do ... I could ... and so-and-so wouldn't ... and then I'd ... and they'd ..., etc." His solutions are so pyramided that you don't dare touch any corner of the pyramid, or the lot will collapse. You can handle this PC by using your lowest level of actual processing, with itsa on solutions, which takes over the automaticity of it. [See above, on auditing problems and solutions, as well as 6404C21 SHSpec-17 "Problems and Solutions", below.]

Level II is the first processing level. It contains repetitive processes and objective processes. Here, there is a danger of restimulating GPM's, unless you use only things that are not in actual GPM's. Is there something that isn't in an actual GPM and can therefore be processed with impunity? Yes. Nouns and most pronouns. Some pronouns are in goals, but at Level II you are far enough from the GPM that pronouns are generally safe. But farther along, you had better avoid such pronouns as "myself". "I" appears as a rare item in GPM's, also.

But nobody has goals in the form, "To be a (noun)." Nowhere in GPM's do you have noun terminals and oppterms. there are only "-nesses", "-ities", and "-tions": adjectival and adverbial forms. So you can process noun terminals with impunity. "Think of a communication," would perhaps lead you straight into a GPM. "Think of a communicator," would not. That is the missing secret of why the twentieth ACC made clears. Nouns were processed in brackets. Nouns can only be locks. Therefore, when you process them, you get key-outs. You would key out actual GPM's by keying out locks on RI's. Adding a pronoun or a noun can make an unsafe process safe.

What is an actual GPM or an actual RI? It is a mass with significance. That is what you need to know at Level IV. Therefore a key-in is and will always be a mass with significance -- almost anything, in short, that you could think of. So masses with significances key in actual GPM's, which is why an environment is restimulative. PT is one huge mass of restimulators. Present time is a haunted area!

It is not the significance that keys in the GPM or the RI. [So to key one out, you have to get masses plus significances.] If you have an actual RI with a significance and someone keeps throwing the significance at you, it will key you in. So a process like, "How could you help?/How could I help?" would throw the PC into the RI. To make it safe, you have to put in " ... help you (or me)," so that you've got a mass plus significance. Running masses with significance is important because, since masses with significance key in actual GPM's, running them keys out actual GPM's. At Level I, the mass with significance that the PC gets accustomed to is the auditor. "Recall a terminal," would be a good process. ARC straightwire works because, and as long as, you have a terminal, a pronoun like "someone" or "something" in it. And for the same reason, you can prepcheck a mass that has a significance, as long as it's there and you are running it. You can run it in brackets, etc. At Level II, you have the PC do objective processes. This fact, plus the fact that control, communication, and

havingness contain basic laws of life, make 8C a high-level workable process. The laws of life, like control, communication, and havingness, are senior to GPM's. But it is the wall that makes 8C workable. It was the wall which, since it was a mass with a significance, had keyed in actual GPM's. So when you get the PC familiar with the wall, the wall keys out and the GPM destimulates. The auditing cycle itself is helpful and beneficial, as well. The auditing cycle is probably the basic process that makes Level II.

The PC's awareness of the auditor as a friendly, helpful mass with a significance is also destimulative. This awareness of the auditor tends to destimulate masses in general for the PC. Furthermore, the auditor is not just a mass with significance but also involves a hope factor. This is a two-pole universe, as Bucky Fuller once taught LRH in Elizabeth, N.J. The two-pole nature of communication showed up when LRH tried solo auditing himself on a line plot. He could go through it, but there was no TA. One terminal gives no TA. One terminal plus a thousandth of a terminal gives a bit of TA, etc. The auditor has to be real to the PC for there to be a session and TA. Early on, this isn't true, so it is up to the auditor to remedy the unreality of the auditor to the PC [i.e. to help the PC to find the auditor]. Reality should increase with auditing.

A new process introverts the PC enough, so that at first the auditor is less real to the PC. So at first, you could get less TA than when the PC gets used to the process. Early on, the PC is so charged up that he has no reality on any other terminals, and there is no terminal for him to discharge against. He is a mobile standing wave. Such an "only one" gets no TA, since there is no one else around. Charge has accumulated on this PC to the point where no other terminal exists. He is trapped in the standing wave of no-flow. This is an animated standing wave that blocks all incoming and outgoing flow. The PC is stuck in a series of wins or loses. He has lost a terminal that he could talk to, so he solves it by being in continuous communication with that terminal. Now, if people aren't that terminal, they are nobody. Or, he wasn't in comm with that one either. He mustn't be there and he mustn't communicate. There are tremendous key-ins involved here. To get TA, we would have to rehabilitate other-terminal-ism. At Level II, we would do it with pronouns, since we can't assess for terminals. At Level III, you would assess by observation, discussing things on a list with the PC and getting all his considerations. You don't do much with the assessment. This applies to R3SC slow assessment and R2C, assessment by dynamics, etc.

Along with a terminal, we get a period of time. Time is very important, to the degree that you can destimulate a somatic by dating it. This works because "all restimulation depends on a mistake in time." The PC thinks that the time something occurred is now. His head hurts in 1964, because he got clobbered in 1944. The basic lesson that you are trying to teach about engrams is that the PC's time is awry. The only thing that fouls you up in handling an incident by just dating the incident and having it blow is the fact that it has already been wrongly dated, e.g. the PC already wrongly dated it. You can find the date of the wrong dating. You can find what the wrong date was. There can be several wrong dates. Then you can find the actual date on which the incident occurred.

In view of the fact that you cannot easily run terminals that have not been accurately assessed, we can use this time factor at Level III, especially if an assessment has been done by a higher-level auditor, to get something to run in Problems Intensives, which involve getting the time of the incident, terminals, etc.

[Problems Intensive is explained above, and in HCOB 9Nov6l "The Problems Intensive -- Use of the Prior Confusion".]

We have made Class IV a clearing level. It is an assessment-type process to make a keyed-out clear, using prepchecks. You use R3. Do a list of the PC's goals, find one that stays in. So what if it is an implant goal or a wrong goal? It stayed in. Do a terminals list for that goal. Both goal and terminal lists should be short lists, listed to a clean needle. You don't get somatics from wrong goals. You get them from right goals that are suppressed or invalidated. So you list for the terminal with, "Who or what would have (the goal)?" Find a terminal that is a noun, then prepcheck it up to a point of high-level cognition or no more TA. Then do another goals list, and find another terminal. This cycle, repeated, will give us a clear, by keying out the actual GPM. Keep the goals lists for later on. You could use higher-classed auditors to do the assessment steps.

The only thing that can key in an actual GPM is a mass with a significance. So prepchecking the mass plus significance tends to key out the locks that keep the GPM connected to PT. Keep it light, in agreement with the PC's reality, so that you don't get him protesting or invalidating the actual goal.

If you sum up the terminal into a service fac, you probably have another family of processes to use. The terminal was [what the PC was using as a make-guilty mechanism. This is a cousin to O/W.] So if the terminal won't prepcheck, you could use service fac brackets on it: "How could you make yourself right/others wrong about it?" However, it is not likely that you will have to do this.

You can key out actual GPM's. Actual GPM's are keyed in only by masses with significance, and oddly enough, there will be only one mass with significance in the environment that is really raising the devil with the PC. When you get that one, you can key him out. You can fish him out of the bank, so that he can go back and clean up the actual GPM's.

6403C17 SHSpec-11 The Road to Perfection

LRH has had a gamble on time going since January of 1963. The question was, "Could he complete the job before the roof fell in?" He neglected organizations and scientologists until February of 1964, in order to research full time. MSH caught the brunt of it. August marked the point at which he found out that it could be done. The materials were there. From then, until January of 1964, the material was labelled, codified, and put together, so that it could be communicated.

At the same time, a bridge had to be created from the man on the street up to a reach for the upper levels, one that would be real to the man on the street. That was a more difficult operation. A person has to be walked forward with wins at every step that are real to the person, so that he will keep going forward and not get discouraged. Some PCs, in fact most PCs, cannot have a win that amounts to anything at all. The tiniest of wins is all that would be tolerable to such a person. At apathy, there is a low acceptance level of a win, e.g. "Nothing terrible happened to me today," would be the highest acceptable level of win to such a person. So you may have to rehabilitate the PCs ability to have a win, too. For this reason, it is more difficult to get someone from Level 0 to Level IV than to get him from Level V on up. He has no certainty yet. It is easier to climb Mont Blanc with an experienced mountaineer than it is to climb a foothill with a girl in a tight dress and spike heels.

There is a political problem, in that we are faced with a world that is getting more and more pessimistic and bent on giving people no wins. The acceptance level of win dwindles away to practically nothing. Anyway, LRH did the job in time, so now he is working out organization, classification, etc. Basic auditing has been put into good condition. It has been rough, but it has made seasoned individuals. Things don't have to be smooth, if they are certain.

Giving someone a gradient series of wins can be interfered with by his having minor ARC breaks and stopping auditing for awhile. Or, there is someone who is "open-minded". A win isn't available, and you get discouraged and give up. Seeing that no win is available, you don't create one. Dissemination hangs up on this one point -- the available win. You write off someone if you see no win available. But that is monitored by your acceptance level of a win. You have to be able to accept a level of win that is so low that it is real to the public person. The scale of win is a gradient scale. It is important to anyone trying to get somewhere with scientology. It has two sides: an outward win of assisting someone and an inward win of being assisted. It is a win for someone if he assists and a lose if he fails to assist, based on his intention to assist. If an auditor helps a PC and the PC doesn't recognize the change, in order to feel good about it, the auditor must have a certainty of observation that requires no agreement from the PC that something has been done. You have to be able to see and be certain of having seen a win in a PC whose acceptance of wins is so low that he doesn't know that he has had one. Your certainty level has got to be high. That is an almost impossible level to attain, but if you don't attain it, you will go into agreement with the PC on acceptability of wins.

Comfort, a relaxed frame of mind, and some serenity about things, requires that you know the exact situation and know that it is the exact situation. True self-confidence and poise, as opposed to the ability to endure or suffer, depends on the ability to conceive the truth of any situation. Knowing the truth of the existing situation is the only thing that supports self-confidence. Most departures from the truth come about as an effort to attain safety and self-security, from a fear of what might happen to him. Man's civilization forces lies on him at many points, by making telling the truth uncomfortable or even fatal. It promulgates the idea that "if you said nothing but the truth for 24 hours, you would lose everything.... But if one fails to announce truth, one is, to that degree, protecting a lie." At this point, a person begins to surround himself with lies. So society brings the individual to tolerate lies. It sees virtue in lies. It aids lies. Recognition of the truth is therefore converted into enduring, the truth. This is a downscale mockery of an upscale item.

Recognition of the truth in a situation is the only way to as-is the situation. However, one can be confronted with so much truth that one cannot as-is it, and one gets swamped by it. This discourages a person from recognizing truth, also. It leads to a not-is of truth. It is a lack of gradient that brings a person away from recognition of truth and makes him less clear-sighted. There is no gradient, and you've got to have one. Time enters into it, since it is part of a gradient. For instance the French Revolution was the result of ramming in a couple of major truths too fast. Political freedom is OK. People could be educated to advantage. But there was no gradient, so the French people ended up more debased after the revolution than before. The truth of the situation wasn't gradiently recognized or approached. There was no evolution from darkness to dazzle.

The "True Believer" has no real reality with the truth that he espouses. Truth requires reality, which is the ability to assimilate truth. If someone reaches with no gradient, with no reality, they wind up with no reality on truth. It is not ever assimilated. Assimilation depends on cause-distance-effect, on communication, and on an even balance of mind (affinity), while assimilating. Truth without ARC is denied to the individual and can wrong and harm him. Truth must go hand in glove with understanding. If there is no understanding, truth is not truth to anyone. It is just truth. All truths are attainable. Transcendentalism, the notion that the truth transcends our ability to understand, is a lot of baloney. There is no point in studying the route to truth if you don't know what the truth is. Studying the truth when one has no idea of what the truth is, when one has no idea of what one is looking for, is like looking for Memphis without having any idea that there are any towns called Memphis, or even that there are any towns. It is an idiotic activity: "Let's all sit down and study how we can get to GMPSXGRTZ." And then nobody ever asks, "What is GMPSXGRTZ? What do you mean, 'how to get there'? Is it a road across space? Is it measured by time? Is it a space-time journey that we are making? What kind of a journey is this, to GMPSXGRTZ???" The answer is, "We11, no.... Let's just discuss how to get to GMPSXGRTZ."!! The above totally bogs down philosophy. Kant "solved" it by saying that you could never find out what GMPSMGRTZ is. He cut off speculation. The work of all current gurus, adepts, and of Lao Tze, etc., is all concerned with how you approach truth, with no idea of what truth is. This is ridiculous!

LRH performed the flatworm experiment in 1938, and found that memory was transferable in a monocell. LRH points out that current experimenters in the area will quit soon, because their results will shortly get bizarre enough, as with the advent of past lives in the Wichita Foundation, so that their appropriations will be cut off, since their researches will be too unreal to their money sources.

We are in an optimum condition, with regard to knowing what truth we are trying to approach, since we can demonstrate by exteriorization a separation between the person and the body. We know that we are going towards the free individual. We know [that our road to truth is] the creation of such an individual. We know that there is no difference in orders of life between a man and a vegetable. We know what truth we are trying to attain. Everybody has some sympathetic harmonic with that truth. What is their reaction to it? It depends on their reality on the approach to this truth. We know that life is right there where the PC is sitting, so to get to truth, "a journey across time and space" is not really required. The journey consists of undoing the lies by which the person has walled himself in. All we have to do to recover the individual and his ability is to undo the turns for the worse that he has taken. We are traveling a road that has been followed, only backwards: the Way, the Tao, whatever. We know what it is. "It is the road that the individual has followed from a degree of perfection and beingness and self-ness ... on down to a disintegration, forgettingness, bluntingness, until he's in the state you find him in.... All the auditor has to do is walk him back that road. It's all there; it's all meter-marked." We are taking each lie in turn that landmarked a further degradation and undoing it. We are recovering the individual and his potential.

So the road to truth adds up to:

1. The individual's potential.

2. The situations in which the person's potential got lessened, and what has happened to this individual.

3. How this individual is related to the rest of the universe.

4. What we can do to restore the potential of that person. That is all part of the truth. "Truth, from the viewpoint of the auditor, is what actually happened, or the situation that actually exists at any moment in the state of beingness of an individual." It is not "the ultimate that we are seeking to attain".

It is not something transcendental. Truth is "that which exists." The road to truth might be better called the road to perfection or to an ultimate truth. Truth is "usually all hedged up in so many 'pitches' and so many directions that people want you to go, so many curves on the line, that you can't separate the wheat from the chaff."

We know where we are going and how to get there, what it takes but "we have not mastered an estimation of the individual's ability to conceive of truth." You may be talking to a grocer about scientology, but actually "you are talking to him about the road to perfection ... the composition of himself.... Who are you? What do you consist of? What potentials [do] you have? What potentials ... have you robbed yourself of? Where are you going? What is life? What is your relationship ... on any dynamic? You may be using the word, 'scientology', but these are the things you have embarked upon to discuss. And the unanswered question is, 'What can he recognize?'" We need to master the estimation of a person's ability to assimilate truth. It is not hard to overwhump someone with a big chunk of truth, e.g. by exteriorizing him. You have had the experience of exteriorizing someone and then having him say, "Omigawd: I'm me and it's it:!", and then, "two hours later, "What exteriorization? I wasn't exteriorized! Well, possibly something happened, but I don't know.' You've shot [the guy] momentarily into the rarefied air of [being able to] see it, ... but he couldn't have it. So you can show people things they can't have, and [that's] how you generate an unreality."

If we had no gradient between wog and OT, we would soon get very unreal to everybody but ourselves. You can show people things they can't have, thus generating an unreality. The common denominator here is "hit with too much truth, the individual degrades. You hit this [guy], he exteriorizes, "Bang!" He says, 'I'm me! I'm a spirit! I don't have mass. A body is a body! I'm different than it!' Two hours later, he's harder to process." His ability to win has been exceeded, and he has lost. It puts you on a withhold not to lay the truth before people. So, lay out the truth, "but provide the road ... by having levels of acceptable truths or realities that an individual can attain.... Establish and rehabilitate his ability to win, ... so that, eventually, ... he can have truth, and that way, you won't just throw [the person] into a complete, frothing, ecstatic, worshipping apathy." [This is the condition of the True Believer.]

In the past, when people got some truth, they built up secrecy about it. But the route must exist and must be wide open, not cloaked in secrecy. Training and skill do have to be there, but there is no other effort at secrecy. The main point is to provide a gradient scale to get people up to a higher reality. The route must exist, wide open, even if 100% of the people don't travel it.

6403C19 SHSpec-12 Flattening a Process

An auditor can lay aside some basic fact, do something else, and then wonder why he is having trouble. Flattening a process is such a fact. There are two aspects to ending a process, both having to do with what you are doing with the process:

1. Fixing the PC up so that he can be audited (rudiments).

2. Auditing the PC. This gives you two different endings. In rudiments, you are doing just enough to cure the elsewhereness of the PC. You don't want any PTP to get in the road of auditing. Use the "ruds kit" to brush off PT hassles. Destimulate the PC and get on with what you started as a major cycle. Not knowing this, you will never complete a cycle of action on a PC. You will keep on having to audit out-ruds, never finishing a cycle, because you don't use tools of destimulation to push the out-rud out of your road.

The other extreme is to abandon a prepcheck or some major action because the PC had a little cognition about something. Don't use a ruds-like whisk broom on a major action. You don't end off in three minutes, with a little bitty cog. You use the TA and you get action off the area. You have to unflatten a subject before you can flatten it, running all the TA out of it. That is main-body-of-the-session auditing. Main-session auditing is all done with the TA, never as with the rudiments. If you use the wrong approach, you will get the wrong ending, and the PC will go nowhere. You have to restimulate the PC to audit him. You only leave major actions when the TA is off. You don't chicken out and say, "Oh, it is seeming a bit better now, is it? Fine! That's a cog, so we will end off now." Flunk!!

Auditing by list is like R2H. You could use a sec check list, carefully not impinging on the PC, not restimulating anything to audit. But that is not the way to handle the body of the session, where you

really want to handle things. The approach you use in the ruds is to restimulate nothing, so that you can get in and audit something else later. Auditors who treat bodies of sessions like rudiments damage the PC, because they leave processes unflat. All sorts of charge will have been left bypassed, if this happens. The effect of this is dramatic and fast-acting in R6. It is less so at lower levels. But the long term result is the same. You could run, "What process has been left unflat?", and get considerable gain.

What happens if you start a prepcheck on one thing and shift to another thing before you finish? For one thing, the PC's ability to be prepchecked will suffer. He will be harder to prepcheck. also, if you prepcheck with a bad comm cycle, the tool would get blunted. You could even prepcheck prepchecking, or prepcheck each prepcheck button. The basic reason why a prepcheck button goes out is an incomplete cycle of action.

Thetans have a bug on continuing. They like to see cycles continue. That gives the longevity and mass of the physical universe. At a low level, any case is subject to the cycle of action. "Fatalism is a total subjugation of the individual by the cycle of action: 'What will be, will be.'" The individual is at total effect. People are in agreement with the cycle of action, but not because it is ultimate truth. However, it only fades out 'way up there. At higher levels, you can widen your time-span and do various odd things with time. Everybody is used to and in agreement with the cycle of action, so it is a reality, but not a truth, that you use in auditing. Violations of it bring about an unreality. That is what happens if you start an auditing cycle with a PC and don't finish it. The PC is parked in the middle of some incompletely as-ised mass, which he carries on into the next process, and so on. Things start looking more and more complicated to the PC as these incomplete cycles stack up. Freedom is real to him as "completing a cycle of action". So there is both the mass that he hasn't as-ised and the incompleteness of the cycle. The idea of a win usually goes along with the cycle of action. One wins when one accomplishes something, even if it is just the accomplishing of still being there. The upper echelon of this comes under intention.

Intention is part of, but senior to, the comm cycle. "It has in it every power the thetan has," including the power to throw lightning bolts, to hold a position, to make something continue, to do away with something, strength, accomplishment, and wit. When you are half-shot as a thetan, when you are pretty bad off, but not yet in a body, when you are pretty gummed up with mass, your intention is still quite good enough to intend the E-meter across the desk, or a crayon into the air, or the telephone receiver off the cradle. The ability to intend is all there is to a thetan's power. All you have to do to weaken a thetan is to foul up his intentions, which you can do by blunting or giving him loses on his intentions. Weakness is the only thing that traps the thetan, that holds him down, etc. So the main thing we have to watch in auditing is that we don't weaken the PC's own intention. Never blunt the PC's own intentions. To avoid doing this, we must differentiate between the PC's intentions and his bank dramatizations. Dramatizations are not intended. Validate the PC, not the bank. You don't ruin a PC by blunting his intentions, but you can key in incidents where his intention was blunted, if you interrupt a cycle of action half way through. Failure to complete auditing cycles validates the bank and blunts the PC's intentions. Getting the PC's goals for the session, if possible, is important in this regard. You should at least get them cared for as ruds, before getting the body of the session going, so that his GI's are in and his attention is free, so that he has had a win. In every PTP, the PC's intention has been blunted. A person makes no progress when he has a PTP, because his intentions are blunted. He has an intention, which something else counters with equal force, so that it hangs up in time.

Level V demonstrates this marvellously. "Oppose" was the way the power of the thetan was knocked out, by taking his goals and intentions and implanting an automatic blunting mechanism. The implant GPM's themselves oppose each other. Opposition is the keynote of an implant, and it is the only way in which they are aberrative. They have too little mass to be really upsetting by themselves. It is what has been done to intention that is upsetting. Children get spoiled, not because the get all the want, but because they get their reactive intentions validated, e.g. they get rewarded for tantrums, and they get their analytical intentions opposed. I.e. the child is not allowed to do what he wants analytically. The auditor who only pays attention to a PC when he ARC breaks is doing the same thing. PCs don't turn nasty. They get overwhumped by the bank when their own intentions are blunted, and the bank dramatizes. A person who is weakened is unable to hold anything at a distance, so everything collapses on him. If you don't so anything about the PC's intentions, you get the PC's dramatizations.

The auditor's intention is valuable to the session. Because he is less susceptible than the PC to dramatization in the PC's bank, his intention is senior to the PC's. But if the PC's intention is neglected, it weakens, and we get an increased chance of dramatization. The PC's analytical intentions are also valuable to the session. Down deep, the PC intends to get freedom and a return of power (i.e. a return of intention). He can now go all the way, if he works along a certain path. The intention for him to arrive is sotto voce in the PC and more explicit in the auditor, since the auditor isn't getting distracted by the bank. The PC can mix up freedom and escape, and not want to confront things. A person is weak to the degree that he has allowed his intention to be blunted and strong to the degree that his intention is free.

Thetans become worried about and hold back their intentions because they have been convinced that their intentions are out of their control and that they can cause bad effects as a result. If you asked a PC, "What intentions do you have to keep under wraps?", you would get a roaring automaticity.

Scientology can get ahead partly because people attacking scientology have no idea what our intentions are. "A world of no wars, no insanity, etc." is very unreal to them. They think, "That couldn't be their real intention," so they attack nonexistent intentions, which is why they come off looking like asses. If a case is recovering, he is really just removing his blunted intentions, i.e. he is removing the obstacles that he has put there or agreed to.

A doingness intention has time added to it. Therefore it is tied into the cycle of action. A pure intention doesn't necessarily involve time or a cycle of action, or space. You could make an intention in the past, present, or future. Time and space are the result of intention, which is senior to them. As a PC comes downscale to "normal" levels, though, his agreement with a cycle of action results in the disappearance of his intention out of the cycle of action. If you take someone who is having a terrible time, you can show him cycles of action, with short-sessioning, CCH's, etc. Eventually his own intentions start to free up out of the MESTiness of it all. The only way the auditor can foul this up is to leave his own cycles of action incomplete.

If we are going to have wins, we must validate analytical intention, knock out dramatizations, and complete cycles of action, by flattening processes, within the reality of the process involved, and in accordance with how much is there to be flattened. If you can get an auditing cycle completed, you will get a win. If you don't, you will get a lose. It is that simple.

6403C24 SHSpec-13 International City

A communication is necessary to stop fights, as well as to start them. The communications that start fights generally occur over distances that are quite great. The distances set up high voltages and the terminals have to shout too loudly, so the communication is imperfect. Great distance in communication enters confusion and misunderstoods. They have to shout at each other, so they consider that they are mad at each other. The leaders have the illusion that they are far enough apart to shoot at each other with impunity. One can blow up Moscow without destroying Washington. It is an illusion of security, lent by distance. But this is no longer true. None of these national governments can really operate broadly for everyone's benefit, but they try to go out and influence areas beyond their borders. The result is continual brushfire wars, e.g. Vietnam, where Washington and Moscow fight by proxy. The ultimate result is to bring about a dangerous environment.

In its obsession with "defense", the government absorbs tax money and spends it on arms. So we get economic upset and inflation because of a shortage of goods. Peace doesn't pay. Literally. If money won't buy things, it inflates. We are told that there are plenty of products in the U.S., but the inflation continues, because the U.S. dollar has gone international, and there is too little production elsewhere. Inflation leads to communism and no money. It leads to slavery, because no one can keep up with it. So everyone, therefore, has to turn to communism. Russia, however, has never succeeded in feeding its own people. One reason for this fact is Russia's defense budget and the large army that they maintain. Another is the fact that the communistic worker is perpetually on strike because he gets no reward for his labor. Politics has entered into economics, where it doesn't belong.

National degradation results from things like draft laws, which put people in a "no choice" scene, being where they don't want to be and doing things that they don't want to do. This leads to apathy. The governments are at war, not the individual. American and Russian farmers, when in comm, get along very well. Only when depersonalized as soldiers can people act for the organizations of earth

and slaughter each other. The planet is going to blow up or otherwise become very unpleasant unless some changes are made to bring about peace.

This has been a long think, [this question of how to promote peace --] ever since Egypt, in political spheres. A perhaps impractical but interesting solution is based on the fact that the two sides of the body would, perhaps, be at war, except for the fact that the left side of the brain controls the right side of the body and vice versa. So if Washington governed the U.S. from Moscow and Moscow governed Russia from Washington, the chances of war would be immensely reduced! Advancing the cause of peace pays nobody, as things stand now. And war does pay. "The more trouble there is, the more importance the political figure has.... Man deifies what causes trouble." Marie of Rumania had a very peaceful. prosperous government. But she didn't get lots of publicity or admiration. In the U.S., the war presidents are the ones who get remembered, not the peace presidents.

The common citizen, however, doesn't make his personal fortune out of such chaos. If Man is to make any real forward progress, he must have peace. The only way that a government would lay off income tax, for instance, would be if it weren't being faced with demands for military appropriations. Length of time since the last war determines the state of calm of a country. The easiest program for international sanity would be one of reducing strife and dissonance in the environment, making a less threatening environment, with less fixation on an unconfrontable future. A person with no future acts weird. Man is tied to the idea that he lives only once. This gives him a certain irresponsibility for the area he lives in. [Cf. Neville Chamberlain: "I bring you peace -- in our time."] Man won't buy the idea that he will live again. There is too much responsibility in this idea.

To have an effective world peace program, the following problems have to be solved:

1. The importance of the politician must be maintained. He has to keep his importance, or he won't support the program.

2. Continued activity for manufacturers and industry, so that the economy won't collapse without war industries.

3. Shortening of the comm lines among the capitols of the world, so that there is greater understanding.

4. Reduction of individual nations' initiatives for waging war.

5. Reduction of the danger in the environment.

6. Offering some startling, dramatic objective that is very complicated to bring about. You need some attractive, constructive, and hard-to-achieve goals.

The solution would have to be big enough to make the problem of war seem soluble.

LRH put this together initially as an exercise on capacities of OT's. One of the things that we have to remember is that we have a base, called "earth". We don't want the base any more enturbulated than it has to be, nor do we want the base so aware of itself as a base that it will resent being one. Also, there are exercises that one should be able to do to improve one's skill. They should not be of a hostile nature, at least towards this planet. I am being "very vague -- purposefully so -- but I think you understand me."

It takes a long time to develop a technology. We have the assets of our technology, so our interest in a peaceful earth is not only altruistic, but also a "first" dynamic interest in its continuance, so that our technology can survive. Earth also has value as a base because, for one thing, it is in a nice, quiet backwater of the galaxy and likely to be overlooked by others in the galaxy.

So LRH dreamed up a project on which thetans could work together. Its name became "The International City Project". LRH reached the conclusion that if all the nation's capitols were in one geographical area, all the major problems mentioned earlier would be solved. The governments would be far less prone to go to war. They would be close enough to each other to communicate easily. There would be no false security from distance. There would be a pleasant social atmosphere, with constant parties with heads of states, not just diplomats. The bombing of such a city would become a

rather remote possibility, "particularly if you never let people who seemed to be angry at each other leave the capitol at the same time!

This would create a problem of a long comm line to the home country. You would have to prevent the development of a new capitol in the home territory, by having the comm line go directly to separate states or counties. The comm lines from the governments would not go on a via to one major city or central point inside their countries, but would go to all the states, prefects, counties, or whatever. This would also prevent revolution in the home country. It would require building lots of comm lines. Also, building the new capitols in a new place would take an immense amount of building. Additionally, you would have an international parliament of earth, housed in a completely bombproof bunker under a mountain. It would have appropriate representation, based on population, production, etc. There would be plenty of politicking to keep the politicians happy.

The one-world-togetherness idea is a popular one on earth. If elementary steps are taken, the rest might follow easily. One preliminary step would be.

1. All governments turn over nuclear weapons and supplies to the U.N. immediately.

2. Have the U.N. and all governments select a site for and construct an international city, preferably in North Africa, on the Mediterranean coast, where land reclamation can expand its area and its comm lines can be easily centered.

3. Persuade all governments to move their capitols to International City, complete with heads of governments, confesses, and parliaments. Prohibit a secondary capitol or even a comm relay center within the country itself.

4. Secure comm lines and command lines from International City to each internal county or state. Regard each of these counties or states as an autonomous unit, under control of the government in International City.

5. Reorganize the U.N. on a formula recognizing land area, population figures, and production value. Remove all favored nations categories and the exercise of special privileged and the veto by a few. "Form the U.N. into a judiciary division, two houses, and an executive branch. Key officials [are] to be popularly elected ... within the nations that they represent, and by voting by both upper and lower U.N. houses for the head of the U.N." Reform the U.N. charter into an instrument specifically engaged in governing the heads of nations and international affairs. Forbid, in the charter, all interference with individuals or smaller communities.

6. Forbid all warlike treaties of "mutual assistance".

7. Create a small, effective military force for the U.N., abolishing all other war facilities.

8. Persuade international monetary activities to stabilize economics.

9. Limit what a national government should be up to in the U.N.

We go ahead with this plan on the basis that a general agreement among scientologists would push all the individual efforts into a coordinated activity, so that they would count. Here is a big plan that is sufficiently sloppy so that if it went pretty far awry, if everybody were moving in that direction, you would have some possibility of attaining the final objective. It has good "figure-figure" value. It is a sufficiently interesting plan that it would cause a lot of conversation. It also has a kind of lonely individuality, in that no one else is doing anything at all for world peace. It coheres what could be lots of individual actions. It is feasible, because it doesn't have to be done perfectly to be done.

Ideas from scientology occur and appear in the world to a surprising degree. So there is more chance of this plan coming to pass than one might think. If scientologists were involved in bringing about what amounts to a complete political revolution of earth, there would be good dissemination in it. Scientologists would be available to handle personal upsets, etc., so their influence would get expanded. Keep the word "scientology" parked somewhere on the fringes of this thing, and we would get a monopoly on mental healing within the boundaries of International City.

The main virtue of this plan is that there has been a complete void of ideas for world peace, and this is an intriguing one. It is something which, if adopted, would certainly make the planet less dangerous. It has its liabilities, but they are outweighed by its advantages. Someone could, perhaps, try to take over the central government and become a dictator, but this would be pretty hard to do. Hitler failed to take over the world. True, the International City arrangement does put all the political control in one place, "but it also puts into that [place] a lot of wily guys." Not being able to attain their political objectives by war, "they will try to attain them by diplomacy, and they would welcome the proximity of other capitols and a large legislature to lobby in.... They are not about to give this up [for] a dictatorship." They wouldn't cooperate with such a dictator.

What about national revolts? Well, "that possibility would be equally apparent to the head of every state in International City, and I think he would tend to govern in such a way that it wouldn't happen."

The political government of International City itself would be independent of the U.N. It would have enough force to balance any house guards or bodyguards that might be around. The product of this city government is the safety and security of individuals in International City. It would be kept as itself by being made very profitable, not political. International City would originally be financed "in such a way that it itself becomes a property which becomes very profitable to some people, it doesn't matter who. They would consider it a governmental responsibility because it is profitable.

The Russians would hate this last bit, but then they are always goofing up in that area anyway. "The way to have a calm International City is to make sure that the ownership of the land and property of International City brings in money to a small group who sit as a council in International City and make sure that things remain nice and peaceful and profitable." No politics would be involved. This makes International City a Hell of a piece of bait for some construction company. "After it has built its buildings, it is going to draw rent on [them] from here on out.... A member of that construction company is going to sit on the governing board of that city with no government over its head, and all it has to do is sit there and keep the peace in International City.... You've put a very hard core of very hard-headed guys who want to make awful sure that they keep dragging down the rent, you see, from the white house!"

You are also splitting up political control. "If you want to see a lousy capital, take a look at a capitol that is owned by the government. Governments take very bad care of [things they own], because there's no profit in it for anybody."

Our direct public interest in International City would be limited to acting as a clearing house for information concerning it. Overtly, it is something for scientologists to support, help out on, and talk about, just like everybody else. Covertly, it is a training ground for the budding OT, a nice exercise for him. It becomes very fruitful. It gives him something useful to do.

Perhaps the main thing that this plan offers is some hope for people. It gives the scientologist a town. It puts a piece of this planet into his hands to be interested in. I chose the location I did because it is where the oldest comm lines on the planet were located. There is a lot of coast and country in the area between Tunis and Tripoli. Many old comm lines have gone through that area. It should be fun for scientologists and OT's. It should create a fantastic amount of new wealth in a desert. It is busy. "It's a broad fourth dynamic method of de-dangerizing the environment -- as a process." Just saying that a feasible plan does exist puts in some hope, and to that degree, it de-dangerizes the environment. There is more future in it. It is a method of disseminating to the heads of nations in one small area, all at once.

We have had trouble with governments recently. They have been disrespectful. We shouldn't stand for it. The way you can really upset a government is to move its capitol. The fact that you are talking about moving all the earth's capitols depowers the nations of earth with regard to scientology. Even if they agree that it is a good thing to do, removing the nations' capitols from their positions makes the nations weak. A terminal is as powerful as it can hold its position. You are threatening them with not being able to hold their position. It puts scientology in a position of being of comparable magnitude the governments of earth, rather then just being of comparable magnitude to a single government, since it would be controlling the positions of all the governments of earth. They don't know the tech, so they couldn't explain the odd feeling that they would get at the idea of moving. They don't know that it is very important to hold a position if you want power. Just espousing such a plan would lead to a shift of relative power between you and the government. They would feel as though they were slipping.

If we hold to this as a central agreement, it will eventually come about. It depends for its power on interest. There is no moneyed group behind this, but there is "a huge vacuum provided ... that would pick up such people and put them into it. [But] then they are not now, i.e. won't then be, ... 'in back of' it, behind it. They're in it. We are in back of it."

6404C10 SHSpec-14 How to Manage a Course

[Some of the data in this tape is also covered in HCOPL 10Apr64 "Scientology Courses".]

There are three zones of responsibility in course management:

1. Providing valuable subject materials. Scientology now embraces and culminates anything desirable in the fields of religion, mysticism, spiritualism, or mental sciences, so we have valuable subject materials.

2. Organizing and codifying the materials so they are highly effective and comprehensible. LRH and MSH have figured out the right form and organization of a bulletin. There are twelve headings.

3. Instructing the student in those materials, to a high level of competency and comprehension.

The largest potential randomity comes in (3), above. Students need individual handling, to clarify their individual misunderstoods. There are no slow students. There are only slow instructors. A fast course is well instructed. A slow course is poorly instructed. A bad course gets bad enrollments. If you want a full course, give a well-instructed course.

We do have to develop methods of handling students who throw lots of complication and questions into learning the materials. The instructor's attitude should be very tough and very helpful. He should be able to discriminate between a student who is genuinely confused and is putting in some arbitrary of his own, and a student who is merely being an obstructionist. The instructor must not be concerned with the student's knowledge of inessentials, but must be very tough about the student's knowledge of essential material. Examine essentials only. Don't bother with inessentials. Instruction is fast to the degree that the instructor gets the essential data through to the student and gets the student off of his concern with bric-a-brac.

(Ill health depends on the broken dramatization of a GPM.)

6404C14 SHSpec-15 The Classification and Gradation Program

The classification program applies to auditors. For PCs, there is the gradation, or levels, program. Such a program became necessary as it became evident that no one was bringing people up the line from no reality to higher levels. The levels became necessary to bring the general public up the line on a gradient. What gave auditors trouble was that PCs didn't know anything about what they were doing or where they were going. In the West, there is no tradition of philosophy in practical life. The healing tradition is one of failed help. Since time immemorial, members of the public have had nothing but failed help. That is what the member of the public compares us to: psychiatry, etc. So people have no tradition of treatment, healing, improvement, ability, etc. There is no tradition of self-betterment. Our biggest task is to define scientology to people, where there is no datum to compare it to, no gradient, and no common communication ground, so they can't get their wits wrapped around scientology. The PC just sits there in the midst of confusion, getting "processed", without knowing what processing is. So we have to create, not only a science, but also a communication. Eighty percent of untrained people will vanish because they never got out of earlier practices that they didn't like. Auditors were losing these PCs because of not getting the PCs educated to know what they were in.

Furthermore, the auditor in the field was upset about PCs having to take a formal course, to get up to Class IV. So there is a compromise. The PC must get educated as he gets processes, but the training is done by the auditor, and the PC must pass training requirements. LRH proposes a checksheet to go before each grade, on which the PC will get checked out, before going on to the next level. The PC learns definitions. He gets an idea that there is something here that aligns with his goals. The PC failed in his goals a long time ago and is in apathy unless someone else helps him. Going on up to

Level IV, the PC would have to be trained on a clay table. This would never have been possible without line plots and goals plots. Even now, the PC needs good training to understand GPM's and to be able to follow commands about them. What's more, when he gets on up the line, he won't be a completely ignorant OT.

There are three routes to getting up the line:

1. The PC route.

2. The co-auditor route.

3. The classed (professional) auditor route.

On the PC route, a grade is something a PC has, that compares with the levels of scientology. The PC is not well-disciplined. LRH says that he has found it hard to audit someone right off the street or even to get him to answer a sensible question. Such a person re-interprets it, etc. This gets straightened out as he goes up the grades. Each grade has an ability that the PC attains. The PC's conquest of the environment is the index of his grade. This gives him a measure of his advancement. The grades are a gradient scale of confront of the environment. For instance, at Level III, the PC is not always dwelling on things that happened in the past. He has relative freedom from the past. There is a difference between hurting and worrying about hurting. At Level IV, the PC has stopped trying to make everybody wrong and himself right. Thus the levels are defined in terms of "abilities regained". Processing improves confront of the environment; so does training. Training gives the PC something to look forward towards instead of providing merely negative gain. A book can evaluate for a PC without the auditor having to.

An auditor can process a PC up to the Class that the auditor is trained to.

The second route is that of the co-auditor. On this route, a person isn't classified, but receives a certificate as a co-auditor. He may not charge for his processing or call himself a professional. He has been through the training courses, but he hasn't been classified. The co-auditor can get an HCA certificate, but not an HPA certificate. Someone who goes on through the academy and gets classed, gets the HPA certificate. He has been formally trained, examined, judged competent to audit PCs, etc. A person can co-audit, getting auditing in exchange for auditing. Sooner or later he will either get up to getting professional Class VI auditing or he will get on a Class VI course at a central organization and go up that way.

The professional or classed auditor gets his training, gets his classification, and now has some selectivity about his co-audit. He probably gets audited by another pro. He is likely to get more precise processing this way, and any errors would be remedied quickly. He would probably get up the levels rapidly. Furthermore, PCs can help him get further trained by getting him more PCs.

There are points in training that are easily overlooked or forgotten, no matter how much they are emphasized and stressed. These get straightened up when auditors come to Saint Hill.

The classifications for auditors are stiffened up, changing the original issue to this degree. Someone can go to the academy and get his certificate, but when he wants to be classed, he has to be good at that level. If someone has certificates up to Level IV but no classifications, he would have to get classed up from Class I on a tough requirement for actual performance.

All training and all courses depend on:

1. Having valuable material or data to impart. We've got that in scientology.

2. The material must be codified. In must be in a condition in which it can be imparted to others, so that it communicates.

3. The material must be instructed, because the questions that will arise will be individual to the student. Instruction consists of handling those questions by showing where the correct answer is. The second point is being handled now: to clarify, codify, and simplify the available material down to the necessary amount. There are only about thirty operations that cover all of auditing at all levels.

Instruction is the most random area, since different levels of application and understanding may be demanded of the person being checked out on a certain piece of data. Education should not be merely to keep someone occupied.

6404C16 SHSpec-16 Auditing By Lists

The Auditor is a success as a magazine. Fred Hare is the editor.

One of the goals series has turned out to be nonexistent. Why does it always take LRH to find these things? It puts a lot of responsibility on him. This puts some extra strain on his case. He is currently in a zone of over-correction, looking so hard for things wrong that all he finds is invalidation of what is right.

Auditing by list is done at Level III, the needle level. Lower levels are tone arm levels. Few auditors getting started in auditing are aware of the skill needed for good metering with the needle. Unlike the TA, the needle can be upset by session events, although the TA can show if the PC is not getting gain. But the process has a lot to do with the TA, too.

The needle registers first the session and second the process or reaction of the PC. A TA is "not a direct representation of the reaction of the PC to the session." The TA does not analyze the session beyond saying whether the PC is getting gain. "Not so the needle, [which] first and foremost registers the session and secondarily registers the process or reaction of the PC." The only difficult manifestation of the needle for the auditor to learn to cope with is the dirty needle. Its source is always the auditor, nothing else. It traces back to the auditor's failure to handle the auditing comm cycle, or the larger auditing cycle. The absolute of never having the PC's needle dirty is unattainable, but it is the auditor's reaction that produces the dirty needle, by not accepting his answer, not acknowledging, cutting his comm cycle, or whatever.

Level III is almost totally devoted to needle. At this level, if you follow the needle, you will get TA action, and if you don't, you won't. The PC may have no charge on a question. He may have no interest in it. If so, the needle will not register. If you miss seeing the no-reaction and give the question again, you get a read by virtue of the PC's considerations, protest, or whatever. The first reaction of the needle is to the session. The second reaction of the needle is to the process or question. If the auditor overlooks this, the PC goes out of session, and the needle will never clean up on the question, etc.

Therefore, you don't let auditors at Level III assess anything, since if they don't realize the read-on-session-first rule, they can foul up ARC break assessments repeatedly and worsen the ARC break.

The Mark V E-meter is beautifully balanced to read maximally on thought and minimally on body motions. It reads just below the PC's reality, at a level where the PC can have reality. The meter has a greater degree of workability than you will ever need, so calls for improvement are passe. A bad meter won't give you needle response on thought. When a needle is moving fast, you can miss reads because the inertia of the needle prevents a manifestation. If the needle is quiet, it is more sensitive.

If someone can really handle a meter at Level III, he will have no trouble with assessments at Level IV. At Level III, you have to learn to keep the needle clean by keeping the session good, so the session at no time gets in the road of the needle reads that you ars getting as you audit. Cleaning a clean causes the PC to go against the session. The needle is now not reading his bank. It is reading his reaction in the session. The auditor must know first that this can happen and second what to do when it does and how it manifests. LRH claims to have made all these errors, with the additional difficulty of not knowing that they were mistakes.

Any change of pace of the needle is a read. It will be discoverable by the PC if it read on the meter. On Level VI, there comes a time when the PC stops reading well on the meter anyway, because he doesn't have much reactive mind left, and the PC's postulates in session are what give rocket reads. If one has an ability with which one has lots of problems, there is reactivity mixed up in it, giving problems and taking the power out of the ability. Getting rid of the reactivity gives a person the full scope of his ability. The magnitude of his performance is then much greater. A PC who fears that he will lose his creative ability by getting rid of the bank needs to know this.

At Level III, of course, there isn't too much of a problem. The being is mostly reactive, and the needle behaves pretty well on reactivity and doesn't get in your face too much on the session. "Somebody can still be upset about the session and sometimes still even read a bit on the needle.... At Level III, the reactive read is larger than the analytical read." But you have to be able to keep the needle clean by keeping the comm cycle straight. And you have to be able to tell when the PC is running right and not in need of session-correcting. Don't harass the PC when things are going all right, and above all, don't blame the PC for the strange behavior of the needle. Be aware that something has happened in the session that is showing up on the needle.

Knowing these data, you can do auditing by list. Auditing by lists has nothing to do with assessment. "On auditing by lists, you are not interested in which level or item of the list reads [best]. You are simply interested in going down the list and making sure that each one in turn is cleaned up if it reads. You're not trying to go down a list and find one of those levels!" Assessment means reading down a list to find which item reads best, because that is the item. Auditing by list is no effort to find the item. It is just "making sure that each question, taken up in turn, is no longer reading, which requires ... reading the question to find out if it reads, and then continuing to get answers until [the question] no longer reads, noticing ... that the question is no longer reading, and passing on to the next." Differentiation between reads on the list question and session reads caused by the PC's reaction to something going on in session is a necessary part of this action, so you clean up the right things. [On the above, cf. Method 3 and 5 list handling.]

What if the needle gives one indication and the PC says something else? For instance, the PC may say, "No," and the meter reads. Then clean up possible session outnesses with "protest", "inval", and "cleaning a clean". Then recheck the question. This keeps the PC from being invalidated by your insistence on something's being there.

"These lists [by which you are auditing] are nothing more than the plus-minus misdemeanors and upsets that a [person] could have." An auditor should be able to make up a list for a particular PC. Only a few prepared lists can be done over and over again. L1 and L4 are the lists used for auditing by list, with the questions asked for a broad scope. You can alternately clean L1 and L4 and keep getting different areas cleaned up. Rudiments and prepchecking are, in fact, a kind of auditing by lists. "Level III is that level where you clean the list.... If [one] can get through that, then [he] can assess." At Level IV, you are using a list in a different way. You are looking for the level to use in looking for a service fac.

The reads that you get at Level III are much tinier than what you will get at Level VI, so don't take little reads at Level VI. A PC who has been ARC breaky gets all his BPC cleaned up and will come up shining, when audited by list on L1 and L4.

6404C21 SHSpec-17 Problems and Solutions

There are some research maxims standing apart from and monitoring the body of scientology, having to do with how you figure it out. Excalibur was a whole book-full. Some of these maxims are in Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science. These maxims give the rationale and the how of how you figure it out. Every once in awhile, one of them gives you a grip on existence.

For instance, one maxim was, "Take a body of knowledge that has produced bad effects and results. You move it out and pay no further attention to it." You can eventually corral the truth by elimination, by this approach. You use this all the time when analyzing cases. You see what didn't work, so you don't run the PC on that. The reverse maxim doesn't happen to be workable. Something having been true in one instance doesn't prove that it has any wide workability. Auditors who don't realize this get stuck in a win with some offbeat process or approach, and wind up with failures.

In trying to pilot a way through the goals plot, when items read one day and not the next, when they checked out and then turned out to be something else, LRH had a datum to cover the situation: "A problem is as complex as it presents potential solutions." It is the number of solutions, not their complexity, that determines the complexity of a problem. This defeats the idea of the "one shot clear", beautiful though the dream may be. The problem of government must be terribly complex, since it has had many many solutions. It is not that a big solution equals a big problem. It is that a complex problem equals many solutions. This could be the situation that you are faced with when a PC doesn't respond well to processing. It could be that you have a complex case on your hands that will only be

resolved by a complexity of processes. If a person's problem in life has required many solutions, then it must be very complex and will require a complexity of processes to resolve. Simple solutions don't work on complex problems. You don't resolve all political problems by voting democratic.

There is another maxim: "A solution must be as complex as the potentials of the problem." In this context, "potentials, means "threats along the dynamics. Here, you are talking about a dangerous problem. For instance, a problem that has the potential of knocking out survival along various fronts is a big problem. You will get defeated if you offer a simple solution. If a person has a dangerous problem and you give him a simple solution, he will reject it. Problems that are simple don't become dangerous. Only complex ones do. They require complex solutions. If this were not the case, the person would have solved the problem already. A problem wouldn't be dangerous if the problem hadn't been allowed to coast along pretty far.

The proper course of action in handling a problem is to find out all aspects of the problem that must be solved. There are bound to be some that are not apparent at first. Find how many solutions will be needed. You could look it over by dynamics. The procedure is:

1. Get what the immediate pressure is. Indicate that there has to be a solution.

2. Get the situation differentiated out into its component problems. Indicate the necessity for a solution for each.

This takes the confusion out of the situation. Just getting the guy to sort it out makes him feel better, because he can now at least see the area better. Also, you have put the buffer of needed solution" in front of every element of it. The PC will be half way handled just by that action. Then you can find solutions on a gradient. He could start gradiently to see which problem could be solved now. This makes Level 0 a breeze, when it is usually rough. Level 0 is rough because most people's problems are so big that they don't know they have them. They don't look at the importances in their vicinity at all! Man is in this condition because no solutions have been possible. Simple solutions to complex problems fail. The International City idea is good and complicated. It has to be, because of the size of the problem that it is trying to solve. The usual solution, "Vote Republican!." is utterly useless.

As you go up the levels, it may appear that you are confronting more complex problems, but actually both problems and solutions become simpler, as you go up the levels. As you go up, you are actually confronted with fewer problems and fewer demanded solutions. The psychologist and psychiatrist think that you go down through Man's psyche to the bottom. They are wrong. You are there. You have to go up, to heightened awareness. A person on his way up has to get more and aware of kinds of awareness and of existence. His only route is up. Psychiatrists think that you have to go down in Man's psyche to get to rock-bottom motivations, etc., through three or four sub-volitional layers. This is untrue. You don't go down in Man's psyche. You are there. There isn't any hidden, deep motivation. All you have left is the individual, and he is motivated. You have to go to higher levels. "This fellow hasn't got an unconscious to be probed. He is unconscious." The psychiatrists are looking for the wrong thing. They are looking for the hidden depths below a guy's level of awareness. Those "deeper levels of unconsciousness" that they are looking for are sitting in the chair right in front of them. It is not the recesses that are hidden. You can't get the individual further down, with drugs, etc., and learn anything. In order to discover anything about the individual, you've got to make the individual more aware, not make him less aware, in order to find out more about him. Psychiatrists are asking the fireman in a ship to help them find the fireman. And the fireman, having lost his identity and beingness, will willingly try to help out by looking for himself. You are looking for Man's spirit, but he is the spirit.

A thetan's increasing awareness of his beingness, his awareness of existence, and the problems and solutions of life are what delineate the seven levels of processing. You could draw up the levels just by asking people at various levels, "What is a problem to you?" If a person's awareness of his relationship to existence is increased, you can bring about a heightened condition of livingness, performance, ability, etc. And that is the only way to do it, regardless of claims for drug enlightenment or high performance on drugs. Drugs reduce awareness. People can think that they perform better when drunk or drugged. That is because they are less aware of their condition.

The "logic" that if we became a little less conscious, we would be a lot better off has been extant since the beginning of this universe. The "final solution" to problems has been to become unaware of them. The penultimate solution is, "I'm doing right," the assumption that whatever you are doing is right.

So if someone wants to improve himself, he has two courses:

1. To become more aware.

2. To become less aware and hope that you don't get run over. The latter is treacherous. It is hoping that everything will be all right. Hope substitutes for control, confront, awareness, and certainty. "I'll just forget about it and hope that it doesn't bother me. I'll become less aware," is the idea. For instance, women in the 19th century fainted as a solution. This is like the "black panther" mechanism, only worse, because one is not simply ignoring the black panther; one is becoming unaware. People get somewhat terrified when you reverse the flow on them and get them to confront all the things of which they have become unaware.

The trick of becoming unaware is that you never actually get there. "This universe [is] a progress towards less and less awareness. It's the route to total sleep. And the trick ... is that it's so rigged that you never get to sleep. The lower you go, the more problems you've got, because now the littler problems seem bigger." Becoming unaware of the big problem brought the thetan less power or force. It reduced his confront. So now he is less able to confront little problems, so the little problem now seems as big as the big problem seemed one stage back. It seems far more threatening. The power and threat of the big problem is vested now in the smaller one. There was a bigger problem of the same gradient that he had ceased to confront: [say, a gale]. He became unaware of it almost purposely, and this put him into a confront only of a slight wind. But the big problem was full of terror, so the breeze is full of terror. There is the trick of uncovering hidden memories. Occasionally you can uncover memory by trickery, and increase the PC's awareness slightly, and he will lose a little fear, but it doesn't improve his condition much. He just shifts to another fear. ["symptom substitution"] "All little fears are irrational and are based on a bigger fear." Freud pointed this out. This happens because "the individual solves the bigger fear by becoming less aware. You can find the bigger fear that caused the lesser fear. This is what Freud was looking for. But you can also throw the PC into the bigger fear and knock him for a loop, by not bailing him out. You mustn't increase a person's awareness beyond his ability to confront. He has the choice either to cognite or to bolt. He is very likely to bolt. That is why analysands commit suicide in analysis, when they do. Don't process by reaching into the deeper states to find the fears that motivate this individual. "There is no deeper subconscious for the individual to go [into]."

If you exteriorize a person without taking off the charge of why he was in his head, if you take him out of his head and make him confront problems that he had gone into his head not to have to confront, you will find that now you can't get him out again with a can opener.

You can put someone into a higher level of awareness. He now becomes aware of the problems that he has not handled. This alone makes it necessary for him to progress by gradients. You will make it as long as you let him sit down for awhile and enjoy the view. He is a victim of self-created charge, great masses of it. When he gets more aware, he backs off from it. You have to take charge off by getting TA action. Then he can easily move up to where you can get more charge off. It is not a spectacular activity. As the PC moves up the line, his problems look bigger, but only because he can see more.

"Reduce the complexity of the problem by reducing yesterday's solutions." This is the key to processing. A person at Level 0 has dangerous problems and must have complex solutions. How do we get around all this? The old solution is what he is sick from. Cures, cures, cures: It is no use to solve somebody's problems for him. What gets us away from this is that we aren't giving people solutions.

The basic error is the most fundamental part of the problem that can be as-ised, because of the chain of solutions. As an auditor, you "are not giving the PC new solutions for his livingness. You are taking out of existence old solutions, which now exist in the form of problems.... You're as-ising what has been solved in the past [and caused the person to] become more unaware.... You're as-ising old problems." You are as-ising past solvents. You are backtracking the way he came down. Running solutions is running yesterday's problems. You are taking out the old think that made him drop doing and be [un]aware. On R1C and R1CM [This is R1C with the meter. You follow the BD after you complete the cycle of action you were on. See p. 623, below.] you are backing the PC through yesterday's problems, by getting his solutions. If you run such a thing as a problem, you are running it below its proper level of awareness. Here is the trick: A problem, by definition, is something that you can't confront, and a solution is a way by which you don't have to confront something. So your

effort to handle the problem is to solve it, and if the way in which you solve it is to become less aware of it, you have moved into lower awareness levels. You are looking at yesterday's solutions. Whether you are running problems or solutions, you are actually running solutions. When you ask for problems, you are asking for something that the PC couldn't confront. When you ask for solutions, you are asking for something that the PC could confront. Running problems requires you to confront only the PC's no-confront. Therefore, you don't run problems. You run solutions, which latter really are problems, but which can be confronted. "It's the difference between running no-confront and confront ... , [though you are actually running the same thing, from a different point of view.] If you call them problems, then you are saying the individual couldn't confront them. If you [call them] solutions, then you are saying [he] could." So when you run solutions, you get rid of the problems that he sets up to avoid confronting things, by backtracking his solutions.

When you do this, the PC becomes more aware and more capable of confronting, up to the point where he can confront the problems that made him decide to become unaware in the first place, and he finds that those, in turn, were solutions, so he finds out what that was a solution for, etc., and he is all set to move on out to freedom. This way out is Route 2.

This principle holds true all the way up. GPM's were very complex solutions, which must have had complex problems behind them. The main problem was an unwillingness to confront. So you don't ask the PC to confront it all at once. You do it gradiently. That is why levels are there. They are there on the basis that the individual, at any given time, is at his lowest level of awareness. You bring him up from there, not down." [You] reduce the complexity of the problem by reducing yesterday's solutions." You've got to walk him back up into further awareness for him to hold his own in the environment he has now entered. That is how to process someone. That is why a manic sometimes turns on, where the PC gets boosted up a bit too high for him at a particular time.

So realize that you are getting off the charge that debars the individual from confronting the problems that he has. The most complex being you will confront is the lowest-level PC. If you reduce the complexity of the problem by as-ising yesterday's complex solutions, you can get charge off, and the PC can act better now, because his awareness level came up. When you first ask for a datum, you won't get it, but you will get off charge. Then, when you ask for the datum again, since you have gotten charge off the area, you will get it. This is how processing works.

"The road into this universe is successive unawarenesses, and the road out is successive awarenesses.... He got himself into trouble by solving himself into trouble.... There are no lower levels of awareness for you to explore. There are only upper levels." The road out is not spectacular. You take the PC out via the road he came in: successive unawarenesses undone.

6404C28 SHSpec-18 Wisdom as an Auditor

Australia is in only one difficulty: They have yet to follow an instruction or order. Scientology is under investigation by the Australian government, which should beware, because when you cut a theta comm line, you will get an explosion. This is because the secret of power is that truth is on a theta line. Power is truth. You can extend untruth in a certain direction and derive power from it for a certain time, but what you are really deriving power from is the amount of truth in the situation. Censorship is a cutting of a theta line. So is failure of the mail, interruptions, etc. No government ever survives a war. You get a new regime, at least. The government that caused or allowed the war cuts the natural being-to-being comm line and gets thrown out as a result. The violence of the war is secondary in effect to this: the result of cutting the natural theta-line between people. The effect of this is obscured because the same being or state may still be there. The war itself is temporary. The real effects of the war last much longer, when the violence recoils upon those who started it. This is the mechanism that gives people their almost pathetic belief in retribution. You have to cut or interfere with a flow before you get much of an explosion as a result of a flow. The cutter of the ARC will explode, sooner or later.

The whole auditing cycle is based on this, and this is the mechanism that causes the ARC break that results from a cut comm line. This can happen in auditing, with a rough auditing comm cycle. A cut theta line in session gives rise to an ARC break. It is always the auditor who started it, and he usually started it much earlier than he would have thought. The result is that you get a dirty needle, then a stuck TA, then an ARC break, maybe 1 1/2 hours after the first auditor mistake. If the auditor doesn't realize what he has done, he is confused and mystified about where this explosion came from. That is

why the auditor should tape his sessions and find the point where he cut the PC's comm line. A cut ARC line is similar to a cut itsa line. The comm lag can be an hour, which makes it hard to spot. The first minor mistake is the starting point which permits further mistakes, PC loss of ARC, etc. The auditor can see it coming before the ARC break hits. His error there is to ignore it and hope it will go away. This is the black panther mechanism. You can make a lot of mistakes, but never be dishonest about your mistakes, or you become unreal to others. The mistake should be handled when the first signs of it show up.

In looking for the point of cut comm, you can find all sorts of by-passed charge. You could take someone and treat this as a front-rank auditing problem, by running, "When has your ARC been cut?" This can't be run as the only process, since it is an out-of-ARC process. You could knock a PC to smithereens with a process like, "Look around here and tell me something you could go out of ARC with." Anything similar to that will do someone in, because it cuts his comm line, right and left. "Look around here and tell me something you don't have to have," would be a killer, too.

The way the psychologist gets in trouble is in not knowing this datum, nor the datum that a thetan never gives up. A thetan never gives up. He says he does, and that fools people, but he never really does. The way to handle a revolutionary is to channel his revolution slightly, not to stop him in his tracks with force. People get fooled because the guy will say he has given up, but this is window dressing. If you see a nation that can't produce, you know that it is composed of people who are unwilling to do or support what they are being required to do or support. (Cf. Castro) There can be communication, but if there is no reality or affinity, and no ARC returned from people to government, you would only get a shadow of return flow from the people.

You can make a tremendous number of mistakes, but don't be dishonest about them. That breeds unreality. Self-immolation isn't the answer, either.

Complete ignorance results in great bravery and lots of opinions. A system of education based on non-inspection, like that of scholasticism, results in something like the Dark Ages. It cuts the ARC of knowledge. Part of being a wise individual is being able to perceive when and where one's ARC is being cut. This would be a person's ability to exercise wisdom. When there is a problem with a group, wisdom consists of discovering what A, what R, and what C is being cut between what terminals. You could locate the problem in the group by finding the area of maximal confusion, e.g. the area of maximal number of dispatches, and minimal production. There must be two terminals, where one is trying to flow ARC and the other is trying to cut it, or both are trying to flow some ARC and also cutting it. Get the terminals involved and find what is being cut by which (it could be both). Locate the cut A, the cut R, and the cut C. Then unblock the ARC.

All PTP's are suspended and non-delivered communications. You can't run out a PTP by running undelivered communications, because the person with the PTP went ahead and solved it, which stuck it. You can't solve the problem for him and have any beneficial result. Solving others' problems doesn't work. [Witness the poor results obtained in marital counselling.] Give someone a hand? Sure. So how do you unravel a messed-up being? You have to find what his ARC for his environment is. You will find that his C is to nobody; it is at people. His R is continually changing and full of doubt, so it is shot, and his A is a toss-up between his hating everybody and/or their hating him. A one-shot, very limited process you could use to alter it is, "What communication have you been unable to deliver?" This is not a repetitive question, and it should not refer to the past, because the guy wants to do it right now:

If you keep trying C without R and A, you spin in, because of the incomplete cycle of communication. This could have something to do with people getting spun in by prayer. They can't locate the terminal [God, J, Virgin Mary, Saints, etc.] so all the communications go undelivered.

How does Q and A, a failure to complete a cycle of action, tie in with cutting ARC? An incomplete cycle of action causes an undelivered communication, which involves a cut theta line. Thus it is inevitable that you will blow up as his auditor.

"I have two different frames of reference by which to look at an auditor's auditing. One is teaching him how to do it and whether he is doing it the way he should be doing it, and the other is, 'What did he do that is making him do it wrong?'" i.e.:

1. What is he doing wrong?

2. What is happening in the session that throws him off, so that he errs?. Under the second heading, "I always assume he knows perfectly how to do it, but that something is disturbing him.... I start looking for something that has gone adrift in his auditing.... I don't immediately then go into the subject of dressing him up on the subject of drills.... You have to have two frames of reference: a critique of his ability to handle preclears and a critique of his ability to handle drills." If he knows how to do the drill, he has fouled up on handling a PC. It could be as corny as giving the PC an undelivered communication, with an R-factor that says, "We won't cover what we were on last time, because we have finished that," when the PC had more to say.

An overt act is the other side of the coin from the undelivered communication. It is a communication that one didn't want to deliver but did deliver. What saves your bacon in auditing is that the overt act is worse than the undelivered communication, in terms of aberrative value, because you have now perverted the theta line by causing it to deliver harm. This really mucks up a theta-line. Our materials are not a dramatization of parts of the bank, luckily. LRH has gone through moments of fear that such things as the tone scale were based on implants or GPM's. They are not. We understand the situation that we are looking at so well that we sometimes err by injecting more into things than are there. All the other data about problems are true, but a problem is still basically an undelivered communication. An overt act [actually, a withhold is not a problem. It is a withdrawal from putting out an ARC line, because you know that you will abuse it. It is a self-discipline to prevent abuse of ARC. The basic withhold is, "don't cause harm". This is more fundamental than GPM's. It is a complex reason for undelivered communication. O/W is an undelivered communication. The thetan delivered it far too well, so he had better not deliver any other comm along that line, and he better not have delivered that one. Look at a person with a lot of PTP's. You could say the following about him:

1. He is having an awful time, for whatever reason, because

2. He is braking himself because he might communicate, and therefore he is withholding because.... These are all rationales. Basically:

1. He is in that state.

2. He is there because he hasn't delivered a communication.

(The ARC break process depends on regretted communication.)

The only way you can run an out-of-ARC process is to make it an alternate process with a positive side. It is then barely workable. It doesn't necessarily run well. The only difficulties in this universe or out of it are based on these factors: What comm aren't you delivering because you have delivered lousy comm? You may have to approach it through A and R, but you want to increase C.

6404C30 SHSpec-19 Effectiveness of Processing

The Australian flap was caused by one PC, Wern, who had a psychiatric history and couldn't have passed a sec check. He got run on Level VI material, flipped out, and went to court. The legislature has been investigating. Upper-level materials have been appearing in court. A document has turned up showing collusion and plans for how witnesses should testify. The org is ignoring instructions to use the document, because of their lawyer's advice. The lawyer is protecting the government of Victoria! And cables keep coming through, begging for money. This has interrupted research. It shows what happens when an org goes off-policy and you can't get orders executed. Policy has been developed out of past errors. When it is ignored, errors appear and trouble follows. Jane Kember took two years to put Johannesburg back together after they went off-policy.

The effectiveness of processing and effective processing is you, the auditor, bringing about a desired effect on the PC. That is your one activity. This applies also to your activities as an instructor, a lecturer, or just to the way in which you produce an effect on someone you are talking to.

One can produce an effect through threat of destruction and by destruction. That is fifty percent of existence. Fifty percent of all effects in this universe are produced by force. If we study that fifty percent, we will find that "nearly all mental healing activities drift into it." This includes electric shock, etc. It is the solid form of effect. Psychiatrists do not realize that they are trying to influence thought. They have no definition of thought. They don't even think that anything is there thinking. They are

trying to influence matter. Man, to them, is matter, and they are using matter to influence matter. They are actually in the field of physics. So an auditor runs a danger in operating in the remaining fifty percent, producing beneficial effects. The danger is that the auditor will leave the other fifty percent on automatic and occasionally drift over into it. Thus everything may be fine for awhile. Then the auditor suddenly explodes. [This may be the mechanism of failed help = destroy.] An auditor, in blowing up at a PC never has and never will have a good effect on the PC who provoked it. What cures you of doing that is finding, on Level VI, that you did have it all upside down and backwards and that you did actually skip a whole Code on the PC. Ultimately, you keep to the Auditor's Code for your own good as an auditor, since violating it makes auditing much harder.

Taken at random, fifty percent of effects would be destructive. Fortunately, by the laws of life, it is the other fifty percent that has lasting benefits. Eradication has to be 100 percent to be effective. A purity of destruction would be a not-thereness, but destruction doesn't go in that direction. It leaves a pile of rubble. An as-ising of a situation is not looked on as destruction. It is seen as a constructive, beneficial action. Actually, it is an ultimate in the fifty percent-destruction bracket. If you want to free someone, you don't just blow up the jail he is in and create a shambles.

So the effect that you are trying to produce on the PC is simply to set him free by as-ising that which is keeping him caged, without knocking him around or leaving rubble around. It is actually pretty easy to do. The way you would leave rubble around would be by giving advice but not as-ising anything. You have launched an other-determined action. You have set up conflict between two or more other terminals. Life could be handled by setting it into more violent counter-motions, as in war. This leaves lots of debris.

Those are the mechanics by which life handles its problems, i.e. counter-motions, terminals vs. terminals, etc. As an auditor, you are being asked to decry and put aside the standard dramatizing actions that life is prone to. You are asked to assume a better, more workable discipline. You are asked to find out what the problem is, what considerations they have had about the problem, and what they have done to solve it. We find that these are the building blocks of the prison:

1. The problem itself.

2. What they have said the problem was, or what has caused it.

3. Solutions they have had. That is all the cage is built of:

1. Conceive the problem was there.

2. Alter-is it.

3. Keep on solving it.

There doesn't have to have been a problem before someone conceived of it, since a thetan is always capable of postulating. Then he justifies it, assigns it to someone other than himself and makes that person cause, and then starts solving the wrong problem. He will submerge the problem. The solution now becomes a problem to him. So he solves that one, etc., etc. Eventually all he knows about it is that he is unhappy, abstracted, and can't concentrate. That is the prison that he has built.

As an auditor, your art is in as-ising these bits and pieces, rather than adding to them by giving him new solutions. If you give the PC a command that would as-is some problems and you fail to discover that the PC is doing something other than the command you gave him, he won't improve. You may then change processes, still get no improvement, and end up mad at the PC. You would thereby have slipped over into the other fifty percent of effect-production.

The only reason why an auditor would start this cycle would be from failing to understand that he is supposed to be knocking out aberration, not letting the PC add to it.

Another deficiency in delivering processing to the PC is where the auditor fails to realize that a problem has gone. green auditor may not know that things blow by as-ising, just by the PC's inspecting things and communicating them to the auditor. There could be too little horsepower in the problem for the PC even to cognite, it is so insubstantial. There is nothing more to it than its isness. Be on the lookout for the problem's having blown on the comm cycle alone, before you have a chance to "handle" it. The

new auditor may never realize that this as-ising is what his training in TR's, comm cycle, etc., are for. Ideally, you want the PC to blow by inspection, remember.

On the other hand, the auditor can get so used to things blowing, fast that he gets a shock when something doesn't. He has run into one of life's little problems that, instead of floating free, has roots. Problems come in two kinds:

1. Loose problems.

2. Problems that have roots. Some things that worry people don't have deep roots. Then there are a fee subjects and items that are just little flags, which turn out to be very deeply anchored indeed, and which don't blow. Don't mistake the one for the other. If you do, you will get overrun or unflat processes.

(R1CM is R1C with the meter. Follow the BD, after you have completed your cycle of action.)

It is a mistake to take up something that has a flag that goes all the way to China but gets no needle reaction or TA BD -- only a clean rise, when it is mentioned, although it is something that does bother the PC. It may be an obvious condition, like the PC's wife leaving him, or his lumbosis. But the more you talk about it, the more trouble you have, because as you force the PC into a recognition of the reality of that condition, you pin him to his most fundamental bank. The condition will be something the auditor brought up. It is an unreal subject to the PC.

The only cage that the PC can as-is is the one that he is aware of. You can force the PC into oddball modifications. This is where testing dead-ends, because you can read deeper into the psyche than the PC can as-is. [LRH recounts a papier-mache incident.] The PC's head may be made of papier-mache, and this may be very obvious to the auditor, but the auditor must not evaluate for the PC. The PC can't as-is anything that he isn't aware of, and if he is not aware that his head is made out of papier-mache, and if it doesn't read on the meter, don't try to handle it. If you do, you can restimulate the PC without any hope of destimulating him. "If it reads on the meter, it has a potential of being real to the PC." The meter has the value of only reading on things that are real to the PC. If it doesn't read, it is unreal or it is well suppressed. "You can as-is in a PC what [he] has reality on." This takes a bit of cage away, so he can see more and as-is more.

You could do almost anything on a PC if you audited him on what he could recognize, things he had reality on. That is the magical trick. Everybody has some level of reality on A, R, and C, so they can get something out of processes involving ARC, no matter what level the PC is at. Stick to what is real to the PC.

"'Look around here and find something that's really real,' ... is probably one of the most nebulous [commands] ever [given]. But [the PC] walks over and picks up that wire over there and he says, 'That is very, very, very real:' I don't know what he means, but it means he can recognize a ... wire. I don't know what he means! I don't even know what he means when he says he can recognize it: But it means to me, for the benefit of just the process itself, that he can see it, recognize it, and direct his attention to it. Great! That's all I'm asking. I don't care what else he means.... What goes on in the PC's head when he answers that question? Wow!" Who knows? (Who cares?) The only time you would care is if the guy was being glib.

Beware of the PC who runs glibly, rattling off answers, etc. It is an automaticity of a circuit answering for the person. The PC may come up to awareness of somatics that he has had all along. Learn to look at a PC from the viewpoint of what the PC can see. The auditor's ability to estimate what he has as-ised is part of his effectiveness in auditing. "You've got to know what you've [already just] taken care of, and therefore you have to know how it is taken care of. It is taken care of by being perceived and as-ised, and that's the only way it is taken care of. You ask the PC to look at something you know he can look at. He looks at it, and he as-ises it, and that's the end product of [all] auditing."

It is all very well to have theories about what is wrong with the PC, as long as you don't try to get the PC to as-is your concept of what is wrong.

Actually, the division of the world into the destructive and the constructive is an artificial one. At the top of the scale, there is only the free, since as-isness is destruction. [Paradoxically, what, at a lower level, is viewed as constructive (as-ising) is actually destructive, and what, at a lower level, is viewed

as destructive (force, suppression) is actually constructive, in that not-is-ness causes persistence.] Auditing is simple, because it evades the complexities of life by undermining them. If auditing were a solution to life, it would have to be as complicated as life. Fortunately, it isn't. It is an as-ising of life.

6405C19 SHSpec-20 The PC and Getting Auditing to work

Any auditor who is having a hard time making auditing work has a mystery about how auditing can occur, whether he knows it or not. He has assigned some value to auditing that is different from and extraneous to the actual value of auditing. He looks for something more complicated than what is there. If a student is having trouble, a third of the time it will resolve if you ask him why auditing doesn't work and remove that barrier to his understanding of why it does work. The session will be unmanageable to the auditor if he has trouble with his comm cycle, doesn't understand why auditing works, and the PC introduces normal or extreme amounts of randomity into the session, with his own out-comm-cycle. As an instructor, you have to get as much confusion out of this as possible. A person who can't get auditing to work is likely to have hidden standards. You can ask:

"Why doesn't auditing work?" and "Why does auditing work?" and 2WC it. A person can't understand why it works because he understands why it doesn't work, and he is caught in this. Discussing why auditing doesn't work is not quite auditing, because you are taking TA blowdowns on what he has told you and getting him to relate these blowdowns to the question of why auditing doesn't work. You are steering him towards a cognition that will straighten out his auditing.

Another third of the time, you can fix the erring auditor by getting him to discuss help. You do rot get him to discuss failed help, because you will run into the line plot. He may spot some weird stable datum on help that impedes his ability to help or be helped. Take up whatever BD's you get independently, and clean them up, so he will start using the comm cycle. The comm cycle is [almost] too easy to use, as long as the auditor's intention towards the PC is good, and he is trying to assist the PC. The things that make a person unable to use the comm cycle are those things that make a person believe that he cannot or should not assist. PCs who get no TA action also have one of these buttons awry, so this procedure works well on PCs, too.

The third category is more esoteric. It is very interesting. It could be called, "Life Among the Lowly." (This was the subtitle of Uncle Tom's Cabin.) People who are being hounded by life, who are under duress, tend to offer up super-sympathy and grief at the same time that they are knocking someone's head off. There is a mechanism here, by which the lowly hold the lowly down, which is pretty vicious. It is the "Poor you!" mechanism, how you, he, or they were wronged. It is the victim syndrome: "You are a victim." This is the common denominator of sociology. It is why someone can never get out of the slum; it is how people get trapped. We had this ourselves in the early days of dianetics. LRH got away from it, seeing that if you can't take responsibility for your own actions, if you can't recognize the cause of your own difficulties, then you are in a trap and will continue in a trap forevermore. For any "war against poverty" to be effective, it would have to contain an understanding of why people in groups remain poor.

"An individual must accept his own responsibility and his own ability as cause before he can run off his overts. You can't get off overts if you can't recognize yourself as cause. You can't get out of a rat race unless you recognize your overts." You keep someone in a rat race if you don't let him recognize his overts, e.g. by saying, "Poor you! Look how you have been wronged!" You are telling the person that he was incapable of cause. You are directing his attention to moments when he was not at cause and pointing out to him that he doesn't cause things. They just happen to him. You put him into the dwindling spiral and hold him on the bottom of the heap forever, by "convincing him that he has been wronged, and that he himself never wrong[ed] anybody.... 'You never had a chance!'"

How does a person become obsessed with a problem? "Obsessed with a problem" describes 90% of your PCs. They are stuck in some problem, via the O/M sequence. They never recognize their own overt in the area, so they get stuck in it. There are several systems that can be used to unpin them. Chief among these is the O/W system. You can't get your hand cut off in a buzz-saw without reaching for the buzz-saw and somehow putting yourself in the vicinity of the buzz-saw. Invented overts, as in a guilt complex,

That is just another alter-is, so watch out for this and be sure that the PC doesn't give you untruths. All dwellingness on a subject is associated with overts against that subject. You cure it with one or

another version of O/W. This is something that is part and parcel of life, which is senior in its power even to GPM's. You could be free of GPM's and still be subject to the consequences of your overts. So it is always safe and indicated to audit O/W.

Auditors do this industriously but not always well. They can make a complete mess of it, chopping comm cycles, buying trivia as overts, having mutual out-ruds, etc. The reason tacit consent enters auditing, when it does, is because of the victim syndrome mentioned above. It has entered the session to some degree. When this happens, there is some thread of "Poor you: You've been wronged!" in the session. If the auditor sits there and buys motivators, he is not auditing the PC at cause. He is "auditing the PC at effect, and so the PC will not get better." Nothing can hold onto a thetan. If he gets caught, he must have grabbed hold and forgotten that he has grabbed hold, to be trapped. What he grabbed hold with is overts. It is his own actual GPM's that are holding him. If you don't get him to spot his overts, you are dramatizing "Life Amongst the Lowly", the reason why people cannot get out of slums, the victim syndrome. Slums operate on the basis of, "You can't do anything about it. Luck is all that can help. How you have been wronged!", etc. That is why you see numbers rackets and lucky charms in slums. "You can't do anything," is the message of social welfare, labor relations, the "war on poverty", etc. A thetan basically doesn't want to commit overt acts. When he does commit them, he pulls himself back and withholds himself.

How does this affect the auditor who can't audit? It is not as simple as, "They believe that they have been wronged, so you have to get their overts off." It is that "this person has been so wronged that [he has] no longer any concept of an overt." The Christian ran into this from another angle, with the idea of repentance. He wanted people to admit guilt, which is an inversion. People get off false overts in an effort to repent enough. This doesn't free them. The "guilt complex" leads to an inversion, where the person isn't getting off actual overts, but is really bragging about overts that he would never have the guts to commit. Don't let the PC do this. Check for untruths.

If a guy is in a victim valence, you get him to define an overt act and then get him to tell you why it isn't an overt. You will get an automaticity! There is no reality on it as an overt act. So you have to follow the reality scale and find something, possibly quite mild, that he knows and feels is a real overt act. Do this on a discussion basis, getting why it wasn't an overt act, not as an auditing action. Once you get something the person really considers to have been an overt act, you might run out his justifications for having done it. [See HCOB 7Ju164 "Scientology III and IV: Justifications" and HCOB 8Ju164 "Scientology III and IV: More Justifications"] You then proceed on a gradient. Nobody in prison has ever committed a crime.

6406C09 SHSpec-22 The Cycle of Action: Its Interpretation on the E-meter

The most confused, maligned area around is the auditor and the cycle of action. It is a difficult subject because it is all over the GPM's. It is not natural. You scientologists, being a cut above the naturalness of normality, of course see something slightly wrong in the whole idea of time and its forward progress. In his auditing, LRH found himself in an interesting state: looking at a zero or absence of time. He found it not wholly pleasant, because without time, there is a lot of other stuff missing. He had a pressure on the face that turned out to be not from something, but from utter nothingness there. This was very peculiar. It was an escape from the time-stream which, at the same time, was more natural than being in the time-stream.

At one time, a thetan was quite capable of moving back in time to straighten out goofs. Then he slipped into the time stream and has been moving along with it ever since. You therefore have a natural antipathy for the idea that time is there or that something has a beginning, a middle, and an end, because this cycle is an authoritative action laid down by time. But you are processing in the physical universe, through and across the agreement of the physical universe. You are apparently going along with the time-stream and processing a bank that lays the time-stream in with an axe. You are trying to resolve a subject, the bank, that is cycles of action to a terrible degree. Mary Baker Eddy erred by shooting for too high a gradient. As long as you are processing through MEST, you must take account of the cycle of action, even though it is not true at the highest levels. Unless you pay attention to this, you jam the bank, and the PC will get into horrible difficulties: high TA, etc. The proper, precise order of things is very important, particularly at lower levels of things, especially with regard to the bank. The bank is fiendishly precise. The PC has to come up through confusion to confront this much order. One of the keynotes of order, and the bank, is that things have a beginning, continue, and have an end.

"There the cycle of action is violated in the PC, the order of his bank is violated, and therefore it doesn't as-is. So the road out follows the cycle of action. Where the auditor has nothing to do with the cycle of action, he has trouble, because he has thrown the PC below the fiendish demands of the bank. We have found empirically that what you have to do is to parallel the cycle of action. There is no detriment involved in doing so. Every time you process a PC without paying attention to the cycle of action, you are processing the PC against the bank. As a result, the bank will jam, which will be manifested on the E-meter as a high TA and a badly-acting needle. A PC who is not running well has, first and foremost, violated the cycle of action. This is a broad enough statement to be fairly meaningless unless you get more details.

You could also say that the reason a case isn't living right is that the cycle of action is being violated. There are two ways in which a cycle of action can be violated, in life:

1. Too slavish an obedience to it, where the individual was out of agreement with it in the first place but is forced to follow it.

2. Ignoring it.

All the "blessings" of the machine age lie in the first zone. Don't follow a cycle of action to the extent of overwhelming someone's power of choice. Oddly enough, there is one zone where a person's power of choice can be overthrown and he can be improved. By following a cycle of action repeatedly, to a point where the person is used to it, you will then begin to as-is enough bank to compensate for the loss of power of choice that you started with, which will when return. You could force a PC through SOP 8C against his power of choice, but only so long as you repeated the cycle of action. It isn't the person's power of choice that gives him reactivity. Power of choice and self-determinism get imprisoned in reactivity. A cycle of action is the prison. So following and running [and running out] a cycle of action will bring about nothing but a freeing of power of choice, whether the PC consents to it or not. You have the determinism of the thetan -- his power of choice -- versus the fiendish cycle of action and precision of the bank and this universe. The biggest overwhelm and loss of power of choice in this universe is in time. This universe is a trap, because having started here, you inevitably get to there: That is an overwhelm, because there is nothing that you can do about it. The thetan knows that wherever he may be in space at 8:55, in ten minutes he will be at 9:05, no matter how much he protests. You can do something about being moved in space, so space is less overwhelming. Hence movement in space from point A to point B is a smaller gradient.

You can approximate the action of time with the cycle of action. Progress through time is paralleled by the cycle of action. It is very close to a process you might call "Make some time.'

This is a very funny process. You can start the PC at point A and move him to point B and have him run into confusion between distance and time. He has the illusion of moving through time. In doing this drill, one differentiates space from time and thus obtains a new level of observation and freedom. This improves the individual's power of choice, at least to the degree that he has increased freedom to observe. As a person gets out of overwhelm relative to something, he can perceive what is happening to it, instead of what it is doing to him.

O/W, in its essence, has never been understood. O/W is not a lesson in morality. It is a lesson in causality. It is really a lesson in "What power of choice have you exercised in life?" However, it is hard to get someone to admit that he has done something wrong, because society tries to get him to restrain admission of overts, which is a big overwhelm.

Justifications refute the cause of the individual. To justify is to state that one had no power of choice, and therefore, not being responsible, committed no overt. In running justifications, you are getting the PC to own up to having been cause. When you go for overts, you are going up against the social mores as the point of overwhelm. You just choose this as the point of overwhelm. Society tries to get the individual to withhold overts, in an effort to suppress him. "In lower level processing, you're choosing... society as the point of overwhelm [of the PC] and you are running O/W: ... You want the individual's revolts against this overwhelm as an expression of his power of choice." Some point of agreement with society can be found in the course of running O/W, that will undo attention from society. The mechanism is:

1. One does things.

2. One can't own up to them.

3. One then gets caved in on because of this.

You could ask, "What third dynamic activity have you gone along with?" Weirdly enough, this would eventually lead into overt acts. The individual gets free to the degree that he can step back and look at the situation.

When we apply this [sort of process] to the sixth dynamic, we get a much more subtle level, one that is much less easily perceived: freedom from the time-stream; freedom from the cycle of action. Time and the cycle of action are so woven into the PC, regradless of what level he is at, that even your address to the third dynamic, junior though it is to the sixth dynamic, is involved with the sixth dynamic. The PC is shooting someone across space, standing on matter, in an action across time. There is a sixth dynamic agreement that is overwhelming. This is going on no matter what the PC is doing. So in processing a person, if you violate that to an enormous degree, by out-cycles-of-action, the person won't know what it is that is being violated, but his tolerance of that violation is terrible.

There are quits a few cycles of action that you could violate. One is the auditing comm cycle. That is the first one that shows up on a meter, even on a low-level PC. The dirty needle you get expresses the jam-up of energy in the PC's bank because of the violation of that cycle of action. There is a disagreement with the reactive bank when the cycle of action is violated. The meter measures energy manifestations taking place in the PC's bank.

If the PC has one erg of attention or awareness and you are asking him to confront 8000 gallons of reality, he won't be able to do it. For instance, if you take a non-scientologist and tell him that he is the source of all his problems, he can't confront it. On the other hand, if a guy has tons of awareness or attention available, and you ask him to confront one pint of reality, he is going to view it as pretty unimportant. "Just look at the horrible conflict between Russia and the U.S.!" "Yes? well, what about it? So what?" When the individual's attention level and the reality to be perceived are more or less balanced, cognitions occur. You could violate some things, which wouldn't be expressed on the meter, because they would be above the PC's reality. But violating the comm cycle will be real to the PC.

Another cycle of action that you could violate is a process cycle of action. This one is expressed, not on the needle, but on the TA. So:

1. The auditing comm cycle is expressed on the needle.

2. A process cycle of action is expressed on the tone arm.

If you get TA motion on something, you have found an overwhelm that the PC can potentially get on top of, providing that you don't leave him in a state of half-overwhelm, but complete the process cycle. If you get TA going on some subject or area and keep on the subject until there is no more TA action, you have done completed cycle of action on the subject. At that point, the PC will no longer be overwhelmed by the subject. If the subject is real to him at all, it will register on the TA, at least slightly, and the PC will be able to overcome the overwhelm that he has experienced in that area. He will process to wins, as long as you don't leave him in a state of half-overwhelm on the subject by failing to complete the cycle of action. He will object to not being brought through it, and the meter will react by freezing up. It won't freeze up immediately, but it will freeze up as you continue to leave unflat processes behind.

You can go on past the point where TA action has ceased. People don't usually err in this direction. More often, they take an hour to get the subject in full view and the TA well started, and then they quit. This goes against both the PC's self-determinism and the cycle of action of the bank, which is what locks up the TA. The trick is to find the point at which TA action ceases. If the PC is stuck, you can go back through his folder and complete the old cycles of action that were incomplete. When you do this, the bank will unjam. Don't ask yourself, "What will produce TA action on this PC?" That is an easy question. What you should be asking is, "What has produced TA action?" Process in the direction of ARC. Let the PC tell you about his problems long enough to find something that moves the TA, and then get into that, with an in-ARC process or something about solutions. Always flatten what has moved the TA, no matter how long ago it happened. Flatten what you get TA motion on. This cycle of action is the only zone or area where you can overwhelm the PC's power of choice

[legitimately]. Don't evaluate for him, but finish your cycles of action!! You can be smooth and slippy about it. Direct the PC's attention back into the area and run the process to a flat point.

Find out what is real to the PC before you start, by getting him to itsa on anything and watching for TA, e.g. on the White Form. If you are having trouble getting TA on a new PC and you can't find any unflat processes from his earlier auditing, you still want to know what has given TA action. If it wasn't an earlier process or something in life, suspect immediately that the

PC was involved in some other practice analogous to scientology, that did get TA, but was left unflat. Now crank up the sensitivity to +128, and ask, "What other mental practice have you been [in]?", and watch the needle like a hawk: Be specific. Ask all kinds of things and sort out what cycle was incomplete there. Flatten the earlier practice when you find it. Get the TA off of it. "All you have to do, if you don't get TA action on the PC, is find out what gave him TA action that wasn't completed." If he is an old PC, suspect [not an earlier practice, but] objective-type processes.

When looking over auditing for unflat processes, you may find a lot of them and have to choose which one to start with. In this case, you have to be careful, especially if you are advising someone else what to audit [case supervising], where you have less control and ease of observation on the things you check. You want to be more certain and take fewer risks, under these circumstances. And one thing that you can be certain of is that any objective process that gave TA will give TA, if it is unflat. "The objective process is the one that's most likely to have stuck the guy ... because it's right here in the physical universe ... and it's closest to the sixth dynamic. Subjective processes are the least likely" to have hung-up TA. The PC could have cognited later on a subjective process, in the course of running something else. In advising auditors (case supervising), give advice that is very down-the-middle and certain, and if the auditor tells you that it didn't work, find out in what way he failed to take your advice.

Meter manifestations at Level VI are different from the Level IV ones. You are used to TA action taking some time to occur, or run out, below Level LI. But two to three sessions worth of TA (at levels 0-IV) occurs in ten to fifteen seconds at Level VI, and that's all the TA action there is to be had. You don't even see all the TA action that occurs. Some of it doesn't go through the meter. The TA action flattens fast at higher levels. Don't overrun the guy. You will drag in TA from somewhere else if you do. If you let the PC go on and on, you will get TA action from the next item or bank, which violates the cycle of action. All the bank objects to at Level VI is overrun -- the cycle of action being extended beyond its end. If you overflatten TA action, you get an exaggeration of the dirty needle that looks like a small rock slam, a sharp-edged dirty needle, a "tocky" needle. The dirty needle expresses TA action prevented from being completed. The tocky needle results from taking more charge off an item then is really there. It expresses the fact that the TA action is all completed. If you continue, you can finally drive it to a stuck needle and a stuck TA. When you ask, "Am I invalidating a correct line-up?", the needle smooths out.

If you are dealing with the thing that enforces a cycle of action on the PC and on life, it objects to a cycle being overrun. It resists a created cycle of action that isn't really there. If an item has been left charged, a new item won't read properly until you clean it up. Suppose you haven't left anything charged, but the new item is suppressed or something. In this case, when you look for an earlier charged item, the needle will go tocky.

All the bank objects to at Level VI is the cycle of action being extended beyond its proper end. The bank raises Hell when you create a cycle of action that wasn't there. The needle will show you that this is happening by getting tocky, and you can indicate the overrun and continue to the next cycle.

6406C16 SHSpec-23 Communication, Overts, and Responsibility

People who have been in processing for some time can forget the degree to which other people are wrapped up in and in contest with, their environments. This is the direct key to the case!

Your first job, as an auditor, is to find out what the PC's environment is. You should also be able to recognize that PCs can get down to the level of where their only concern is to handle some problem in their environment. This PC is not going to OT, just to a sigh of relief. A contest is not necessarily fisticuffs. It is just that there are different ways of reacting to the environment. At lower levels, anything the PC is doing is an effort to handle the environment. This effort could even amount to

catatonia or complete immobility. The method is not necessarily smart. But down to the lowest rung, the person is still in contest with his environment and trying to handle it. A thetan never gives up. The methods he uses are solutions. Their frailty is so great that you can unsettle them quite easily. The more irrational the solution, the more easily it is unstabilized. It is amazing that this fact hasn't been realized much sooner, by earlier practitioners. An irrational solution has more points to it. Therefore, it is harder to maintain. A madman works at staying mad. The only requisite to unstabilizing this solution is communication. There has to be contact to do it. A probable reason why earlier practitioners didn't see how easy it was to unsettle the irrational solution was that the first step, getting into communication, was so difficult. A person could have so much trouble with this point that he forgets that if he could communicate, would be simple to unsettle the aberrated solution. Psychotherapy parks on the subject of communication. Therapists get so frantic that their efforts to achieve communication get more and more frantic and brutal, culminating, eventually, in electric shock and prefrontal lobotomies. Part of the trouble is that the psychotherapists think that they can reach the patient by doing something to his brain. [Gestalt and "touchie-feelie" therapies satisfy this same need of the therapist's to reach the patient, in a less destructive, but equally ineffective way.]

To do anything for a person, you must be in communication with that person. You must be reaching him and receiving comm from him. Don't assume, however, that communication solves all. Communication is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for helping someone. In the lower levels, where scientology breaks down, it is in the area of effort to communicate to the being. That is why the auditor gets weird notions about what he should do to and for the person. That is where every psychotherapy breaks down, and it is true for scientology too. You have to keep acknowledging the PC and giving the next auditing command. That is what you have trouble getting across to lower-classed auditors, and that is why you work on keeping the comm cycle in.

You are working along a communication channel, in order to accomplish a result with the PC, so you must keep the channel in good repair. What makes a level, in scientology, is a gradient scale of what communication can be entered in upon with the PC. For instance, at Level 0 a PC can't yet be talked to. Once you are reaching the PC and he is responding to you, you can take up the goofiest solutions he has for his environment. You are trying to alleviate his contest with his environment. The fact that he is in contest with his environment barriers communication from his environment. A person solves his environment by withholding from it. He will eventually solve the fact that he is being communicated to from his environment during auditing by moving you out of his environment. The PC is having trouble with his environment. He is not having trouble with you. Therefore you can't be part of his environment. You are thus no longer part of his normal environment. Hence, he will talk to you, even if to no one else. He says, "There are human beings and I don't want anything to do with them. And then there are auditors. They are different!" So the auditor takes on holy proportions. [This seems to be the real explanation of "transference".] Similarly, attacks on scientology make scientology supernatural to justify their overts on us. [Scientologists can't be considered normal people, or the overts would not be justified.] The Melbourne Inquiry goes along this way. The organization has taken on a supernatural aura. If you can reach and talk to people when others can't, you will immediately assume some special status with the PC who is aware of this.

Don't bother to deal with this issue with the PC. [Unlike psychoanalysis, which dwells on the "transference".] Once you have your communication line in, use it to handle whatever contests the PC has going with the environment. You can use whatever you know of the communication formula to get some communication established, then gradually improve it and move into other processes.

Just getting into comm with the PC is likely to give him some benefits, but don't stop with that. Communication isn't the end-all. It is merely the channel. Now you are set up to do something for the case. Scientology is the only discipline that can uniformly:

1. Accomplish a comm line.

2. Use it to increase communication. and then 3. Do something for the individual. Don't stop when you establish communication, even though the mere establishment of a comm line is beneficial. The PC will look better around you because he is in ARC with you, so don't forget that he may still be batty around others. If you don't do something for the PC, you may find that, while he is calm and sane in your vicinity, he is just as nutty in his environment as ever. You may feel that you have cured his battiness, when it is only resolved around you. So you don't believe him when he talks about how bad life is. Don't "make the mistake of saying, 'I've cured him because I can now talk to him.'" All

you have done is to set him up to now do something for him. Communication is the beginning, not the end.

Now, after establishing communication, you must find out what, in his environment, is dangerous and menacing, and what means he is using to combat these elements. You shouldn't use "Problems and Solutions" too long, beyond the opening part of the case, or you will restimulate the problems and solutions in his GPM's. Problems and Solutions isn't the basis of his activities with his environment at all. It is what the PC does to solve his environment that keeps him obsessed and pinned-in against the hostile elements in his environment.

How do you know that you haven't handled the PC's PTP? He is going to do something about it, so it is not handled. That is the biggest index you have. So you want to find what the individual is continuously doing in his environment. This falls under the heading of O/W, not problems, because the more he does about the problem he is stuck in, the more he will be obsessed by it and the more he will be stuck. What brings about an undue concentration on a subject and a conviction that a person has a tremendous conflict with his environment? It is because he doing something about it all the time. For instance, a person who is hung up on the U.N. must be doing something to or about the U.N., this lifetime.

A person's way of fighting some part of the environment can take innumerable forms. He feels that he had better not communicate with the environment because he is going to commit overts. He is mucking up his communication with the environment, therefore, because his communication with the environment is a series of overts. So therefore he has to not communicate with the environment, because it is an overt against the environment. So he had better have some kind of wild solution, so he won't have to communicate with his environment. [In summary:

1. An individual keeps doing things to solve his environment. This doingness amounts to a continuous series of overts.

2. So the individual considers that his communicating with the environment is an overt.

3. Therefore, he has to stop communicating with the environment.

4. So he develops wild solutions, so that he won't have to communicate with the environment (like not looking).]

This is not at the communication level. It is just riding on the comm line. The individual has put up a screen against tigers, so he can't see the tigers. He just knows that he has to fight in that direction. This may take different forms, e.g. never looking in that direction. Someone who doesn't look at something has something there that he is doing something to or about. He does low-level overts, because he is afraid that he will do high-level overts. The bank is manufactured in such a way that:

1. The individual is forced to commit overts.

2. He gets in trouble after committing those overts. People are kept insane because the bank enforces commitment of overts and insures insanity if the individual does commit overts.

Even if the individual didn't have a bank, he would get into trouble by committing overts, because committing overts violates the communication formula. This is above the bank. There are two mechanisms above the bank:

1. The communication formula. [Cf. axiom 51]

2. O/W. That puts the auditor in the driver seat early on, because he has two things that are superior to all the aberration that the PC can muster. O/W is one of the frail spots of auditors. You would expect the perpetuators of any trap to talk a lot about invasion of privacy and how people should keep their withholds, so they seize E-meters. The most craziness is at the door to sanity.

Auditors' reticence in pulling withholds is based on a fear of breaking down the communication channel. They preserve communication so well that they never do anything with it. An auditor can pussyfoot on getting overts from a PC, because he wants to preserve the comm line, but he hasn't done anything with it. The fact is that if the PC is pinned into something, he must have originated

something that got him connected to the thing. Then, once he is pinned to it, he gets into an obsessive "do" to straighten it all out. This gives him more worries. When a person is pinned, he thinks that he can unpin himself by more doing. Actually, he can unpin himself by stopping obsessive doing. Anyone can get caught in this mechanism, since it is the basic mechanism of entrapment. What the individual originally did may not have been intentional, but he starts having to do more and more to handle it.

Sometimes the doingness in resisting a thing is to blow, having failed to handle it. So if the person can't leave physically, he may, for instance, get groggy, or show people that he shouldn't be allowed to stay around. There are innumerable ways in which a thetan can leave without leaving physically, all the way down the neurotic/psychotic spiral. For instance, if one cannot leave a marriage physically, one may leave non-physically. Complication stems from the number of ways in which a thetan can leave without leaving physically. For instance, a thetan can make others sorry they didn't let him leave. He can appear nasty, where he was happy before. Psychotherapy could be called a study of ways of leaving without leaving physically. So the sequence is:

1. An individual commits overts. Asserted Thereness.

2. He commits more overts to get out of previous overts.

3. He invents solutions to not leaving. Asserted Not-Thereness

All this occurs on comm channels. Being on a comm line, it is resolved by communication. O/W (regretted reach or action), and the communication formula are senior to the bank.

The bank boobytraps this. The word "withhold" is in the bank, so you shouldn't use it. It is too restimulative and gives false TA (i.e. TA unrelated to discharge) by virtue of just moving banks around. In running withholds, therefore, substitute for "withhold" "what (the PC) didn't say". Use ""What haven't you said?"

"One of the principal factors that you bat your head against ... in a case, is the inability of a case to admit any action or take any responsibility for action." If a case can take no responsibility for any action ever committed, that case has had it. That's any act, not just an overt act. "A lost soul that's being shredded between the worlds with a soundless wail is the person who can take no responsibility for any action he has ever done." That is where a case ceases to be in range of any assistance. The case must be able to take some responsibility for some action, in order to be salvageable. This makes those things that you can't talk to pretty irresponsible, doesn't it? Well, they are. "I can imagine a conversation, if you could achieve one, with a spider." The utter irresponsibility of any action ever undertaken by the spider would be amazing. Inability to communicate is an index of irresponsibility. "As the ability to communicate drops out, responsibility for action, as a factor, falls," and vice versa. They rise and fall together. A stutterer has some deteriorated area of communication and therefore a deteriorated area of responsibility.

A madman is as mad as you can't get into communication with him. The biggest problem with the madman is how you can get in comm with him: what gradient of comm to use, and how you put it to him that you want to find out what part of his environment he can be responsible for. You could get in comm with him, one way or another. He would eventually differentiate you from the rest of the environment. Then you would have to find out where a guy is stuck and what he is stuck in, then find "what responsibility can he take ... for his own actions in that zone or area," expand that perimeter, and you would return his sanity. All you are interested in at lower levels is "responsibility for own actions or responsibility for lack of actions." The real difficulty is the getting into comm and really finding what he would take responsibility for. An undercut would be to get a "done", by reason of placement: "Where have you been that you know you have been?"

Even though "communication" is in the bank, the formulas of communication are superior to the reactive bank. Responsibility is also superior to the bank. It is the woof and warp of being a thetan. The questions are: "Can you decide to do something and do it? Can you be somewhere at will? Can you be in or out of something on your own determinism?" The overt-motivator sequence is not an ultimate truth, but it goes out, as a consideration, higher than any other consideration. It is still a truth after other things have become lies, before it becomes a lie. It gives you all levels of processing and cases from Level IV on down. If you've got those two factors [communication and responsibility], you've got all lower levels of processing.

472

There is no real reason for you to be in the dark about why you are not making progress with a case. Whatever other factors are present, these factors are more present. There is one thing that gets in your road. Someone can have a GPM keyed in to such a degree that it is driving him "round the bend. At lower levels, you had better leave it alone. LRH has tried reading a PC a list of words that might be causing the condition. If one read, LRH told the PC that that word was an integral part of the reactive bank that was influencing him, and the PC ceased to be obsessively worried. This is a bit dangerous, though.

If a person is glibly telling you what he has done in an area, it may be that he is not really taking responsibility for that. The rebuttal, in this case, is to get the PC to explain, at length, how he has not really done this thing. Eventually, it begins to dawn on him how he did have something to do with it. This is an indirect approach to a lower-level case. You can't run it too long, because it is an out-of-ARC process. At a little higher level, you could run, "What reasons did you have for doing that?", as long as you don't let him get into inventing them.

6406C18 SHSpec-24 Studying: Introduction

If you can't learn anything, you can't find out how to do anything. If an auditor can't learn anything, he will never know how to audit. This is very fundamental, but all great successes are built on fundamentals.

Better than fifty percent of scientology consists of the discipline, technology, and know-how of application. You could give the commands of scientology processes to another group of mental technicians, and they would get no results. "Failure to duplicate = failure to understand = failure to apply."

LRH and Reg dreamed up a course having to do with business and commerce, with scientology applied to them. Reg executed the course, and it has been very successful. It is a good-will gesture. The only trouble is that everybody tried to get into the act, teaching their own courses to the same end. Reg wasn't worried about others duplicating the course. People are aware, even with a perfect duplicate course, that they are not taking the real course in salesmanship. Even on the copyist, this enters enough in the way of an overt or something like this, so that he then goes into an obsessive alter-is, and then it is true that they can't duplicate it.

Professors in universities cause the loss of technology by writing their own books on their subjects instead of teaching the real source material, which they alter-is. There were thirteen heavier-than-air methods of flight. The fixed-wing configuration wasn't necessarily the best, though it was one of the easier ones to manufacture. The fixed-wing system won out; the other twelve have lost, even though some were more efficient than the one that was easy to do.

In civilizations, it is customary for a body of knowledge to come into existence, then for some part of it to be duplicated and developed and other parts of the tech to get lost. Civilizations die out because they lose their technology, apart from one gimmick that has nothing to back it up.

"Technology ... gets lost because people can't study." Civilizations tend to rise to a peak. Then, under stress of combat or whatever, they lose their technology, because no one studies it. For instance, the technology of the British silversmiths got lost when the Labor government taxed silver out of existence.

One problem with study is the amount of false knowledge around. If a person studied without any judgement of what he was studying, or any evaluation of it, he would study very poorly. Study has to do with one thing, basically: willingness to know. In order to study, one must first be willing to know. Without a willingness to know, you can get systems that add up to no knowledge.

In scientology, we have one thing that is not easy to put into texts: the discipline of how you do it. It is easy to transmit by example and is at least fifty percent of what we are doing. This is a frailty for the future success of what we are doing. It is the most likely thing to get lost. What needs to be learned is not the commands of processes. It is how to apply them. In scientology, one is learning the doingness, not the processes. The processes won't work in the absence of the doingness: TR's, comm cycle, metering, etc.

LRH decided to learn about study by doing a course in photography. He had done the course up to the third lesson, already, and wondered why he stopped there, and why he occasionally bogged down, e.g. in the parts about optics and chemistry. He realized that he didn't know anything about photography, despite having done it since age twelve. He realized that he had entered the course in a tolerant state of mind, willing to learn a few gimmicks. And he realized that this attitude was incredibly arrogant. He had always thought that the trouble he had had with photography was that they kept changing the methods. He realized that the basics and fundamentals in the subject, which he didn't know, had been present in the subject since 1860! At that point, knowing that there was something to learn, he really started to study. From three books in 3 1/2 years, he sped up to eight books in two weeks. Arrogance and tolerance: the attitude that, "I know all about it, but I'm willing to learn a few tricks," prevents a person from studying.

LRH's standards of criticism have shifted. What he was willing to take pictures of changed utterly. He mastered fundamentals and reached a position of judgment and opinion on it. Previously, he had had no judgment, only fixed ideas. There is a big difference between an opinion and a fixed idea or prejudice. One has fixed opinions when one lacks understanding of an area. In the absence of knowledge, judgment becomes fixed ideas. LRH's former ideas on photography had not been resulting in a finished picture. Also, before this realization, he was the victim of external conditions. If there was no sun, he could not take a picture. After this realization, knowing your tools and darkroom tech, you are not monitored by conditions around you.

The breakthrough was, "There really is something there to learn!" This is a prime condition necessary for study. So the first barrier to learning is the consideration that you know all about it, and you won't let your certainty that you know be affected by the fact that you are not getting a result. Judgment depends in freedom from fixed opinions and on no need to protect yourself from your lack of knowledge in some area. Judgment is impossible in the presence of fixed opinions. To judge, one must know what one knows and what one does not know. Judgment depends on knowledge. It is not what a person knows. It is what he can do.

An auditor's ability to learn, then depends first on his willingness to learn. "I know all there is to know," and "I get no results," shows lack of judgment on one's own skill. It is a silly statement.

Status has a lot to do with this. One considers he must appear wise or clever or whatever, and pretends knowingness to give this appearance. But in the presence of genuine knowledge, a real esteem takes the place of a false, self-generated esteem. It comes down to a test of what a person can do. There is no argument with competence. Psychiatry serves as a wonderful example of this.

To be a good critic of some area, you would have to know what could and what couldn't be done in that area. A person who already knows something about an area can learn more about it without feeling challenged, threatened, or insulted by the suggestion that he learn it, unlike someone who doesn't know all about it, but wants to think that he does.

The only place our technology might break down is from unwillingness to learn it, stemming from the belief that one already knows it all. This is one of those stupid fundamentals that stays in because nobody bothers to as-is it. There is always a first lesson to teach, a basic entry point to learning a subject. On the subject of study itself, this datum is fundamental. Where you fail in instruction, you always omitted the first datum to teach.

6406C30 SHSpec-25 Cause Level, OT, and the Public

What is wrong with you is this: You are so bird-dogged onto the glories of OT that you are going to leave the rest of the world suspended between the lower rung of OT and the ground. The bottom rung of OT does not sit on the ground. There is a large gap. So there has to be another ladder there. The lower ladder could be called "cause level". A person can't vanquish the sun and stars who is having a Hell of a time with his wife.

We have had the definition of causativeness for a long time. "If you could imagine an expansion of reach from an inverse self -- a not-imagined, unbelieved self, which he can't reach, because it ain't, because he doesn't know, he actually sort of has to reach in, in order to reach out -- if you can imagine a reach that is this confused, that a person doesn't even know which direction to go to get it, you've got Level O" and 99% of the human beings on the planet.

They are following the Pied Piper of science. The blind alley of science is that Man is intelligent meat, a machine. This leaves out the being himself. According to this view, Man is a thinking brain nothing more. There are two kinds of sciences:

1. Classification, or naming things.

2. Extrapolative: a science that derives answers.

Modern science is just a classification science. E.g. biology is nothing but classification. It doesn't let you learn anything. To modern science, the science of Man is just another classification science. "When they don't know anything, they name everything.... If you don't know the right name for the non-existent parts of the brain, then you know nothing about the mind." They go on the basis that Man never creates. They try to understand the mind on the basis of the law of conservation of energy, i.e. that nothing is ever created or destroyed. From that viewpoint, Man doesn't make any sense." Something would have to be done to him before he could do anything to anybody else." This isn't true, so neither is stimulus/response theory. Since Man isn't really understandable on the basis of his never creating, the stimulus/response mechanism is likewise untrue.

After making wrong assumptions about the mind, modern science can't understand it, so they sweep it aside as an incomprehensible subject: the humanities. So we just classify and appoint authorities is it and say that it is an unworkable field.

Then the scientologist comes along and says, "Heresy: Man is not a machine. He's a thetan, a being!" 'We've taken that as our basic ... assumption, because we can demonstrate it." This violates the idea that the scientist has that nothing is ever created or destroyed. The fact is, however, that Man mocks up his own mind. This disagrees with the law of conservation of energy. When you say, "mind", the scientist receives, "brain". When you say that you can run out a troublesome part of the mind, he thinks that it would be easier to cut out part of the brain. He has already accepted two falsehoods:

1. Man is a machine.

2. Man never creates anything.

You can prove the scientist wrong by getting a result on a preclear. That is a difference between us and the humanities. Form is more important to the non-scientologist than the result. "They have no end results, so they've begun to believe there are no end results in the field of the mind.... You ... say, 'An end result can occur in the field of the mind.... You have to follow ... a very exact discipline to get this end result,' and they don't believe that." The end result is more important to us than how you arrive at it. They lost interest in end results because they couldn't produce any. They couldn't produce any end results because they couldn't accept these basic premises:

1. Man is a being independent of his body.

2. He is capable of creating his private universe, including his mind, complete with mass and spaces. We cure a leukemia case, and the doctors say, "They couldn't have! It must have been misdiagnosed in the first place." You ask, "Why couldn't he have had leukemia?", and the answer is, "He couldn't have had it, because it is incurable." I.e. leukemia is incurable, by definition. They are trying to protect authority in an unworkable rationale that they themselves, down deep, know has failed. Their question is, "How long can we put up the big bluff?" All analysts know that they aren't getting results.

To get workable results, one must accept two things:

1. A being is an independent thing that can exist independent of a body.

2. A being is capable of auto-creation, all by his lonesome. By doing this, he builds a mind. A person's own universe, or his bank, is not stuck in his skull but is plastered all over the physical universe.

The "scientific" premises about the origin of Man require at least as much assumption as our premises about Man's nature. The "life springing from an electrified sea of ammonia" bit is at least as bizarre as the Virgin Mary story. Science starts assuming that Man is an inflow mechanism. The reverse is actually true. The former assumption won't cure anyone. The latter assumption will, always. If you

want to help a man, don't get him to inflow. Get him to outflow. That is why scientists cannot make Man well or solve the problems of the mind.

Man is actually an outflow mechanism. You solve his problems on the basis of outflow. If you want to prove this, watch what happens if you run someone on an inflow, e.g. "Think of a motivator." This will give you a high stuck TA and a PC who feels worse and worse, sicker and sicker, fuzzy and foggy, etc. Actually, Man's basic action is outflowing, and his basic error was an outflow. He is restraining himself from outflow because of his experience of causing bad outflows. He learned not to outflow, so he decided to inflow only. Then he thought he could only inflow. Then he caved in. We get an end result by operating on this assumption. We rehab the ability to outflow and win. However, society and religion train people to operate on this reverse basis. We are really in the line of religion, rather than science, if "science, means "conservation of energy". Science has only recently, i.e. in the past hundred years, presumed to have anything to do with the field of the mind. In space-opera, of course, science took over the mind, but without comprehension, so you got oddball damaging actions. However, space-opera science was capable of more damage than modern science. Our assumptions about the nature of Man are violently opposed to the assumptions of science.

That is the first ladder that you have to jump with people. They have to get past the current belief that if you stuff something in the body, something beneficial will occur.

This is something that has confronted us in the past few weeks wi h violence. Practically no one comes to St. Hill who is low on causativeness, since it takes outflow and causativeness to get here. Out in central organizations or in the world at large, you run into more non-communication than is comfortable. If you flee the non-scientology world after standing it for just so long, "it's the level of causation that gets [on] your nerves. It isn't that they don't talk your language. It's their non-communication. It's the fact that they don't seem to connect with anything." People have to be gotten up to recognition of the world around them. Total introversion has to be changed to slight extroversion before there is any way that they can as-is items. A guy can't go OT until he has been gotten out of his total introversion. The grades enable the individual to break through to the environment. They get a person reaching, causative to a degree, extroverted, and able to as-is. A person has to be able to cause, slightly at least, before he can as-is something. When a person can't as-is the bank, he is the effect of it. A small percentage of the Level IV co-auditors were Type B when they started. They weren't really low on cause, but only when they were spot-on on the exact item with all ruds in could they as-is it. These were people who had had a fair amount of auditing. If you put a green PC into a GPM, even spot-on, he would do nothing to the GPM. The GPM would make him sick. You can take a Type A PC, who can usually as-is anything, and, if he is underfed, run down, or underslept, so that his body is soaking up energy, he will run poorly, with a packed-up meter.

If someone can't as-is his personal problems, he won't be able to as-is a GPM. This barriered a lovely idea that LRH had, which only works on him. If he finds himself thinking too hard about something, he can always skip down through the end-words and pick out the one that has gotten into restimulation, and let it blow down . This is a bit heroic: He thought that you could just take someone at Level IV and assess the end words, but you can't. The meter packs up almost at once.

When a person cannot as-is his bank because his cause level is too low, he will be the effect of his bank and he will get no disappearance of that is worrying him. So whatever process you use, your whole task is to put the PC more at cause. You run O/W to raise someone's cause level, since O/W is a big barrier to his cause level, in that he has done something he regrets and, furthermore, isn't communicating about it. You run O/W to raise his certainty of having done, not just to as-is regretted doingness. You will find that it is probably that few of your PCs have been answering the auditing question, since, while you are looking for something they have done, they are looking for an explanation of what happened to them. Some PCs go plunging madly into the bank, searching madly for some answer that explains it all. Such PCs invent things or give things that they are not sure of, in an effort to find the "right" answer. A11 you have to do is be sure the PC is certain that he did the thing, without alter-ises. In other words, you want an as-ising of doneness. "All you want is the answer to your ... question, 'What have you done?', not 'What have you done [that is] bad, antisocial, etc.'" "I ate breakfast, and that is probably why ... " is not an answer to the auditing question. "As auditor, all you have to do is police and make sure the person is certain he did do that." "It isn't the quality of the deed. It's just whether or not he has done it." Just make sure the PC is sure that he did that. Otherwise, O/W will not work.

So you build up the person's idea of what he can cause and what he can reach, until he can reach the lowest rung of the upper ladder. You can convert SOP 8C and run it in such a way that the PC is sure of doing it. Distance has to do with reach, So on SOP 8C, you get a wider perimeter of what a person can reach Then, [on subjective processing] you get a gradient of what the PC can as-is in his mind." The object of all lower level processing, up to Level VI, is to raise the cause level of the individual."

Don't expect recognition or appreciation from society around you, when they don't even recognize themselves as existing. We don't really have opponents except ourselves, if we neglect the lower ladder that people need to climb before getting on the ladder to OT. O/W is the only thing that will key out a GPM without the PC's having to pay attention to the GPM. This is because O/W is senior to the bank and can therefore make a key-out clear. Then you can erase the bank. To as-is, a person must have done something. Promote the idea of raising cause level, not so much the idea of going OT. People could understand that.

6407C02 SHSpec-26 O/W Modernized and Revised

There are two stages to auditing:

1. Get into comm.

2. Do something for the PC. It is notorious that few scientologists will inquire deeply into exactly what someone did. This is because, in order to do something for someone, one must have a comm line, which is supported or made possible by reality and affinity. And where a person is too demanding, the affinity tends to break down. So the auditor doesn't want to break the affinity line. Hence, he never gets into the second stage of processing, the one after a comm line has been established, in which the auditor does something for the PC. The PC may feel miraculously better just from having a comm line established. But the two stages are like walking up to the bus and driving off. If you don't drive off, you never arrive anywhere.

Any upset the PC has is actually so delicately balanced that once you have gotten in communication with the PC, it is easy to do something about the upset. Batty ideas and doingnesses are particularly easy to get rid of, since they are based on very slippery logic. You could have the guy's case fall apart before your eyes, just from your asking, "What are you doing that is sensible?" and "Why is it sensible?"

Once your comm line and auditing discipline are perfect, so you don't disturb the comm line, you can forage around amongst his aberrations to great effect. A comm line is only valuable to the extent that you can use it to move around in the morass which he calls his ideas. If you used the process given above, aberration would fall to pieces. Use perfect discipline to keep in the comm line. Audit well. Get your comm cycle in. Let your cycles of action be completed. Then you can do something for the PC. The discipline of auditing is what makes it possible for you to do something for the PC, unlike other therapies. That is all it is for, in fact. This gets you up to the door. [Now you have to go through it.] The magic of auditing and the difficult part, is to get in comm with the PC. Once you have done that, doing something for the PC is very easy, since his aberrations are so delicately balanced. If you are not in comm with the PC, he presents himself as accused by you. He justifies himself. A PC who is in comm with the auditor won't be trying to justify himself and uphold his status. You can go out of comm with a PC by not doing anything for him. You lose the R-factor with the person and you go out of comm.

A process is simply a combination of mental mechanisms which, when inspected, will pass away. All auditing is subtractive. It consists of as-ising things on the case. You can over-audit, by trying to get more TA action from a process when you have gotten it all. You can under-audit by leaving off before getting all the TA action out. It takes only observation of the PC. When you have done something for the PC, you will have gotten the TA action off the process. If you have done something for the PC, TA action will cease, and it won't stop until then. Don't do something for the PC after you have already done something for him, on a particular process or in a particular area. If you go on in the area, you will only restimulate something else in the PC. If you are clever, you will run a process that cyclically runs out of TA, and end it there, at the end of a cycle. In R-6, you develop a sensitivity for when an item is dead, and you will leave it. If you ask for it one more time, you are dead. You will get a tocky needle and an ARC breaky PC. At lower levels, you can get one thing run out, acknowledge it very well, and go on using the same process in a way which makes it a whole new

minor cycle within your major process cycle. Auditors who can't do this have to run lots of different processes. But they could get much more out of one process, if they got slick at directing attention. You don't necessarily change the process when the PC has cognited, if it is a general process that can apply to lots of areas. Get the cognition out of one area, then find another area. You don't have to change the process. You can just change the subject of the process. If you use this approach, you have to ask yourself all along, "Have I done something for the PC?" If you notice that the PC's answers are dodgy, recognize that your comm line isn't established.

Some processes, such as "What could you say to me?/What would you rather not say to me?" do two things at once: both getting into comm and doing something for the PC, e.g. by getting off withholds.

All this is a prelude to O/W, because O/W is the greatest comm line wrecker that an auditor has to deal with. Withhold running is peculiar, in that it can put in a comm line, but it is avoided for fear of breaking down a comm line. It can get confusing, when the same process that puts in the comm line to the PC also does something for the PC. This tends to cause a confusion in which the difference between putting in a comm line and doing something for the PC gets lost. O/W is senior to the bank. That doesn't mean that when the bank is gone, you will still have O/W. It means that O/W keys out the bank. Handled rightly, it puts in the comm line. But if the auditor permits the PC to sit there with withholds in the session, instead of protecting his comm line, as is his intention, he ends up destroying the comm line by missing the withhold and letting the PC ARC break.

Another thing that makes O/W dicey is that the word, "Withhold" occurs in the bank. Furthermore, "withhold" is an out-of-ARC process and cannot be run by itself. "Done", fortunately, does not appear in the bank, so you can run "Done/Not done". However, the common denominator of the bank is "done"." Done" is a high order of lock on all forms of reactivity. "Done to" is another part of the bank, unless the auditor uses a specific name with it, that is not in the bank. [See p. 595, above, re use of nouns in processes.]

A PTP can be created by a failure to complete a comm cycle. A method of handling PTP's would be to ask the PC, at start of session, "Are there any communications you have left incomplete?" The PC would then rattle off several, and not register further on PTP's. The reason why he hasn't completed the communication is because of the overts he has against what he has the PTP with. You never have a PTP with something that you don't have an overt on. So first a PTP is based on or connected to an incomplete comm cycle, then to a done. This follows the pattern of what to do in auditing. [See p. 642, above.] That is the way the bank stacks up. Even a psychosomatic illness is based on an incomplete communication. In extremis, you can handle psychosomatic illness as a PTP. You can handle it non-adventurously with, "What communication to or about the illness haven't you delivered?" Or you can ask, "What comm haven't you completed to the blumjum?" The more adventurous cycle is the done. And notice that you have just got the same cycle as that of auditor to PC: establish comm, then do something. The severity of the illness has nothing to do with the speed of release of it or the difficulty of handling it. The "What communication hasn't been completed?" is easy. It requires nothing of your auditing discipline, but it is the "lick-and-a-promise". The done takes more skill, knowledge, and perseverance.

The session patter could go like this:

Auditor: PTP?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Any comm you haven't completed?

PC: Blah blah.

If the PTP is then gone, then there is no need to continue.

If the PTP is not gone, then get off the PC's overts. There are seventeen ways to get off series of overts. There are:

Overts in chains.

Recurring withholds.

Recurring overts.

Basic-basic of something.

Etc., etc. You have to ask the proper questions to get the overts. Suppose the PC keeps giving you the same (often minor) overt? It is part of a chain. You need to ask the right question and audit by chain. You must also be prepared to find no overt at the bottom of the chain.

But Man is basically good, despite his reactive bank. The bank is only composed to make a man commit overts, which is against his better nature. The bank is the perfect trap, because having committed the overts, the individual won't go on communicating.

You do not want to talk to people that you have wronged. You withhold to prevent further overts. That is the fundamental think of Man, before he goes so far downscale that he dramatizes obsessively.

"What have you done?" has two branches:

1. What have you done that is socially reprehensible and prevents you from communicating with others?

2. Just having done something.

Both are valid. But watch out for the PC using the process to look for an explanation of what has happened to him. This PC will give suppositional answers, which you don't want. He will invent things he hasn't done to get rid of the consequences that he is experiencing. He is trying to find a good enough overt to explain what is occurring in his life. He will often go far backtrack to find it. Steer this PC back to where he belongs. All you want is what he is absolutely certain that he has done, so you have to make sure that he is certain he did the thing. If the auditor is asking A and the PC is doing B, the communication factor is out, so the auditor won't do something for the PC. You might ask, "What are you quite positive that you have done?"

O/W is likely to be the biggest area of recovery for the PC, provided the auditor isn't too tender and will steer the PC. You have to observe when the PC thinks that it wasn't an overt. If the guy gives you something he did as an overt but obviously doesn't feel that it was an overt, then you must ask, "Why wasn't this an overt?", and get itsa. Then you might ask, "Was this really an overt, after all?" At this point, you might get the glee of insanity. Then you might get a long worry about this, with TA action. Eventually, he will realize that it was an overt. Meanwhile, you are raising the cause level of the PC. You could go into "done" in numerous other categories. However, you may fail, in trying to direct somebody in these fields.

6407C07 SHSpec-27 Dissemination

LRH took pictures of the circus, at the request of its management. He projected them on a 12' x 12' screen in the ring and had a party. He told the elephant man, who had a swelling on his knee, how to do a touch assist two weeks ago. It worked. If someone asks you for help, do something for him." I never tell anybody anything.... People come to see me wherever I go.... Putting a practice together has always been a mystery to me -- how anybody could miss." The only thing an auditor has to solve is the problem of what to live on while he is building a practice. It could take three to five months. Get in contact with people. Join social clubs. People listen to you because you seem to know your business. Dissemination is not a problem with LRH, because he doesn't make it a problem. Name and reputation don't matter. It is what you can do that counts. LRH has signed things Rene Lafayette, Ken Martin, Kurt von Rocken, Winchester Remington Colt, etc.

There is no easy way to do anything. There are some ways that are not as hard as others. Being a pro in any field takes work, of one sort or another, physical or otherwise. You have to invest some of yourself in it. You have to know how you are going to use the data. You had better know all there is to know about your subject if you hope to be able to solve a technical problem that may or may not have been covered in what you have been studying. You may find that the problem is actually very simple. Even though you know that what you are studying is inapplicable to what you are going to be doing, go ahead and learn it well. If it is part of a formal course, finish studying it if you are in training, because you are liable to find out that its principles do apply after all, when you get "round

the corner. After you have completed the study, make your adaptions. Put some of yourself in it. Ask yourself, "How will I use this stuff? How will it apply to me?" Study does you no good whatever, unless you go through this process. Students in many fields: engineering courses, economics, etc., don't consider what application they will put the data to, which is one reason they have trouble learning it.

Solutions are evolved, not from inspiration, but from observation, inspection, data, and familiarity. Reach and withdraw runs off the barriers that prevent you from observing something. You can overdo the studying by spending far too long gathering data. This would indicate some defect in getting familiarity with what you are studying. To gain knowledge or understanding of something, you need to be in touch with it. ARC = U. You can get too concentrated on one line and get so withdrawn that you lose touch with other things. That is why LRH periodically goes charging off into contact with different areas. Once in awhile, you ought to go look and see how people operate, so that they don't get unreal.

In building a practice, you've got to work at it, but you can't force it out of its own time-frame.

"I'm not a creature of ivory towers. I get impatient with sitting at a desk, snowed under with dispatches. That's why we have scientology."

6407C09 SHSpec-28 Studying -- Data Assimilation

These are the points to watch in assimilating data:

1. Nomenclature: Knowing what a word means.

2. The subject matter itself: arrangement and understanding of the subject matter.

Part of the issue of nomenclature is knowing what a definition means. We can't use psychiatric terms in scientology, because the field of psychiatry has a different basis and purpose than ours, and their terms have implications that would give utterly unwanted twists to our knowledge, if we used them. It doesn't matter that they are the "authorities". An authority, in fact, is someone who can produce a result. The world has elected people as authorities on subjects, when these people can't do the subjects. So if you recognized these authorities, you would get all crossed up with fields that had failed, and that would enter a degree of failure into scientology. So we leave their technology and nomenclature alone. We get results, so we are the authorities. The existing terminology is actually false, since it is from a field that gives no result.

Our terminology has evolved and has become fixed on the printed page. We have to safeguard what we've got, or knowledge gets wiped out. We must first try to evolve nomenclature cleverly, so that it won't conflict with earlier terms. Then we must carry it forward as a standardized item to maintain a constant. Another responsibility is to avoid developing too many new terms.

Any technical field has specialized terminology. They are all snob languages, showing a superior understanding. You don't dare use carnival terminology in front of a circus performer, when referring to the same thing. As one becomes more expert in a field and gets more familiar with a subject, his terminology becomes less formal and serious. It becomes more like slang, having passed through a phase of formal terms. We short-cutted this process by leaving out the pompous formal nomenclature stage. Reverence for nomenclature is symptomatic of being at the novice stage of memorizing the terms.

Knowledge is tremendously dependent on nomenclature. This fact is almost never appreciated by teachers and students. They are trying to talk and use a language that they don't know. This can get so bad that they think the subject is incomprehensible or that they are incapable of understanding it, when in fact they just haven't grasped the meaning of some symbols being used to designate things. Or their grasp is fumbly, not instantaneous. As a person goes on studying past a point of uncomprehended nomenclature, he stacks up the opinion that he doesn't know about it, carried on forward from the one term that he didn't totally grasp. He thinks he doesn't know or can't know a subject, when in fact he only doesn't grasp the nomenclature. The basic lie that makes incomprehension persist is that it is the subject that is not understood, when it is a word that is not understood. A person will develop an automatic comm lag at the point of the non-understood word.

He will misassign the lack of understanding to whatever area it appears in. A comprehension of the nomenclature used is vital, in studying anything. You put yourself in the soup as soon as you leave one word not understood behind you.

Besides the subject of nomenclature, we have the subject matter itself: the arrangement and understanding of it, i.e. what is being named. One should get a very thorough grasp of the thing under discussion. A person can misunderstand something that he has read because it conflicts with the usual idea, or he can even find it unbelievable. If you don't agree with something that is true, it is either a misunderstood or there is a button that you are running into. When you find something unbelievable, be sure you know what you are unbelieving. First be sure that you have understood the words used. Then be sure that you have got the thing, the phenomenon, right. Ninety percent of the time you will find that you had something in crosswise. In the other ten percent of the cases, you can handle it by setting up examples of how it applies to you and to life. Get examples of how it is that way and how it isn't that way. You will generally find, then, that some button was in the way of your grasping it.

Following this sort of routine, you will find yourself able to study. Former methods of study, what few there have been, have not been very successful. When there is no training available, about the only reliable method of studying is to read everything you can find on the subject, from cover to cover.

In studying scientology, it is imperative to know how to study, since we are studying that which we are studying with. To classify students as fast or slow or bright or dull is to make a false classification, since this classification leads to no improvement of anyone's ability to study. There are students who can memorize words and pages virtually at a glance. But this does not guarantee that they will be able to do anything with what they memorized. You can find out, by seeing whether they can define the words.

The direction and end purpose of study is understanding. With an unknown word or phenomenon in the middle of a subject, you will have mystery and non-application.

One of the primary criticisms of modern education is that it doesn't immediately result in application. You should be able to take any textbook direction and, if you have understood it, apply it directly and effectively without familiarity. If you also have familiarity, as in studying auditing while auditing, you should be a whiz.

6407C15 SHSpec-30 Organizational Operation

Your practice as a scientologist can carry you into the fields of organization and business. Your perimeter of action goes out wider than just processing people. It includes the economic woof and warp that makes the trap that keeps civilizations interiorized into themselves. It includes relationships on dynamics beyond the first dynamic. We don't evaluate for the PC. However, outside of an auditing session, advice can be valuable and non-evaluative. The individual has eight dynamics. You can handle his first dynamic in auditing, but he has stresses and impacts reaching him from the second, third, and other dynamics.

Only two things give you trouble:

1. Significance.

2. Mass.

When someone can't confront mass, he goes into significance, figure-figure, etc. And sometimes, but not necessarily, handling mass is a substitute activity for one unable to handle significances. Also, some people who can handle mass very well can't think. But there is no reason why someone can't do both. Occupationally, a person could be in a position where he mainly handles one or the other and considers that he mustn't do the other, or that he can't. Society tells you that you mustn't confront certain things. If you accept this dictum, you can find yourself up some blind alley someplace.

When life offers a person no reward, he will lose interest in playing the game anymore. Destruction of a reward factor is more contributive to a psychosis than punishment.

You could have conflict between fourth dynamics, if Terrans came into conflict with another race of beings. The fifth dynamic tends to be out of comm with people. So does the sixth. Man finds the seventh dynamic unreal. One this planet, the eighth dynamic is the subject of nuttiness.

Up the line, the common denominator is understanding and communication. The only reason why you have trouble inside a dynamic or one dynamic against another, is lack of communication and understanding, with it or of it. The less communication and understanding is feasible, the more trouble you would have in doing something with it. The reward and punishment factors are out to the degree that the communication or understanding is out. The English and Germans keep having wars because of differences in culture, slight those these differences are.

Understanding can exist, even in the absence of significant communication, on the fifth dynamic or at least between men and the fifth dynamic. There is not much mutual understanding within the fifth dynamic. There is a lot of mutual warfare. This doesn't mean that the "Law of the Jungle" is senior or the only one operating. There are also assistive factors in the fifth dynamic: points of high understanding, as in symbiosis.

We are in the field of looking over the dynamics and finding out how far communication is out and how far understanding is out. The easiest way to square somebody around in life is to process him. However, sometimes you have to start out by approaching a person with advice, before he will even get processing. You can advise someone who is going to get processed to move out of his normal environment for a week, and so on. You may have to give him very complicated advice, to match the complexity of his problems.

As you move up into dynamics besides the first, you may find that you have things to handle that you can't handle by getting all involved into processing. When you depart from handling a first dynamic, practically speaking, you have advice or instruction as the main activity. Instruction is more directed advice. You use this on the upper seven dynamics. So training, instilling cultural patterns, etc., becomes part of a scientologist's activities. Advice is casual, undirected instruction. Basically, it is what you use everywhere but on the first dynamic. When people ask for advice, go ahead and evaluate, if advice is all you can get them to have. It would be irresponsible not to give advice, if the person can't get some processing. Within the reality you've got and the data you've got, give the best and least partisan advice you can. You only get into trouble when you move away from being pan-determined in the advice you give, or, for that matter, in whom you will process. Remember, though, that advice that isn't partisan is unacceptable. Do give advice, but don't spend a whole lot of time mulling it over. Just don't pretend to be completely detached. If a guy wants you to get mad at his mother-in-law, you don't have to, but you don't have to pretend that you are detached and no part of the conflict, either. Bleaugh!! Look interested and give advice. You can offer advice urging communication. If that is not accepted, realize that you don't know much about the situation and you might as well give the person something that he can and will apply and do. Estimate the degree of understanding that can occur in the situation and advise that. [Presumably, this would also apply to communication.] Don't assume that you know very much about the situation or that you can give him the perfect solution. If you had the perfect solution, the person wouldn't take it. He would only take as much as he could apply. So give him what he can apply and do. The equation is: What is the best advice you can give him that will be taken? When you know that a person will take a particular piece of advice, put pressure on and put in the hope factor. Advice is anything that you can deal off the cuff that the person can do, that is more beneficial to him than what he is doing. The point is: Handle it! You can do a lot besides processing a person. Hunt and punch around for what he will accept.

Don't assume that everything you are told is true. And don't get partisan. The advice you give can be slightly destructive. Just don't give advice that is widely destructive.

1. Try to bring about auditing.

2. If you can't bring about auditing, try to bring about communication.

3. If you can't bring about communication, try to bring about understanding. Give the individual something practical. Give him something to do. In this way, you will lessen the amount of people's troubles that you listen to. Even if people don't do what you say, you will have catalyzed the situation, and it will have smoothed out. If they don't want to handle it, they will stop talking to you, anyway. The fact that you are helping the people in your vicinity handle life does put you kingpin and aces up, and you actually occupy a role that you will increasingly occupy as scientology rolls along.

6407C28 SHSpec-31 Campaign to Handle Psychosomatic Ills

There will be a small popular textbook on the handling of psychosomatic illnesses. Healing is nobody's monopoly. If it becomes anyone's monopoly, it will be the monopoly of those who can produce results. He who can do the job should be the authority.

There are three [actually four] aspects or types of illness:

1. Predisposition, e.g. rats carrying disease, impure water, etc.

2. Precipitation.

3. Acuteness, i.e. acute illness or injury.

4. Prolongation, i.e." any illness that goes beyond its expected term."

When there is an acute injury or illness, one that exists right now, but is temporary, then there is a job for a medico.

He is the authority in that field. That is where he is trained. We should grant him that beingness. If someone gets cholera, he is sick. Get the medico. Where the medico errs is in trying to take in terrain that is broader than the sphere of his authority.

There are two other things that happen in illness: The predisposition or cause of it. The medico is just faintly into this. It is more the province of the public health officer, who is often an engineer, not an M.D. Efforts to handle predisposition factors are put on a physical level: TB testing, industrial health programs, etc. Medicine can't often determine the length of time involved in predisposition. It begins with an indeterminate point, as far as medicine or doctors are concerned, with a physical cause, e.g. a germ or malarial mosquito, or the alcohol that a drunk driver who injured himself drank before he drove. Such things are what the medico attributes predisposition to. They are physical things, not mental ones.

The other area of illness is prolongation: the perpetuation of an illness, the failure to recover speedily, by the expected term of the illness. Doctors know the expected duration of the acute phase of an illness. They have no way of estimating the period of predisposition, unless they can establish a disease contact. Even that is not really accurate, since a person can be predisposed to a certain illness before contacting germs. contact with the germ is really precipitation of the illness.

So medicos are only slightly involved in predisposition. They have acute illness as their exclusive purview, and they are totally ineffective in the area of prolongation. Prolongation is a fuzzier area, since the treatment of the illness can contribute to it. The medicos' whole idea of prolongation is:

1. Treatment not soon enough.

2. Improper treatment.

3. Complications.

But prolongation can only be controlled to a limited extent by medicine. If an illness enters the stage of prolongation, with complications setting in, the medicos tend to go into apathy, just like the patient, because there are elements in the prolongation of the illness that they can't control. Medicos understand predisposition by physical means; they understand the acute phase in physical terms. In scientology, we would say that the cycle of action would be from the first contact [with the predisposing factor] to the end of the expected normal term of the illness. The doctor can handle this cycle, but sometimes complications occur -- because of poor or absent treatment, in his view. Again it is physical, but the medico tends to be rather apathetic about it or to go into frantic activity, e.g. repeated operations or "heroic" measures. "Shock", or postoperative shock, is a physical thing to a doctor. Usually, he can neither prevent it nor do anything about it. He neglects any possible mental influence.

When you say "illness" and "healing", the M.D., of course, thinks of a physical address to these, since this is what he means by these terms. However, most doctors know that they are up against

something else when they are dealing with psychosomatic illness. If you say, "psychosomatic healing", this is way out to the doctor. How the doctor somes to recognize the existence of psychosomatic illness is a puzzler, since this type of illness is not started by a physical contact. The faults that the doctor finds with psychosomatic healing are only that:

1. It encroaches on his field.

2. He doesn't understand it.

The psychosomatic healer tends to overreach himself and to enter the field of physical healing, in which he is not trained, and he tends to inhibit or prohibit treatment of physical illness, when it exists. For example a doctor will, therefore, condemn a chiropractor. He will point out that the chiropractor adjusted the slipped disc of ten patients and of course nine of them felt better. But he did the same thing with the tenth patient, who was really suffering from TB, which, undiagnosed by the ignorant practitioner, subsequently caused the death of the patient. Therefore a chiropractor is dangerous, to the doctor. That is the professional M.D.'s professional objection in its entirety. This argument is neatly handled by us if we send sick patients to an M.D. before we handle them. The M.D. also recognizes that when he gets into the field of psychosomatic illness, he is in a never-never land he knows not of, because it is not purely physical.

An auditor can't do much with someone who is acutely physically ill. Such a person has too much PTP and not enough ability to as-is. Heavy, acute illness is a PTP, and you can't audit over a PTP, so don't try. Get the PTP handled first, by a doctor if necessary. Then the field of prolongation of illness belongs to scientology. Don't audit over a high temperature. You could perhaps use a very simple process: reach/withdraw from the pillow, perhaps, and see if it works. But that's all. The proper approach is to try to put such a PC in communication at a very low level. If you don't get a sudden resurgence, leave it. There is no point in trying to complete whatever action you were on, because the PC is too distracted by his body problem to as-is what you were on. Prolonged illness is in the field of psychosomatic healing, i.e. scientology. A touch assist shifts the PC's attention off of the place where the PC decided to stop the shock wave, and it discharges that part of the incident. Thus a touch assist allows the incident to run through. The places where the shock wave did go to can be run out. If you continued the touch assist, you would put the PC back at the beginning of the incident again. Then you would have to run the incident out again. [The reason why an engram persists is that it contains a lie. The PC has tried to stop the motion, and with the stuck picture, has apparently done so. But actually, the PC did not stop the incident or the movement of the shock wave through the body, so it has to be run through to be as-ised.]

So, when accepting a PC for auditing, you would be wise to have him get a good physical exam first, so that any acute physical illness can be treated before you start auditing him. However, if the PC has an "untreatable" illness, there is no point in telling the doctor that you are going to heal him. You are not talking about the same kind of healing, so you will just get into a big disagreement. You can get into communication with the doctor on the basis of his expertise in his area. Get him to write a report on his findings. Don't appear to challenge him in his field.

When you are in the field of psychosomatics, you are in the field of prolongation of illness. Your argument with the M.D. takes an interesting turn, at this point. There is nothing that he can do. You can tell him, "This is a question of psychosomatic illness. There is probably some mental condition holding the illness in place." He can agree with you, in oversimplified terms. You can tell him that it is more complicated than that, and he will agree. It is something that has exceeded his cycle of action, so he has to become the effect of it.

If you can do something about psychosomatic illness when the doctor can't, he will be glad to send those patients to you, because those are the patients he can do nothing about, which makes him feel like a fraud and gives him loses. These are the patients whose illnesses go on longer than they should. You can tell the doctor a simplified version of what you will do, as one specialist to another. Then you get your result, and the doctor will look on you with awe.

The M.D. knows that the "psychiatrist is a failure, because (among other things) he can't handle -- never solved -- the problem of prolongation for the M.D." If scientology made its position completely clear to the medical doctor, namely, that we are not interested in trying to heal obvious physical injury and illness, our view would become much realer to the M.D., and we would be seen as doing him a service, in handling the "crocks". Just agree to the truth that a skull fracture, for example, is nothing

that psychosomatic healing should be practiced on -- that there is a purview that belongs properly and exclusively to the M.D. and surgeon -- and he will stop fighting you instantly.

Psychosomatic healing actually has an old tradition, older than the M.D.'s. This includes witch doctoring, "magic", etc. Naturally it is the oldest tradition. It has truth behind it, because it is the tradition of the spirit. This is just a small part of scientology, but it is where we belong in the field of healing.

6407C30 SHSpec-32 "Psychosomatic" -- Its Meaning in scientology

Medical treatment lies in what they call "psychic trauma". Within 24 hours of LRH's setting out a program of helping the medicos, they goofed with a Saint Hill student (Bill Webster-Johnson). They gave him the wrong blood-type during a transfusion and thereby possibly cost him his life. That's pure damn foolishness! In the first place, they monkey around when they get outside their limited proper field. This caused LRH to take a sharp look at possible cooperation and made him question it. Legislatures pass laws about things that they know nothing about. "There's nothing in the Constitution that says you have to be sane to be a citizen, and yet ... if you are pronounced insane, you are no longer a citizen and have no civil rights whatsoever." The right to say who is insane is given to people with no training in the field of the mind, who think that the mind is the brain. By law, they do not have to be trained in anything but medicine, anyway. There is no bill or law that says that psychiatrists can practice in the field of the mind, only that one must be an M.D. Psychiatrists do not have to be licensed, and the term, "psychiatrist" has no legal standing.

To train an animal, you wait for the animal to do something and then say the command word and reward the animal. Association, according to Pavlov and Thompson, is a concatenation of [events], by which one reaches a conclusion. Freudian psychiatry is not currently practiced. None of the current practitioners was trained by Freud, and the original system may have called for more intelligence on the part of the practitioner than seems to be used now. Freud probably used savvy and word-association to cone down on the problem. Free association is the lengthy procedure. For contemporary Freudians, amassing "enough" data appears to be their system.

But by the time one amasses enough data one is simply confused. You need a chance to apply the data.

Technology is dicey stuff. The more vias it goes through, the more errors it becomes subject to. LRH handles lots of tech queries from students, instructors, MSH, etc.

The right to practice depends, ideally, on the ability to do, not on some state legislator's decisions. Promoters and lobbyists determine what laws and appropriations shall be made anyway, in order to get more money for their department or industry or whatever. That is why there are periodic attacks on scientology. It is being used as an example of "How bad it all is, over there."

If you hit someone, mentally or physically, with enough force, duress, or bad news, you can make him give you something:

Mass: A physical blow

Significance: Saying how bad it is. E.g., "Is seepage troubling your loved ones?" This is a mortuary bad news come-on for expensive caskets. Blackmail is based on the same principle. So is taxation and the draft. The medical doctor uses this technique in disease-fighting campaigns that scare people with how bad it is. Instead of getting their income from curing people, they use the scare tactic as a large source of funds.

If you understand how this law operates, you can usually put together a good defense or counter-attack. This scare tactic is also used by patients: "I'm so bad off, you've got to give me...." With the next bad news artist you run into, ask him boldfacedly, "What am I expected to give you?" You will stop him cold in his tracks. This "completely discombobulates" him. You apply the second half of the law that he is operating on (albeit unknowingly) before he is ready for it. You complete the cycle unexpectedly.

You may not get a sensible answer to your question, but you will change what he is doing his attention. He may not doing this consciously. He may have you misidentified and be dramatizing something. He surely doesn't expect your response.

"If you can make people laugh when they're crying and cry when they're laughing, then you would know something about the human mind." This is an interesting point. But "knowing the mind doesn't mean manipulating the mind."

The medical profession means something else by psychosomatic healing than what you mean by it. They mean "the mind's influence on the body", but they consider the mind to be the brain. So "psychosomatic" means the brain's or the nervous system's effect on the body. This is like saying that the switchboard is the causative element of the phone company. So "psychosomatic" has come to mean "the body's effect on the body". Thus the subject of psychosomatic illness has disappeared as a meaningful subject.

The word, "psychosomatic" actually means "psyche -- soul, plus soma -- body", so a proper definition of "psychosomatic" would be "a thetan's influence on the body". That is our definition, but not the medicos'. The first downgrade was to translate "psyche" as "mind". The thetan had lost his identity and had become identified with the masses and machinery of the mind. The second downgrade was to make "mind" mean "brain and nervous system". This makes "psychosomatic" mean about what "the influence of the switchboards and telephone lines on the government" would mean. That is what the M.D.'s mean. Since the brain and nervous system are part of the body, you are just dealing with the body's influence on the body. Case has just fallen out of it.

A better term, then, might be "spiritual healing", or the spirit's influence on the body. You can educate or process someone to recognition of the effect he as a being is having on his

You could ask him for times in his life when he was ill, following being upset. He might comm lag a long time, but getting a few of these out of the way will improve someone's case.

We have advanced beyond the tradition of psychosomatic healing because we recognize three stages of influence: The thetan (psyche) influencing the mind (psycho), which then influences the body (soma). We recognize that the mind is doing something to the body. Some retained memory has held a pain or an experience in place, keeping the body ill or predisposing the body to illness or injury. You wouldn't have a somatic (body feeling) of feeling good, because it would be you that felt good. Dianetics was at the level of mind over the body. But even here, the mind was not totally causative. We had to recognize that something was doing something that was not the mind. We recognized that the thetan existed and could influence the mind to make it stop influencing the body for the worse, and that makes us different. We have found the thing that the thetan can influence: the mind. He may not be able to influence the body directly, but he can influence the mind which, in turn, is influencing the body. This is more effective than earlier healing practices, because asking the thetan to influence the body directly is too great a gap for him to jump.

Scientology handles predisposition to illness, and we are the only ones who can, just as we are the only ones who can handle prolongation of illness.

6408C04 SHSpec-33 A Summary of Study

There has not been a technology of education or study. There was a school technology, but it didn't have much to do with education. Education seldom has much to do with school. Education, as opposed to schooling, takes into account the relative importance, i.e. the applicability, of the data being taught. Schooling has no real thought of applicability. For instance, there are people in art who think that knowing names and dates is knowing something about art, when they couldn't tell you what a picture was painted with.

In education, mass and significance must be balanced. Don't get too much significance for the mass. When you get into significance vs. mass, you get into action. Action could be defined as significance versus mass of some kind. The reason why one engages in action is that one has a purpose of achieving or avoiding something. In education, when the significance is never added to the mass, you get a jammed curriculum. There is no doingness. A significance that has nothing to do with the mass that you are now confronting is a disrelated datum. All it does is to throw you a curve. School is

expert at doing this. You could have a school system that would teach, but that wouldn't educate anyone or train anyone for anything, because it failed to add any mass or doingness to the significance. The data in such a school system is all curiosa. It is not of any use. That is why you almost never turn an artist out of a university. Universities separate significance from action, so that the student gets introverted, with no confront of the subject. You can't have education if you detach doingness from significance. If you do this, you get a highly impractical person who never leaves school: a professor.

For someone to teach who cannot do is a terrible mistake. Instructors in scientology should be able to audit. Any trouble an instructor has in teaching has at least a little to do with inability in the area.

A person merely writing reports of people who can do is too far removed from the mass to write a good textbook.

When you have thoroughly learned something, you can use your textbook knowledge to think, and you will get a better result than the pure textbook approach would give. LRH also found that the pure darkroom training that he had had wasn't enough in itself to make a good photographer. There is ample evidence of this fact in the daily newspaper pictures, which are mostly by untrained photographers. Photography has the common denominator of the public taste. It is a new subject -- only a little over a century old. It hasn't had time to get snobbish.

When a subject is all mass and no significance, it also fails. Professionalism has to do with significance, doingness, and mass. You need all three to get a final result. Education would treat these three things equally. This isn't a new thought, but the photography course confirmed it for LRH. Professionalism is sweated for. Professionals work hard. Dilettantes don't.

You don't have to have done everything that has been done to be a pro. You don't have to have made a human mind to fix one up, or to have built an E-meter to know how to operate one. This would be an overstress on doingness.

The way to keep things in balance is to design the course such that if someone isn't going to do something, you strip the significance out of it. Doingnesses become converted to significances if one isn't going to perform them. You should never thus convert doingnesses to only significances, i.e. never take something that is never more to be performed and describe it far beyond necessity. You can work it in the other direction and convert a significance to a doingness, if you take something that has been done but isn't currently being done and teach someone to do it, e.g. Bromoil prints. The doingness and mass of a subject that should be taught are the currently applicable doingnesses and masses of the subject. The significances that should be taught are enough background so that the individual doesn't get stuck in the doingness, so that the doingness has a framework, and the principles behind it are clear and understood. This is a little more significance than you would expect. That is why you show the student how the subject evolved, what other doingnesses there have been, and the principles behind the doingnesses. Then he can think, as well as perform a mechanical act. That is the difference between a pro and a practical man. When a doingness changes, the guy who has grounding in the subject can understand why and evaluate it properly. A professional, therefore, can advance, where a practical man without theoretical grounding would become antiquated or obsolete.

A [mere] theoretician could be well-taught, but he is seldom educated, since his doingness would be missing. He might have some other doingness that would be useful. E.g. he could be an art expert who knows nothing about art but whose doingness is the detection of the age of canvasses. Or whatever.

Most of the protest of the young is that they are being schooled, not educated. An instructor could think someone was doing simply because he was in motion. But if the motion has nothing to do with what the student will be doing, it reacts like a significance, and the student will feel bored and stuck, as though he was up against something that he couldn't move through.

Education should be the activity of relaying an idea or an action from one being to another in such a way as not to stultify or inhibit the use thereof. It permits the recipient to think on and develop the subject and not to become antiquated on the subject. The information is loose and flexible in his head, not fixed in such a way that it relates to only one thing. The basic thing wrong with education has been that it never defined what it was trying to do. It got confused with schooling. Education got in trouble the second it started to do something that it didn't define.

By starting with the thetan as the basis of our theory, we exceed the reach of other subjects. We have to process someone to get him to understand, because the thetan is relatively incapable of understanding in a degraded state. There appears to be a close relationship between mis-education and aberration. You could get resurgences in many areas of a case just by getting someone to find and define misunderstood words from life.

6408C06 SHSpec-34 Study -- Gradients and Nomenclature

Bulletins are now being written in a form that is easier to understand, since LRH started to study study. Scores on exams have gone from 5% in the go's to 60% in the 90's, since this material started to be communicated. The aim is to improve the ability of the student to learn by altering the methodology of teaching. This is an unusual approach. We are now handling the student's subjective reaction to the subject by changing the method of teaching. The usual way to change the student's reaction to the subject was by punishment, the normal physical universe method. The grade system is a punishment system. On rare occasions, the participation of the student has been invited by some teachers.

Education is not normally very successful, although educators don't often recognize or admit this fact. In scientology, we have the unusual situation of being able to see the end product of our education in action. This makes it easy to see how well the students learned the material. In studying study, LRH avoided fields where the student's ability to apply what he learned is readily observable. We have instantaneous inspection of the results of our study. This is quite rare.

Most fields of study expect the student to be very amateurish. In the field of photography, you get results almost as rapidly as in studying auditing, which made it a good comparative field for studying.

Auditing is a complicated activity. In teaching it, we apply the principle of gradient scales, which was discovered long since. We have someone learn a fairly simple basic action very well. Then we add a second action, etc. Modern universities usually err by entering the gradient at too high a point and assuming that the students already know basics that they don't, in fact. Modern education is the art of teaching on an out-gradient.

Our basic gradient on education is to start by getting someone there. This is a step that elementary school teachers overlook and that works very well when used for five or ten minutes a day, brief a time though that is, at the start of the day. For instance, you could run, "Look at that wall," etc. The fact that a body is there doesn't prove that the person is there. Nobody is smart where he is not, so getting the person there raises I.Q.

You always have to start with an action that is simple enough so that the student can get it rather easily. Otherwise, he will feel spinny and confused as he goes on. You could discover whether this had happened with a person by checking on the E-meter for early difficulties in studying dianetics or scientology. If you got TA and continued reads as the person discussed it, you would know that there was something there that bad never been resolved.

The difficulties that men have with their minds are those which have ridden forward with them into the present. Those are the ones that must be handled. You can always get one read on a difficulty or confusion that someone has had in the past, simply because it is pictured on the track as having been a difficulty. But it won't keep reading, if it hasn't ridden forward in time. As an auditor, you are only interested in the things that the person never resolved, which are active now. Those things will read repetitively. This applies to clearing up someone's difficulty in studying, because the confusions that the person had which are now cleared up have no power to confuse him now. ARC must have preceded all misemotion and bad reaction. The confusion that sticks the student in PT is never his basic confusion. If a student really can't learn something, then there is a lower point on the gradient that the student skipped. At that point, he had enough confusion to be overwhelmed. That second point is the one that you will get on the meter. You won't get the earliest point. This follows the pattern of the mind. A person doesn't have trouble from what he knows is wrong. What the student is very confused about, which the instructor can't seem to teach, is not the right point to try to clear up. The way to handle this student is to go back and find the word in the earlier material that wasn't understood. You can pinpoint within a few words the exact spot at which a student started to have trouble, then look earlier and find the skipped gradient. If there is some word that a student doesn't understand, with violence, you look before that. You go back as far as you need to.

The physiological manifestations will be feeling headachy, spots in front of the eyes, walls getting closer, a spinny, weird feeling. The skipped gradient can even be in an allied subject. When a word is misunderstood, words right after it vanish.

Teaching is relaying data to a person that he can receive and understand, in such a way that he will be able to use the data. That is the definition that was given the other day to fit in with this exact rationale that we are discussing now. Instruction would consist of guiding a student along a known gradient, not dreaming up solutions to his confusions. Good instruction consists in backtracking to find the point where the student thought he understood, when he didn't. "Study is a concatenation of certainties, ... a string of confidences and competences." So before you help a student out, let him get in trouble. "Never trouble trouble 'til trouble troubles you." That is the difficulty of group study. Teachers have to make an average of trouble for the whole class. Don't ever help a student before be runs into trouble.

It is interesting that it was in 1947 that LRH started investigating the effect of a mis-learned word on life, following the data from Commander Thompson on word-associations. LRH established that when he cleared up some words, what had been troubling a person ceased to trouble him, though he could well have new problems.

Another aspect of the misunderstood word phenomenon can be that the word or phrase used can be inadequate, leading to omitted data. One can get hung up by being deprived of some information, e.g. by a typographical error. So it could be omitted data as well as misunderstood words [that causes trouble for the student]. The fault could be in the text. The common ingredient is that something is not understood.

6408C11 SHSpec-35 Study: Evaluation of Information

Psychologists are working for advertisers in order to find out what makes people tick: motivational research. But they are the wrong people to go to, since they don't know what the real buttons are. A scientologist could be much more successful at motivational research, degrading though the use of knowledge of the mind for such purposes would be.

In order to live calmly in the midst of confusion, a person must have the basic answers. Then the confusion doesn't bother him 90% of the time, and the other 10% of the time he can do something about it. Knowledge is achieved by study. The subject of words boobytraps a person's efforts to find out about the world. The individual generally assigns to the wrong part of the study material the reason why he can't study it, because the right part is something that he isn't confronting, and he feels he can't confront it. So he disperses and confronts something else.

Study could mean the same thing as inspection, i.e. observation to find out something about something. A person can observe something directly, or he can get knowledge on a second-hand basis from the printed page. The second system speeds up the amount that you can learn, since you don't have to do all the basic leg-work. Even when you have direct experience, it is best to have some fruits of others' observations and experience from which to profit. Illiterate cultures don't survive as well as literate ones. Those who do not know, who do not understand, get overwhelmed and tossed out.

Between the two extremes of:

1. No observation necessary because one knows everything (a dying civilization or individual).

2. No observation possible (because the words aren't known). lies the middle ground of knowing the words and staying alert. Never become complacent about what you know and you will survive nicely. This applies especially to someone who knows more than those around him. This danger, of stultifying because of thinking that there is no more need to observe, faces scientology.

The person who survives is the one who can observe, understand, and do. Second hand observation in particular has to be very well understood. The understanding has to increase in proportion to the directness of the observation. Understanding is a substitute for mass in studying something. There are two things to understand about second hand observation and understanding. The understanding can be indirect because of:

1. Time.

2. Being relayed by someone else. The difficulties of second-hand observation are innumerable, so part of our understanding must be evaluation of the reliability of the information that we are being given. That is where the bulk of beings get fouled up. Evaluating an information source is a matter of experience, among other things. You must be able to go on past something you know you don't understand, being prepared for any misunderstood phenomena and knowing the source of these phenomena.

What a person studies and the way in which he studies, should depend on what he wishes to do with the information. Specialized words are used for specialized observations. You can approach a subject at various levels. You can think that you know more than you do, if you have had a superficial contact with the subject. But how much do you want or need to know about the subject? Do you want to be able to discuss it at parties, or to use it for something, and if the latter, for what do you want to use it? For instance, art could be used as a discussion topic, as interior decoration, as investment, as something that one will teach others to appreciate, or as something that one will create oneself.

Study that winds up only in understanding with no activity is OK. There is a lot of it around in society. But don't make a habit of it. You can think that you know all about it, when you can't do it. That is not very pro-survival. Neither is the consideration that the subject is too complicated for you to ever use it. Doingness does require much more understanding than lookingness. If you are studying for doingness, study on a gradient. Give the student a series of doingnesses that he can do and have wins at. Doingness increases understanding, as well as the other way around.

6408C13 SHSpec-36 Study and Education

Education is acquiring a knowingness in a subject and an ability to act in that area. The whole subject of education has, as its end, the accomplishment of certain doingnesses. Study that doesn't have that intention is only directed towards acquaintance, dilletantism, or doodle-daddling. That is not really education. Education is to accomplish certain things with that subject. If a person is educated in a subject, he can accomplish the results of that subject because he knows that subject. This is why "education" in schools isn't really education at all.

You can't really separate education from some role, some professional doingness, as the end in view. That is the modern quarrel with "education" in schools. Much is spent to educate students, but they don't get educated. People don't get educated in arithmetic because it doesn't have an end product. It could have an end product, but the end product hasn't been defined or described. In universities, the student is expected to use higher mathematics to solve problems that could actually be solved with arithmetic, if arithmetic hadn't been degraded by being thought of as nothing but groundwork for higher mathematics.

As the purpose of a subject deteriorates or is purported to deteriorate, the subject itself disappears. If the individual learning the subject has no purpose for the subject, it will die away in him. A live study is one that has use. A dead study has no use. You can cause a subject to die away, either by making its use die away or by omitting its purpose as part of the educational process. [I.e. not telling students what the subject is for. This brings to mind the dissemination formula. This is related to the fact that you need a purpose to study something. Getting a person's ruin and applying the formula gives him a purpose for looking at the subject of scientology.]

It is possible to become obsessive in the study of some subject that has no use. In talking about scientology, people will think of it as a subject only when they see that it has a purpose that is real to them as an attainable purpose.

For an educational subject to continue to exist, it must have a purpose that can be seen to be an attainable action to the individual addressed, in his view. The value of a subject depends upon the value of attaining its stated purpose. A culture is held together only by education. The achievement of an education is remunerated to the degree that:

1. Its service is understood to be valuable. This shows that some odd services are thought to be valuable, e.g. undertaking, which has survived as a technical line for thousands of years.

2. It is understood. A continuing need for a subject will preserve the subject, but its technology must be relayed which it will be if it is needed. One could destroy a subject by destroying its purpose or by destroying its technology, or by adding things to its technology that are unnecessary. In educating a person in a certain subject, the longer it takes to get to the point of using the subject, the more opportunities there are to fail at it. This is is the reverse of the too-steep gradient. [Cf. the analogy of the "runway". If it is too short, you can't take off, but if it is too long, you are likely to damage the plane on the ruts and stones before you can take off.]

True knowledge gives correct emphasis. Merely theoretical knowledge will give a wrong emphasis. This can result in technology getting lost, as would happen if, for instance, you studied three weeks on how to make E-meter varnish, and other such matters. Unrealities enter when you teach solutions to problems that don't exist or when you fail to solve problems that do exist. By experience, you learn where the problems are. It is hard to teach a subject with which you have no immediate personal experience. This is one reason why education gets a bad name, since most professors don't know what they are talking about. [Those that can, do; those that can't, teach.]

All subjects wind up in a finite doingness. If a subject doesn't wind up in a finite doingness, a person cannot be educated in that subject. Anything that winds up in a specific doingness can be educated.

Education in the absence of the mass with which the technology will be involved is hard on people. It makes them feel squashed, bent, sort of spinny, bored, exasperated, sort of dead. Pictures of the mass would help. You would expect the greatest incidence of suicide and illness where people were studying a subject whose mass was absent. Too steep a gradient gives a different physiological reaction: a confusion and reelingness. The bypassed definition gives a blank, washed-out, not-there feeling, followed by a nervous hysteria. The eventual manifestation of this is a blow from the subject.

To remedy the absence of mass, supply mass. To remedy the too-steep gradient, find the last point that was well understood and find the misunderstood right there or just after. To remedy the misunderstood word get it defined and used.

Manifestations of study problems:
Absent Mass

1. Squashed feeling.

2. Bent feeling.

3. Feeling sort of spinny.

4. Boredom.

5. Flatness.

6. Peeling sort of dead.

7. Exasperation.

8. Headaches.

9. Stomach aches.

10. Eyes hurting.

11. Dizziness.

Too Steep a Gradient

1. Confusion.

2. Reelingness.

Bypassed Definition

491

1. Blank, not-there, washed-out feeling.

2. Followed by a nervous hysteria.

3. Followed by a blow from the subject. This is the final manifestation.

Gradients are more involved with doingness, though they do hang off in the subject of significance. But it is the action that we are interested in.

The misunderstood word is the most important thing in establishing someone's doingness. The restoration of doingness depends only on getting the misunderstood word defined and understood, though to do well or with talent may vary from person to person. A person, say, doesn't know a word in psychology, so he can't move over into scientology. The misunderstood word opens the gate to education, so it is the most important aspect of study tech.

6409C01 SHSpec-37 The PE Course

Here is some data from the field of study that relates to the PE course: New people hear incomprehensible words and don't return. That's it. That is the reason why you have fifteen people on Monday who dwindle to two people on Friday. What has been discovered here is the act that exists prior to the overt and which illumines the overt-motivator and O/W sequences. "Before there is an overt, there is a non-comprehend." So the overt-motivator sequence goes:

1. A misunderstood word.

2. A non-comprehend.

3. A belief that it is OK to commit an overt.

4. The commission of the overt.

5. The withhold of the overt.

6. A blow -- an attack or a withdrawal. This can be big or small.

[See also HCOB 8Sep64 "Levels II to IV: Overts -- What Lies Behind Them?"]

A critical thought is a justifier, a lessener of the overt, and therefore a symptom of an overt. If you ask the PC for an overt and he gives a critical thought, of course you don't leave it there. You ask for the done. Having gotten that, you could ask for the non-comprehend, and, behind that, for the misunderstood word. Get the nattery student to find (on his own, before the next course-time) all of his misunderstoods in previous courses or studies and get them cleaned up.

Someone who can't do anything about anything is reasonable about it all. This is a disease that a civilized person gets into. "Being reasonable" doesn't solve anything. You "can't do anything about it", so you get reasonable about it. Being reasonable is what someone does who can't make his goals anymore. If you really find out what the score is, you don't have to be reasonable. You can do something about it. If a guy is having trouble understanding and is nattering about scientology before he has had time to find anything to natter about, there is a word or words in a prior related subject that was misunderstood. Someone who has misunderstood words in a field that is allied to scientology, will be unable to learn scientology. This is why someone who is a psychologist has trouble learning scientology. He could do some clay table processing to handle it. Or you could assign him a self-audit, looking up the words in psychology that he didn't understand. This takes care of the natterer in the PE course, as a very precise action.

If you get someone in the PE course who is trying to get it but can't, ask him for the word that you have used that he didn't understand. If the guy is simply trying and failing to grasp a word, he just has an in-context misunderstood word. Find it, and he will brighten up.

Then there is the perfect PE student who sits and nods but hasn't a clue. This is handled by having people give written examples of the point that you have made, taken from real life. This permits a

return flow and lets you spot the fellow who is utterly glib and can't apply, the fellow who hasn't connected. Get him to give you a list of words that he hasn't understood since starting the course. Take up those words and clean them up. Probably some other people on the course haven't got them either.

Suppose that you were offered a course, to teach you all about automobiles, and you had never seen one, but you had sort of vaguely heard about them. You had heard that they travel over the ground at tremendous speeds. This sow ded rather neat and intriguing, so you decided to take the course. Then, suppose you got hit with three nights in a row of how neat cars are and how fast you can go in them and how intriguing they are, and you never got word one about what an automobile is, what makes it work, or what its parts are? So when you teach scientology, teach it.

An overt against scientology is a justification for not having understood some word or concept in scientology. Keep it simple and keep it defined. As much as possible, keep it familiar. People like the familiar.

People don't like things that are totally new. The public likes the old, with maybe a little bit of improvement, not new subjects. So you had better represent scientology as what it is, which is the only conservative study in the field of the mind. It follows the traditional patterns of philosophy, religion, and the mind. Your own interest in it may have come from your recognition, in it, of the philosophy of Greece and Rome, and of faculty psychology.

People justify not having understood a subject, so they commit the overt. That shows that the subject is no good. Present-day psychologists think of a man as a machine. Psychology has a stable datum: "Perception depends on association and sensation." According to the psychologist, there is no perception in the absence of sensation and association. That is, a machine, in the absence of someone tickling its gears and certain things making other things happen, is incapable of noticing anything that is happening. This notion puts conditions upon being able to perceive anything, and it is not true. It would be true of a machine with nobody in charge, but it is not true of a being. A being does not require sensation with association in order to perceive. Only if a person were a piece of meat would this be true. "Before I can look at a field of hay, I'd have to have received a sensation from [it] and [to] have associated it with my childhood." A robot would have to do that. It would have to have associative memory, etc. Psychologists believe that Man is a robot.

When you say that "perception is engaged upon by the being himself as a means of communication with the universe around him and other beings," you would have been welcomed by the sixteenth century faculty psychologists, but you are damned by the moderns. You have introduced volition: volitional and non-volitional acts. "You have set up the individual as seeing what he wants to see and not seeing what he doesn't want to see. You have set up the whole mechanism of power of choice, and you have set up the dignity of the individual. And that they want nothing to do with, because they, ... in not understanding Man, have gone the route of the overt. [See earlier part of this tape.]"

"That's why psychiatry cuts out brains. They've got to make nothing out of Man, because they haven't understood him." And the misunderstood word that it goes back to is "psychology". Every psychiatrist is in the frame of mind of a con man. They are ARC broken with their own subject. They know it doesn't work. This is where their contempt for Man comes from. They dominate thought in universities. They teach that Man is no good. He is just a machine. Such a philosophy became "necessary" when leaders entered wars that killed off thirty million people at a crack. This philosophy justifies the overt. "You have to have a philosophy that Man is no good, in order to go on committing overts."

"So ... Man's mental subjects first didn't bother to understand anything about Man, and so then began to commit overts, and then employment was found for these blokes by fellows who had to have their overts justified": the Hitlers and the Stalins. Man is not more degraded than he was. It is just that Man's mental sciences have "departed from the traditional, which had to do with the dignity of Man." Wundt made his big mistake at Leipzig, in 1879, and Pavlov and psychiatry came riding in.

Scientology is in the great tradition of the dignity of Man. The ideas that we are moving along with are the traditional ideas. These ideas have to do with attention, perception, power of choice, and motivation of behavior. We do not go on the basis of how wicked everyone is. We just ask what these things are. The idea that men are animals was always there to be bought, but it wasn't until 1879 that it got taken up. So modern psychology is the upstart subject. Modern psychology and psychiatry

came from the Russian and the German -- two groups of people who have no enviable reputation for humanitarianism. If the Germans had just stopped with music and cameras, we would be fine. But every once in awhile, they got careless with guns. Psychiatry came from Germany and modern psychology came from the Russians.

Psychology is really a sub-study of scientology, and, as such, it is our property. After all, psychologists can't even define "psychology". It should have its spelling changed to psyche-ology -- study of the soul -- so as to reflect its true and traditional meaning.

It is the psychiatrists and "psychologists" who are the radicals. Scientologists and the traditionalists. We are the conservatives.

Psychiatry, psychology, philosophy, and religion and all subsumed in scientology. The radical approaches have had their chance and have failed to produce results. They should stand aside in favor of the more traditional approach. Psychology, as psyche-ology, should be seen as being part of scientology.

The eyes can see by putting something there to be perceived, as well as by perceiving what is there. Learning nomenclature is equivalent to learning what is there. Treat the PE course as an area where people can learn the language and find out what is there to be named, and students will come up smiling. If they don't understand the words, they blow, natter, and commit overts. Thus we build our own opposition.

6409C03 SHSpec-38 Clearing -- What It Is

"Clear" means what it meant in Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science, which is the same as what it means on adding machines. Computers have complex circuits. Sometimes a drop of solder gets dropped in, which short-circuits the circuits and adds some wrong constant factor to the computer. In mechanical adding machines, if you never pushed the "clear" button after the previous operation, you would get the old total added in. That is the uncleared answer, where old data modifies PT data. The mind, likewise, will add old answers into current computations and get wrong answers. A person's memory will be bad in the area where the old answer is stuck. Amnesia is all the "held-down fives", adding up to a total blank. Memory is not a broad condition. It is spotty as a leopard. A person has bad memory in an area of aberration. A traumatic experience is surrounded by locks, so sometimes it is hard to find. There is no such thing, however, as a uniformly good or bad memory. The worse off someone is, the more areas of no-memory there are. [Insanity becomes a way of obfuscating overts, as well as a motivator and a justifier for them. If we could get a person to see the overt, all that insanity would become unnecessary.]

If you want to improve someone's memory, you must ask, "Memory on what?" A person is aberrated in the area where his memory is poor. There is a fairly good-sized piece of nuttiness occluding some area of his experience and memory. All you have to do is to monkey with it a little, and it will start to clear. Psychiatry errs by trying to make sense out of the incomprehensible. It can't be done, by definition. You should not try to figure that "square shapes make people nervous", because some patients were nervous around doors. Instead, you should find out how come the patients got nuts on the subject of doors. You don't try to make sense out of the incomprehensible. All you have to do is to understand that he [the person who has presented you with the incomprehensible] doesn't understand it, and to start looking for where it came from.

People are far more normal than they are crazy. [Cf. H.S. Sullivan] Nobody is totally crazy. Other "mental sciences" go crazy on this fact, because of Man's thirst for "allness", which is just the craving to identify A with A. Psychiatrists, going A=A=A, think that there is such a thing as a total insanity, and that therefore there is such a thing as the state of being insane. Even in his legal systems, Man has to have something called "insanity". This is not correct: A person is insane in one or more areas or subjects. There is no such thing as total insanity. A gibbering idiot who asks for a glass of water when he is thirsty is sane in that area. The sentence, "This man is insane," requires three dots at its end to show that it is incomplete: Psychiatrists have never completed the sentence so that it reads properly and accurately as, "This man is insane on the subject of _____ ." But if psychiatrists knew that much about the subject of insanity, they could cure it. It is the missing link.

Actually, they have never defined their terms. If you ask a psychiatrist, "What subject is this guy insane on?", he would say, maybe, "Exhibitionism!" Bull pucky!! That's a condition, not a subject. You can't classify insanities, because no insanity is the same, on the same subject, as any other.

To finish the sentence, "This man is insane on the subject of _____ ," psychiatrists would have to observe the patient. Then they would see that there was no similarity to others' insanity.

Find the subject on which a person is insane, find the source of the subject, and he will have cognitions and the aberration will blow. "If you are in an area where the PC is cogniting, you must therefore be in an area where the PC was aberrated." You are tracking down and "clearing" a "held-down five". A cognition is a returned memory. When the PC is cogniting, it is an indicator that he is getting rid of held-down fives. And he will be remembering better in that area. If a person never cognites, you aren't tracking down any held-down fives.

"Clear" means "on any given subject, not nuts anymore", especially where the person has been pretty nuts. You could say, for example, "On the subject of children, this person is clear." You would have to put it into the framework of a relationship of some kind. When you have hit enough stuck fives, you can call the guy a clear, which means "a cleared being, with a cleared ability to think". A guy who has been cleared in a given area of aberration can't go nuts in that area again. It took a fantastically off-the-wall set of circumstances to aberrate the person in the first place. To aberrate him again, you would have to get the same weird circumstances all together again, and then some, because now he is educated, too. He knows how it happened. A cleared person, or clear, would be a person with no obvious aberrations and with a majority of areas cleared, who has a cleared ability to think.

The basic business of an auditor is to use scientology tech to locate areas of aberration in the being, and then to follow those areas down until the person recognized an earlier causation for the condition. He would then be unable to reconstruct his nuttiness in that area, because the thing that had him aberrated in the first place is gone, and he also knows that he has been nuts in that area, so when he sees something approaching that could be a recurrence of the condition, he pre-understands what might happen again, and it won't happen. Having had the experience [and being aware of it] is like being inoculated. He couldn't go nuts again in that area if he tried. Therefore clearing is stable.

The state of total causation is not the same as the state of clear. The state of total causation is OT, which is different from being unaberrated. Clearing is something that applies to the mind. It is related to a finite state of existence -- the ability to survive well in everyday existence, in the universe, across time. When we try to make clear an absolute, we go beyond that into another area that has the side-effects of clear, although you are not trying to fix the guy up. The final result is total resumption of beingness at total causation, which isn't necessarily in the physical universe, in finite time.

Clearing is an assist to finite existence, not some supernatural thing. Man doesn't leap from a state of total aberration to a state of total divinity. It is a long walk, which starts with the guy's present environment. The gradient scale only breaks down when the PC gets into running the things that make up the mind: GPM's. Now you are handling uncommon, unnatural problems, like, "Why did the being make a time track? What is he doing in the physical universe?", etc. An individual who had no time at all would not be normal! It takes a different framework to explain this.

Now you have an individual who, through his understandings of what is around him and his exact handling of the masses and significances in his immediate vicinity, has a gradual emergence and cognition of what is going on. We are knocking out his concept of existence and replacing it with total knowingness of existence. That individual is emerging towards causation, not towards being cleared. He is going towards a point where he causes the past, not where he is cleared of the past. The aberrations you are taking away from him on R6 are not timed aberrations. That is what makes them build up, and that is why they are rough. They can't be blown by meter dating; they date "now". However, you can date and blow an implant. A GPM isn't something that happened in the year 2681 B That is quite different from something that happened within the universe, that you can fit in on the time track. If you find an engram, all you have to do it date it, and it goes, "Bzzt!" The PC wouldn't have a prayer of getting it back. After the guy is clear, you begin to ask, "Where is the time coming from, that you are dating the clearing in?" Now you are into R6 and OT. The guy is "more causative over the universe; less worried about what the universe is doing to him." You are going from the finite to the infinite. The field of re-creation of the individual, or the individual's rising up towards total cause, is a long and arduous road. You don't run out of GPM's very fast.

The point is, that there is a separation point between the finite universe and the world of total beingness. People going towards clearing are interested in physical well-being and their relationships with other human beings. They are interested in accomplishing finite goals in the physical universe, like keeping a job, etc. If a person going up the other track hasn't totally followed the clearing track, he is still interested in those things, too, although perhaps not so aberratedly. But only people who are interested in clearing are interested in finite physical universe goals.

If someone is "insane", you remove the individual areas of aberration as they become accessible and leave a growing core of sanity that was always there. "Somewhere along the line, he ceases to be interested in becoming clear of his past ... and he begins to be very sincerely ... interested in causation: personal, individual causation." What is the individual's relationship to and responsibility with regard to the physical universe? The individual is also capable of going nuts in this direction and thinking that he is God, but only if he isn't really past the gates on the road. Clearing ceases when the individual can recognize his basic GPM's and knows where they came from, etc. Ordinary clearing procedures won't touch GPM's, so clearing ceases. Now you go into running GPM's. The person soon gets over being interested in blowing out the electric light or wondering if he could do this, etc. He gets more serious-minded about the situation as it becomes more real to him and more natural to him. He stops worrying about other people getting to be OT. The end of the road is in view, and it is a finite road.

So the two roads are different. One has to do with processing somebody within the limits of time and experience, deleting things that keep the individual from getting right answers in existence. The other is different. Auditing changes; the individual's responses to auditing change. You can still shift the pre-OT back a little onto the other road. If you do this too much, he collides with the next GPM and it jams the meter. The locks are now all on top of GPM's, not on traumatic life experiences. [Charge on a subject could lead to misunderstanding a word on the subject. Clarification of the word would cause dropping away of some locks on the subject. This could apply to GPM words also.]

It isn't how big or how little a person's aberrations are that counts. It is how many aberrations he has. The closer the aberrations are in subject to each other, the more there are. These aberrations are not necessarily [based on] dramatic or interesting experiences, either, although the PC may try to make more out of them than is actually there.

6409C15 SHSpec-39 Scientology and Tradition

You have to understand something about policy. Policy is not just something that LRH just dreamed up. It is something that has been worked out and that has held true over a period of time. If someone who was supervising staff knew all the policies on central orgs that have been worked out over the years, and if he did what they said, he would never have to solve a single problem. Looking over any scene in an org and the policies for the area, LRH could routinely give the policy covering that situation. It is interesting for an organization as young as this one to have this much policy. Policy makes communication possible between two points. This is its main function, not forcing people to obey orders. In the absence of policy, you don't have communication between two points, because the two points are not agreed on anything.

Tradition is, likewise, an agreement. The above points about policy, therefore, also cover a civilization. A civilization has mores and guides to conduct, which are agreed upon and which assist the general survival of the individual and the majority of the group. Policy is, or should be, based on experience and should lead towards survival.

So we have policies, customs, and procedures. These are sequential doingnesses. If you don't know and follow these, you fall out of agreement with the people who are following them, and you will feel strange. You might have a better way to do something than the agreed-upon way, but if your way is at wide variance with the accepted way, the others may shoot you.

If a society is too dissonant, it is no longer a civilization, because it does not have agreements. There are all kinds of ways of getting married these days. This bunch of mishmashes shows that there is something wrong with the institution of marriage as it now stands. The rise of animalistic psychology has violated the individual's right even to have customs. Behaviorism invalidates the idea that people should have customs. There are only supposed to be pushbutton responses. One is supposed to react to stimuli, etc. Instead of policies, you have manipulation. People and societies object to

manipulation, especially hidden manipulation. It violates the right to have a right way to do things. It denies the individual the right to any sense at all. It is no longer based on considerations of survival. The dignity of Man involves the ability to decide policy with others. Policy and customs are things that make sense, at least at the time that they are formulated. Customs and policy look odd when they persist after the problem that they were created to handle has vanished. When a tradition that originally made sense loses its sense, it may now have, as its rationale, "politeness", or some such thing. People tend to carry solutions into the future after the problem is licked.

Policies can conflict if realities are different. For instance, in Miami, during the second world war, American planes had a habit of practicing dive bombing on hips entering harbors. They got fired on by a Dutch ship returning from the South Pacific.

In scientology, we appear to be out of step. But what we are out of step with is the new technology of control, which assumes that men are animals that should be handled by having their buttons pushed. LRH was taught at Princeton that law proceeds from the customs of the people. Law that proceeds only from a central source and ignores or seeks to change people's customs will either be ignored or will bring on a revolution, as with Prohibition. The Civil Rights Act also sought to change customs by legislation. It violates the First Amendment and other amendments of the Constitution. It violates the right to a jury trial, something that no one seemed to notice. This produced a breakdown in communication, which resulted in disorder and rioting, because it was a violation of custom and an attempt at a central enforcement of custom. The way to keep the peace is to keep the customs of the people. Military governors had this fact laid on them with an axe, since this was the way to keep civil bodies in back of the front lines under control. Having them out of control was embarrassing.

When you violate the expected survival pattern of an area, you have said, "Die!" Bucking a custom is bucking a theta comm line. You have cut the comm line between point A and point B. Now their actions don't mesh, since they are operating on different policies.

Custom and policies are methods of bringing about communication and agreement along certain matters that lead to a higher level of survival. If policy leads to a higher level of survival, it is good policy. Poor policy leads to a lower level of survival, and bad policy leads to complete disaster. This accounts for the ebb and flow of civilizations. Civilizations could die out because their customs have become antiquated, but far more often civilizations are smashed by the fact that the central government or an external source (an invasion) has smashed the customs of the civilization. Today, on this planet, communism is engaged upon this process, using the Wundtian psychology of 1879.

Scientology is not in conflict with the customs of the planet or the universe. Quite the contrary: If you can communicate with anyone on the subject of scientology, he will agree with you, unless he misunderstands a word, since you are talking to him out of the traditional technologies of healing and the human spirit, and the traditional philosophies and psychologies: "Know the truth, and the truth will set you free!" This is an ancient policy of psychology that is now being violated. For instance, Washington is now claiming that the government has the right to lie! This violates the custom of "tell the truth" and the policy of the courts. Governments justify government lies in all sorts of ways, but individuals aren't supposed to lie. It is legal for governments to lie but not for the individual to lie. This is bad news.

The man in the street will agree with you, as long as you don't use words that are strange to him. He will agree on ideas such as the idea that Man has a right to be free, to control his life, etc. Our target is not to make an insane person quiet but to make him sane. That has been the target of mental healing since the Stone Age, but not in the last half-century. That is why we are looked upon as dangerous by the new faddists, who are interested in manipulation, not freedom. They would argue with the idea that it is good for people to be free, an idea that has never been contested in civilized society. Try asking a psychiatrist, "What are you trying to do with your patient?" He will never tell you that he is trying to make him sane. He will obfuscate. The slave philosophy was practiced in Sparta. Communism is similar, but bolder.

"We have made progress in how to accomplish goals which Man has had as long as he has been Man." What we have developed that is new is a technology to attain the traditional goals of philosophy and religion. Scientology's way of expressing Man's basic goals and our organizational methods may be new, but not the basic goals of scientology, which are the goals of Man. We can improve on the idea behind the witch doctor: healing by manipulation of symbols. We have the advantage of being able to

communicate and have a session. By "witch doctor" we do not mean someone who uses an African black magic juju, but a real healing witch doctor.

In the absence of orthodoxy, anything can be called unorthodox. A society that has no right conduct is a society in which anyone can be punished and criticized, by art critics, scientific agencies, etc., "because he is not conducting himself rightly." You can no longer comply; there is nothing to comply with. "They pretend there is a custom there, when there isn't any, ... that there is a '1-2-3-4' procedure, and then will never tell you what it is, and yet punish you because you don't comply with it." The material wealth of a society doesn't demonstrate its longevity or endurance. Greece's greatest art [and philosophy] was produced in its decline.

The communication of custom is itself a technology. When it breaks down, the custom can be abandoned. Conversely, when the custom itself has broken down, you get communication breaking down. We get a breakdown of a civilization when its customs break down because of a failure to communicate them. You get no cooperation when people don't know the customs on which they operate. The means of communication of customs are no longer taught in this civilization. This is where study tech and misunderstood word tech fits in.

So you could be remiss in teaching scientology by using words that are strange and misunderstood. If you do this, you have not established communication. Being comprehensible comes ahead of being effective, since comprehensibility makes your effectiveness apparent. "If you're truly comprehensible, [people] will forgive you almost anything, as witness my life." So the proper order of importance is:

1. Comprehensibility.

2. Necessity (demand).

3. Effectiveness.

6409C22 SHSpec-40 A Review of Study

There are no textbooks on how to study, even in schools of education. LRH plans to write one that would revolutionize the field of study and education. In Johannesburg, tests on school children showed a decrease in I.Q. that was more marked, the longer they stayed in school. The longer a person studies, of course, the more words he runs into that he doesn't understand and the more confusion he piles up.

Artists, writers, etc., in the work-a-day world have this peculiarity: The successful ones have never taken a course in their art field or even finished college. At a party given in New York for professional writers, LRH did an informal survey to determine the educational background of the guests. He found that most of them had either been expelled from college or had never attended college in the first place. The one exception was a man who piped up and said that he had obtained a PhD in literature. He turned out to be a literary agent, a failed writer. In the years following, LRH found out that writing courses don't teach writing. They teach some technology that writers don't use and various gimmicks that writers also don't use. Writers do have and use a technology, but writing courses don't teach it. The trouble is that writers are professional liars. When then tell you how they write, they tell the most incredible tales: They never really say what they do. So there are a lot of pretended technologies in the area.

In any technical subject, technology builds up in the area of correction. Such technologies as photographic retouching or correction lists tend to be more complex than the technologies that they correct. If you have the technique of how to do it in the first place, everything will move smoothly from there on. But if technology is missing, not known, or not practiced, we will now get a complicated technology arising as a lower-scale subject that will be corrective of the upper-scale subject. Medicine is another example of a corrective technology. The upper-scale technology would be that of making bodies properly in the first place.

As practiced today all education is a corrective technology. It is trying to correct its own failed corrections. There is duress in the field to get students to learn. This must be an effort to correct the students' failure to get the material in the first place, caused by early confusions. Duress, in education, is a substitute for the missing technology of the misunderstood word and the cause of the failure of

education. The duress makes it impossible for the student to use his education. He is left on a suppress and an only-one basis, because the duress has caused him to go out of ARC with the subject, so he does a non-application of the information. He might even get weird and revengeful towards his subject. Schools keep kids in line until they are old enough for the police to take over the job.

"Freedom from" is fighting something or worrying about it, not true freedom.

[One way in which you can have a misunderstood is by getting what the writer is saying but, having misunderstood or missed something (perhaps earlier), not getting what the writer is driving at.]

How does the state suffer from mis-education? In Russia, many students were given on-the-job training for key posts. But after their training, 100% of the students left the posts that they were trained for. What must have happened is that, 'way back in school, the communist love of changing the meanings of words got in there. The English upper, governing class lost their influence by being educated to death.

So the continuation of a culture depends on having a technology of study. The government is trying to bring in law and order, while creating disorder, delinquency, and stupidity in the schools. Once again, scientology and dianetics collide with an area where there is a pretended technology. Unlike the area of medicine and drugs, the field of education is not one of vested interest, because there is not as much money in it.

When you are teaching teachers about study technology, you should recognize that you are moving them up from Level 0 to Level I. [See pp. 521-523, above for a description of Level 0; above, for a description of Levels I and II; for a summary of Levels and Classes I-IV.] You can tell the teachers, "The I.Q. of your children could be increased by study, instead of decreased," or "Your school could run with less upset," or "Juvenile delinquency is caused by mis-education." This will be very acceptable to them, and they will never think to ask where this data and knowledge is coming from, because they never think about anything in the first place. You haven't realized that they can't see where it is coming from, because they can't see at all! This is because they have been trained into stupidity.

When you fail to communicate to someone about scientology, it is because you are talking to them above the level at which you should be talking to them. You've got to give them the idea that there are data, that data can be comprehended, and that they can learn something. Then you can give them the idea that there is knowledge. People don't expect anything to work, because nothing ever has. They don't think that there is anything to know. If we are unreal to them, it is because everything is unreal to them. We have a high command-value over them. Scientology could probably put the whole society into some kind of obedience basis, but that is not our purpose.

You would have a win if you approached someone on the following gradient:

1. Getting him into a state where he could learn.

2. Showing him that there was something to be studied.

3. Showing him that there was a body of information about study.

4. Showing him that there was a body of information to study.

This hasn't been our normal approach. We have generally overlooked the fact that if someone can't learn, he can't even receive your message. In fact, his basic PTP's have to do with not knowing. If he knew that there was some way to learn about anything, he would be very interested. If he could know that there was some way to gather data, he would be on your side, because he could apply this to his PTP's. You would teach him that the first step to knowing about something is to observe it. Both you and he have probably taken it for granted that he is already doing that, when he isn't. You could ask him something like, "Have you ever taken a really good look at what your wife is doing?", or some such.

When you are teaching someone about study, you take the obvious and expand it, as an introduction to the field. In dissemination, you are not up against society's ignorance, cussedness, or unwillingness to be helped, but against incorrect study tech and charge on study. This jams your comm line.

Incorrect study tech prohibits people from learning that there is more to know, thus stultifying the intellect, creating stupidity, and discouraging observation. Therefore study is an excellent dissemination tool. When disseminating, stay simple. Concentrate on something like, "One learns through observation, which is accomplished by observing." Tell them about the value of observing, gaining familiarity, etc. Don't start with the ARC triangle: The person that you are disseminating to doesn't know that knowledge hasn't already all been found out. He has to come to realize that he can learn and that there is more to know. Since he first tried to learn something, he has been subjected to a technology that stultifies the intellect. He has weird ideas about study that make him flinch from the idea of learning things. You have to make him reach by giving him the obvious, which he can see. Take the obvious points and get studious about them. You can get away with being studious about what is obvious. A person isn't going to get anywhere except by observation, anyway. Let him get complex about the subject of observation. He will only wind up back at observing. He will get to the fact that you observe by observing, after he blows through the complexity. By reach and withdraw of observation, he gets more familiar, e.g. with his wife.

Thus, study can bring him out of it.

6409C29 SHSpec-41 Gradients

Gradients are vital in all areas of scientology -- and life. "Gradient" is a concept that has bypassed many scientologists, as evidenced by the difficulty that some of them have in pulling withholds. If you knew gradients well, you would never have trouble with auditing PCs. What you are really having trouble with isn't what you appear to be having trouble with. The same applies to a PC or a student. If you are not getting case gain on a PC, it could be a mistake in the gradient. You can't get someone over a trouble that he isn't having. So if you process his problem and he doesn't get better, you have him over his head on what he can confront and handle. What he complains of may not be the real problem at all. Some processes, like, "What could you confront?", handle this automatically. This doesn't mean that you don't have to follow a gradient in your address to the case. You should plan it on a gradient. Processes are all designed with the idea of starting with a little and moving up to a lot. The classification program is designed the same way. As the auditor moves up in class, he can handle more difficult PCs and more of the PC's case.

You can handle just about anything by tackling the first fundamental thing first and taking on more and more, bit by bit. In lots of research, people have never gone to the fundamentals. They have never asked what they were looking for or where to approach it, or observed some obvious basics. For instance, you can examine sound (a gross vibration) with light (a fine vibration), but you can't examine light with sound. You can't look at it with anything but itself. The only thing that can look at color (light waves) is you. (The "color wheel" can't be a circle. The same color appearing at the other end of the spectrum must be a matter of harmonics.) This gets into "taste". You are the only "thing" that can evaluate color harmonics.

When you don't know about gradients, you try to build a castle on top of a palace on top of a condition that you call the PC's case, without going to the fundamentals, knowing what you are looking for or where to approach it, or observing some obvious basics. This happens because you never walked up the gradient and never saw the fundamentals of th PC's case. You only wind up with a notion of the fantastic complexities of existence. If one's observations are nonsense, then one's solutions will be nonsense. And if you keep trying to observe the totality of the case without observing one little thing about it, you will never find the gradient that leads to observation of the case. Approach a case with the question, "What is he doing that I can understand?" You won't be able to remedy the case unless you can find one thing to handle at a time, on the case. To remedy a case, find one thing you can understand about the case and fix it. Then find another. As this proceeds, the case will become simpler. Don't try to grasp or handle the whole damned case in two days.

The PC is always at the top of a self-created gradient of complexity that he hasn't climbed, and he tries to get the auditor there, too. So you get suckered in on it and try to solve the whole case overnight. Thus you get a lose.

Now, take overts: You ask the PC if he has ever committed a crime that could send him to jail if it were discovered. That is flying to the top of the building, jumping the gradient, and making the auditor feel as though he can't pull overts. No. You pull overts on a gradient. What gradient would work? First you have to take into consideration the fact that you are pulling the PC's overts on a

comm line, which may be pretty tenuous to start with. The comm line must be sturdy enough to hold the level of charge, or overt, that we want to have come over on it. First build up the comm line. Then start getting some little overts that come across easily, leading to bigger and bigger overts, always pulling overts of a magnitude that the PC can confront. There are two gradients:

1. The PC's willingness to talk to the auditor.

2. The level of overt that he is willing to tell.

There are degrees of willingness to talk to the auditor. You can't expect a PC who is unwilling to talk to you to tell you some big overt. Once you have the comm line in, the PC will be able to tell you as much as he himself can confront, which will increase, the more he tells you.

People can generally confront thought more easily than they can confront masses or things. So on the PE course, stick to definitions, of things like "life" or "body", not necessarily even definitions of scientology terms. You can blow tons of charge with nothing but definitions. Don't get into heavy bank stuff. Use a light gradient. Definitions about thoughts are easier for people to grasp than definitions of masses. If someone can't see the data that you are giving him, he can't apply it, and he flies up to the top floor of the building, adds complexities to the data, and then considers that it is complex and that there is no fundamental there. So he invents a bunch of nonsense with regard to it, misses it entirely, and never gets any result with it. So be careful about gradients in training. The student has to be able to see and apply what you are talking about.

What you want to watch for in a PC is glibness, unreal answers, and no comm lag. Trying to find a gradient to enter in on with that fellow is fantastic, because he is already stuck in the top floor, but unreal. The gradient had better be a low, slow approach. You have to find something about the case that you can grasp, then go ahead. The time to start looking for something in the case that you can grasp is when the case gets into some difficulty, some lack of advance. Undercut the case on the basis of ability. If you undercut on the basis of sanity, you may insult the PC. Find out what the PC can really do and get him to do it better. When a PC doesn't advance, find a lower gradient. Find something about the PC that you can grasp.

The next time you feel queasy about pulling a PC's overts, look the situation over. Do you have a comm line there to pull the overts on? When you do, the next stage is "What could the guy himself confront?" Approach the PC gradiently with questions like, "What have you done?" and "Why wasn't that an overt?" You have to keep the comm line in while pulling the overts, by pulling them gradiently. You can [err by] asking the PC for more overt than he himself can confront having done. As long as you are asking for overts he can confront, the comm line will stay in and your manner won't even matter. Asking for things that he can't confront only restimulates him. It is not a matter of politeness.

When we pick up points, in the gradient of living, that the person has bypassed and gotten stuck on and get him to understand them, we call this clearing. At those points, the PC had wrong answers or omissions. When those are cleared up, he can confront and live life easily. Don't be so dedicated to the gradient that you fail to observe when someone climbs it very fast, as can happen.

A complicating factor that hasn't been recognized is people's prior education or knowledge of some area or activity. This is generally explained as "natural talent" or a "knack".

You can get mistaken ideas about the difficulty of auditing or about your ability to audit, when the real problem is only that of approaching the case on the right gradient. It is trebly important to train students on the right gradient, so that people can win at it and know that they can do it and keep on doing it.

6410C13 SHSpec-42 Cycles of Action

"The importance [relative value or worth] assigned to a datum is as important as the datum." This is evaluation of importances.

Cycles of action are a fundamental of which one must be aware. There is no particular crisis relating to this topic, except insofar as auditors have been failing to get their questions answered. We are talking about a cycle, in the sense that a wheel going around and coming back to the same place is a cycle.

The word "cycle" has picked up some odd connotations, as in the modern short story, which tries to give an appearance of no-change by starting and ending in the same place, in the same mood. In the field of mechanics, a cycle is a total revolution. In physics and engineering, a cycle is the motion between the end of one wave and the end of the next wave, i.e. the motion during one wavelength. There is an old definition of "cycle", [that has more to do with what we are talking about], that is a philosophical concept that doesn't involve the word "cycle". This concept is found in the "Hymn to the Dawn Child" in the Vedas. It expresses that there is a nothingness from which comes something that grows, matures, decays, and returns to nebulosity and nothingness.

(Johann Templehof went to India and got people from Krishnamurti's group interested in scientology. This annoyed Krishnamurti.)

The concept of the cycle of action gives us lots of applicable wisdom. A cycle of action is a plot of consecutive incident against time. From R6, we know that time is a commonly-held consideration. It is a big GPM, with a lot of root-words with an end-word -- "time" -- connected to them. It is an agreed-upon progress that we are all making and moving forward. In view of the fact that we are all in present time, since there is nowhere else to be, and that we don't really move in time, the incident, as it goes forward, appears to be plotted against time. It is the incident that makes the time. Old humanoids have no time, because little happens and there is no future. Kids' days are interminable because a lot happens. You could boil this down to tolerance of incident. It is one's tolerance for incidents that give one the impression of time going fast or slow. When a person has an increase in his tolerance for incident, life seems to slow down. "If you measure ... time by the amount of incident occurring and then didn't have any incident, ... you wouldn't have any time." It is not that the more incident, the more time you have, necessarily. You are dealing with a false commodity, for one thing, and, for another thing, how much time you have depends on the consideration of whether a lot of incident makes a lot of time or little time. You can practically monitor how much time you have by your consideration of how busy you want to be. Sometimes there gets to be too much incident, so there gets to be not enough time. You can manufacture time by deciding that you can confront being busier. "It's the consideration of how much incident makes how much time that gives or subtracts time from one's existence." It is how much you decide that you can tolerate or confront. If you have the consideration that you can be busier or that you have enough time to do something, you can and will. "You can consider time long or short," and it will be.

You can also get up to a point where you consider time long or short, without measuring it against incident. You could get high enough toned to consider that evening was a couple of years away and live a couple of years before evening. [Since you would thus be out of agreement with other beings, it would seem that to do this, you would have to have a considerable tolerance for being alone for long periods of time!]

The three [actually five] different attitudes towards time, here, are:

1. Unconscious.

2. Incident monitors the person's time. Here the person is at the total effect of time, and he is habituated to incident monitoring his time. But it is a certain speed of incident that he is used to having monitor his life. When the pace changes, he gets a reverse consideration. The person never affects, changes, or even considers the incidents. This is homo sapiens.

3. Person monitors time by willingness to confront incident. Here, at the state of Release, the person considers one of two things: a. If I get busy, time goes faster. b. If I do nothing, time will go faster. The first of these two considerations is commonest. Here, the being gets the idea that he can monitor time by his willingness to confront incident. He can change his own pace by changing incident.

4. Person just postulates time. This occurs around Level VI. Here, the person's considerations about time alone determine the amount of time he has. He doesn't have to depend on exterior incident to consider whether much or little time goes by. He can make a party last a long time, if he wants to.

5. Pan-determined time. At the level of OT, the being might have a pan-determined attitude towards time which would monitor the time of others, as with Sleeping Beauty.

Mesmerism provides a lower-scale example of a similar phenomenon. With mesmerism, you can put someone into total rapport, where he feels and thinks the feelings and thoughts of the person who has

him mesmerized. The mesmerizer can pinch his own back, and the mesmerized person will leap convulsively and have fingernail marks on his back. This is a form of physical pan-determinism. It is quite unethical to do this on some poor sap who has only a shred of self-determinism left, but it is a lower harmonic of the upper-level pan-determinism over time.

To considerations about how much time is passing, you could add other considerations, like the consideration that the actions people are engaged in are happiness-producing actions. In an area where such a consideration had been made, everyone would think he was doing fine. You could also have the opposite consideration: that the actions people are engaged in are misery-producing actions. In this case, people would feel as though they were committing overts by acting. This would change people's considerations of time. The main culprit in doing this is the newspaper, which puts out this consideration by reporting only bad news. On a pan-determined basis, but using a very low-grade, finite comm line, the newspapers are spreading the idea of a worthless series of incidents. This makes time worthless to people. If a society depends a lot on whether they feel their cycle of action should or shouldn't proceed, this consideration will do something to time and to the amount of doingness.

An action is simply a motion through space having a certain speed, especially volitional or intended motion. It has a bad name, in some quarters, e.g. in literature or psychology. In civil defense, during crises, any individual in action, during an atomic attack, would be put out of action. A local authority, who is supposed to act, is not a being. The idea is: There must be no action (intended motion). "The prevention of motion is fairly prevalent in mental healing." The psychiatrist thinks that someone is cured when he becomes inactive. A person who has a label and who is active must be restrained. In mysticism, the wise or enlightened person is supposed to be totally motionless. People would like to believe this, if they are scared of OT's. The "mystical mystic" is a case type. He is "reasonable", but he won't act.

So the idea of time and whether incidents or action should occur gets messed up. Action has become a dirty word. You get an insane generality, here: the attitude that "No incidents should take place," or "Lots of incidents should take place." Below this, you get, "It's all going on and there's nothing I can do about it. It's all happening to me. It has nothing to do with me." This is the sign of a civilization on the decline. Even the person who says, "It has nothing to do with me," has to admit that it does have something to do with him when he is driven to it. If you approach him closely enough with action and you will get a "cornered rat" effect. Then you get an uncontrolled response like a bar-room brawl.

Action gets a bad connotation because it can produce destruction and pain. "When people cannot confront pain, ... they are also refusing to confront action, and when [this happens], they cease to confront incident, and they won't advance a cycle of action, and their sense of time goes [out]." By telling sick people to stay quiet, doctors are prolonging the time for them. Telling them to have activity of some sort would make time pass more quickly. This has a remarkable effect on healing.

Where more action is demanded of a person than he can confront, pugnacity sets in. So you get destructive action, which is more action than anyone can confront, as with Hitler, who created too much action. This gives people the false idea that the cycle of action always ends in decay and death, because this is what it looks like in the physical universe. It is here that we depart from the cycle of action depicted in "The Hymn of the Dawn Child". We are taught this on every hand. You have so many examples of cycles of action that end in death and disaster, that you get reluctant to complete a cycle of action. This leads to such foolish ideas as "I mustn't complete a cycle of action on the PC, because it will injure him." This is the worry of an auditor who never completes auditing cycles. That is what keeps people from arriving. They are afraid to get to the final point. Or there could be something wrong with the person's considerations of "cycle" or "action". Confrontation of incident may be low. For instance, some auditors can't confront too rapidly changing a PC or too slowly changing a PC. This could lead to overrun, if one can't confront changing the process, or underrun, if one thinks that completing cycles of action means killing PCs.

Any of these difficulties with the cycle of action means trouble with the auditing cycle, one way or another. If an auditor's comm cycle is out, after he is up the line a bit, then this is why. It is not the complexity of the process. The auditor has to have his auditing cycle in for sure, by the time he is auditing R6.

There are:

1. Considerations of cycles.

2. Considerations of action.

3. Considerations of cycles of actions.

In scientology, a cycle of action is simply from the beginning to the end of an intended action. [i.e. the start of the cycle of action would be the first appearance of the intention to do something, or of the intention to begin doing it now.] You can also have an other-determined definition of cycle of action: From the moment Mother looks at me to where she whips me. The self-determined cycle of action is from the beginning to the end of an intentional action.

The way to take care of trouble with the cycle of action is itsa on its elements.

6410C20 SHSpec-43 Levels -- The Reasons for Them

LRH had a cognition: Khrushchev was overthrown because Russia went into a "compulsive duplication of Great Britain and the U.S. and tried to hold an election."

The term "raw meat" applies to:

1. Lack of processing.

2. The PC's opinion of what he is.

Someone who has actually started on R6 must not be returned to clearing or getting definitions audited, etc. He is sitting in an item and could pick up some other item out of sequence -- some end-word that is out of sequence. This could give him nasty somatics.

So there are solid technical reasons why PCs progress up the levels. The original reason for levels was to stretch auditors out to what they were capable of. It became obvious that PCs didn't gain well when run above their level, despite their eagerness to be run on R6.

The reason why John Campbell parted company with LRH was his devotion to the machine. He thought the ideal civilization was machines tending machines. People who consider that they can formulate infallible plans for a Utopia don't think that people should have power of choice, since it disrupts the utopian plans. But the ideal plan has hardly been found, on the political front, as one can see in any newspaper. Furthermore, since absolutes are unobtainable, the ideal state will never be achieved. Beings are not all alike, so who could judge when perfection had been attained? You would never get complete agreement. Man is capable of his own judgment. This alone keeps the absolute from being attained. For instance, what is the "perfect" piece of music?

All the way down the line, the individual never completely loses his individuality. Integrity to himself is the last resort of a thetan. The individual can only be pushed so far. Richmond Kelly Turner commanded the USS Astoria cruiser, in World War II. He was a Captain Bligh-type guy. Very grim. LRH knew him. [Maybe the source of Mr. Roberts.] Nothing on the Astoria worked. The crew was on a "white mutiny", in which the crew acts only under direct orders, takes no initiative, and executes nothing that is needed unless directly ordered to do exactly that. That was their way of getting even. "A thetan never gives up." Russia is one big white mutiny. It is not that there is anything wrong with having rules and having people comply with them. What is wrong is using duress continually to deny people any judgment or initiative with regard to the rules.

The gradient of ability, relative to rules, is:

1. Doesn't obey rules because he doesn't know them.

2. Total adherence to rules, based on understanding of them.

3. Varying the rules, based on a higher understanding.

What gets interesting and can get troublesome, is when you follow the rules with variations. If you are trying to learn some subject, follow a plan, or something. There are two conditions that are a variation from the "must do it":

1. Total ignorance and rebellion, based on aberration.

2. Skill and judgment enough to know which rules can be varied and how.

This latter condition is reached when you know the game all the way around. The amateur tries to find the perfect instrument to do it. The pro knows how to make use of what he's got and the rules. In order to vary the rules successfully, you have to know the rules cold. Otherwise you will fail, because you are operating out of ignorance and rebellion. [LRH tells an anecdote about an old Chinese carpenter who resists using a guard on his band saw. He knows what he is doing.] You've got to earn the right to vary the rules, in life or in auditing.

In confronting variation from the rules, the manager, supervisor, or whoever, has to be able to differentiate between the two sources of variation: ignorance or familiarity. If he doesn't, "judgment is denied the individual [who could exercise it]," and the supervisor gets into trouble. Are you dealing with ignorance or virtuosity? You can enforce the rule against the person who varies it for the first reason, with impunity, because life is assisting you by punishing stupidity and ignorance anyway. But don't shoot the second type of variation down. This person has earned the right to vary the rule.

Whether the person knows his business or not can be seen from his results. If he is consistently getting results and protests the rules, we can see that he is a virtuoso. If he is consistently unable to get results, he needs more rules, not less, since his departure from the rules doesn't get good results. The only way you will progress is over his dead body. But he never dies, so you can't win using force and duress against ignorance. You must educate. On the other hand, if you combat virtuosity instead of ignorance, and you create leaders for a revolution that will unseat you.

The people who have been exported to this planet all fall into two and only two classes:

1. Rebellious geniuses.

2. Stupid criminals.

There is no in-between. The latter rebel destructively and stupidly; the former rebel intelligently. They give trouble to the stupid state, which thinks that it has the perfect answer. One gives reactive trouble, and the other gives intelligent, self-determined trouble. You had better recognize the difference between the two. When you try to handle self-determined, intelligent trouble with force, this is handling thought with mass, and it doesn't handle well, since power of choice is the main power the person has. So use duress on the former, but never on the latter. All protest is not the former, exclusively. Our question in scientology is, "Why should some people stay debased, stupid, and protesting?"

Becoming an OT has to do with power of choice and power of observation. Therefore, no wave of a magic wand will produce an OT, since it would just be another effect on the person. Buddha tried to wave a magic wand and produces slaves -- a horrible example of a postulate gone wrong. The Asia Minor OT [J] who turned leaves into loaves and fishes, or whatever, just impressed everyone to the point that they are still overwhumped. This is probably not what he intended.

The unpopularity of scientology levels comes from an unfamiliarity with the road to be walked. You've got to get the guy to where he can talk to an auditor enough and tolerate control enough and be keyed out enough from the mass that he is sitting in, and under enough discipline to confront the objects in the bank necessary to run out to resolve his case. That may take quite awhile. The easiest thing to do is to unburden the case by getting locks off. You do this by:

1. Handling the auditing environment. First you unburden the session. Then get the PC educated into what he is supposed to do and willing to talk to the auditor. You have to explain this to him and show him the auditing comm cycle. Get what auditing is over to the PC. This is getting the PC "sessionable". [LRH invents the term "sessionable".]

2. Handling the between-sessions environment. a. Preparation. Handle PTP's at first just by finding out what they are, before actually auditing them. We can ask the PC what the parts of his environment are [Cf. expanded dianetics]. This alone helps him to sort out his problems. It gives some gain. Get the PC to straighten out his environment so he is not sitting in his office with his house right outside the window, while he is in the auditing room. This is not auditing the environment. It is just getting the PC to identify its parts. At this point, you don't want his problems with his job. You just want his job named as a part of his environment. You are getting him sessionable, which might take several sessions. b. Auditing. Then you ask the PC for problems with the parts of the environment mentioned above. Find one that his attention is stuck on. Ask him what communication he hasn't completed to those terminals. You handle problems very lightly, but wind up with the period between sessions being clean enough so that it doesn't keep coming up at the start of each new session. Again, this may take several sessions.

3. Beginning, approach to the bank. Now we are going into the PC's past and future. In (1) and (2), above, we were broadening the perimeters of the PC. We continue this now by beginning to handle the PC's past and future, helping him to orient himself better. We could run, "Give me something that happened in the past, with date and place." This does the same for the PC's past environment that you have done for his present environment. At what is now Level I, you begin ARC straightwire: orienting the PC to his past -- repetitive processes. If the PC gets to this point, he can be audited easily.

4. Clay table healing. Using this, you can straighten out the concern that the PC has about the body.

5. On up the levels. In completing the levels, you are handling locks on GPM's, so they get all straightened out, ready for R6. Someone who hasn't been brought up through the levels isn't ready for R6 and will get into trouble.

6410C27 SHSpec-44 The Failed Case

The Book of Case Remedies handles the failed case. Look up the symptoms and handle as directed. But there is one case that will always be a failed case. The reason lies not with the auditor, scientology, or the tech.

In 1954, LRH researched people who had turned against dianetics and scientology to find the common denominator. He found about twenty-one people who had been in dianetics and scientology but had worked against it and caused a lot of trouble. Seventeen of the twenty-one had criminal records. Also, they had had auditing but had gotten no case change. There might have been twenty-one for twenty-one, but LRH got tired of looking after seventeen. Recently, LRH found out the other factor in the totally failed case: "The totally failed case commits more overts between sessions [in PT] than can be picked up in a session." He is the "continuous PT overts" case. He doesn't as-is things well. He takes a long time to get at anything. He takes no responsibility for anything. He is hard to get in comm with. Etc. In Freudian terms, he is the "detached case" [Dissociative Reaction? Schizoid personality?] He admits to fantastic crimes, but doesn't really consider he did them. He is really saying, "Society forced me to commit ... ," or "My hand stole the watch ... ," etc. He says, "I picked up the pocket book," but means "My hand picked up the pocket book."

Such a case can't as-is the overt because there is a lie in his statement of it. It is incomplete. He says, "My hand stole the watch ." but the correct statement is, "I saw the watch and stole it with my hand." He has put an alter-is on the line. He didn't do it. It "happened".

Then there is the guy who is putting up a social front and never admits anything he has done, because he doesn't want to look bad to the auditor. This is partly a matter of getting in a good comm line. You can get real overts off the case by asking for horrendously exaggerated overts, [like, "Have you murdered any little children lately?"]. It is a trick. For another gradient, you can ask, "What are you willing to talk to me about?"

(You can audit all the sexual overts off the case that you like, without restimulating GPM's, because "sex" is not in the GPM's or end-words as such, though it forms locks on GPM end-words and root-words. Sex is a humanoid activity, and the GPM words don't necessarily refer to humanoid activities.)

But the real failed case commits so many overts in PT you don't have time in session to get them all off. The failed case is continually committing real PT overts. He is so irresponsible that the overts don't react on the meter, because they are just not potentially real to him.

The source of small reads in R6 is running the PC where he isn't, which means leaving BPC where he is. If he is getting no reads on any list you are using to correct this situation, either the items on the lists are unreal, because he's got no reality on GPM's, being totally uneducated, or he's got it all suppressed.

If you are running a prepcheck on a PC, and he runs out of answers on a button, e.g." suppress", don't push him on that button just because you are getting TA on it. You will just restimulate the rest of the buttons! TA action, in a prepcheck, is on the process [i.e. the whole prepcheck], not on the button you happen to be running at the moment. If the prepcheck is not flat when you reach the end of the buttons, go through it again. "I know of no auditing action where a PC who has been getting proper TA action in the session, who says, 'I don't have any more answers to it,' has ever had any further answers to it." There are indicators in the physical appearance and meter behavior of the PC who is running O/W, that there are more answers than he is willing to give. Only in this case do you press the question home. This is not applicable to PTP's. Withheld PTP's won't hurt the PC. They will only be withheld if they are connected to an overt, and you will get that on O/W buttons. So watch out for overrun.

The slowest rate of change, in a PC, is at the start of the case. The case that is winning accelerates in rate of change, as you audit it up the line. Cognitions of a given magnitude come faster. Comm lag decreases. So you have to be careful not to overrun the PC. The failed case, however, doesn't change at all. You can check rate of change of a case by checking to see how many hours it takes for a person to have a fundamental cog of some kind. At first, perhaps, it takes 25 hours. Later, perhaps, it only takes an hour. Then you get the person who audits almost by inspection. The increased rate of cognition goes along with a decrease in the comm lag. Another thing you will notice is the PC's physical posture and mannerisms. If there is no change in these over time, if the PC keeps returning to a posture or mannerism, then he is not experiencing a rate of change of progress. Another bad indicator in this respect is when a non-optimum condition persists. When you see that, you know that the case needs remedying. The other bad indicators would be there, too. As an auditing supervisor, you should expect to see some change within a few days.

One way to spot what overts the failed case is committing between sessions is to listen for what he complains of in others. The way you would handle the failed case would be to extend your zone of influence to include everywhere the case goes between sessions, for long enough to prevent the continuous overts, long enough to pull the PC out of it. This would be a very thoroughgoing solution and change, but it is about all you could do. You do what you can. There is no fast process to undercut the case, either. The furthest south process you could use to benefit the case would be justifications. But you still have to get a comm line established first.

Commoner than the continuous PT overt case is the person who continually committed overts in the past and has this in restimulation. The case that has lots of past overts but isn't doing them in PT is easier to handle. The proper approach to this case is:

1. Get in comm with the PC.

2. Get more and more overts, on a gentle gradient. If the case keeps getting off the same overt, it has become a problem, as far as the mechanics of it go. A problem is postulate-counter-postulate. Therefore it floats in time. This is a problem about the overt. It wasn't an overt, in his view. It was justified, so, in this situation, you can use:

1. "What have you done?"

2. "How have you justified it?"   or

3. "How wasn't that an overt?"

This is not a repetitive process. Ask, "What have you done that was a harmful act?", and really get an answer that both of you agree was a real overt. This is not a repetitive question. It is one question that might take 25 hours of arguing back and forth about "What is an overt?", etc. -- chitter-chat -- to get

answered. When you've got it, then ask, "How was that not an overt?", and keep going on that one for as long as it takes to really get that answered. You want to get "what he really thought was unharmful about it.... Why he really had to do it." At the end of this process, he will really cog. Don't run these two questions as a repetitive process. It can take a long time to get them answered. You are asking the questions right into the guts of aberration. You are not going up on it on some gradient, hoping some accident will occur. You are going right down the center of the road, after something that answered that question.

An unchanging condition comes from a postulate-counter-postulate. So "an overt which created ... or ... sought to solve an obsessive problem, hangs in time and becomes both an overt act and a PTP." Most overts are committed as solutions. This gives you another inroad to the case that keeps committing PT overts. Handle the overt as a PTP that the PC is trying to solve. You could find out, "What PTP are you trying to solve with overts?" Or, "What have you done recently that was pretty anti-social?", then "What problem were you trying to solve by doing that?" It would be an odd-ball problem. The trouble with such a case is that you are likely only to get a bunch of motivators.

Repetitive questions don't work if the question you ask the PC or his answer to it isn't real to him. The fact that the PC is out of comm with you makes finding the PTP that the PC's overt is intended to solve uncertain of result. However, on ordinary cases, it works very well to find what PTP the guy is trying to solve with his overts, and doing so blows lots of overts into view that the PC might never otherwise have suspected. Not all overts are efforts to solve problems. Some are accidental; some are out of misunderstoods. Getting the justifications off unlocks the problem aspect, takes a lot of locks off, etc. The PC will cognite on the problem, and the effect can sometimes be magical.

None of the above will work with a truly failed case type, although it may sometimes nudge such a case. The only thing you can do with the failed case is to restrain him somehow from committing overts, long enough to get him audited, long enough so that he will quit committing the continuous PT overts.

6411C03 SHSpec-45 Programs

LRH went on a flat-out research excursion between 22Jan63 and April of 1964, a skull-buster of up to 18 hours a day on the meter. This resulted in the material necessary to get someone running on R6. Then he saw that the low end of [what was to become] the grade chart -- the bridge -- was starting to get unreal to him. He was beginning to pass out of any interest in Levels 0-IV. He was understanding people's insanity so well that he "was just as-ising everything -- left, right, and center. [He] 'didn't have to do anything about it.'" It was beginning to look silly to him. He noted this attitude growing in him. He realized that this was not OK, that a bridge from Level 0 to Level VI had to be put together. This project was completed in the period from April to November of 1964, with The Book of Case Remedies, clay table healing, and clay table clearing.

During that period of wrap-up, LRH realized that the subject of study and education has to be clarified and improved, so that the material that he had researched could be communicated. Study tech started from the viewpoint of what material should be communicated and how it should be communicated. LRH never published his notes for this project, and he has twice lost and found them.

All this is why LRH hasn't himself gone totally OT and departed.

The other recent work that LRH has done has been setting out organizational programming, as laid out in recent policies. It is based on selling books, as a dissemination tool. The money received from selling books and, more importantly, memberships, goes into a sealed account for book advertising. The more books are sold, the more students and PCs will come in. Names of book buyers who haven't come into the org in three to four months are sent to local franchise-holders. They can no longer teach HQS unless they become City Offices. [For a description of City Offices, see above.] So they will become city offices, at which time they will have book accounts. This is all based on the idea of pyramiding. By 1968, R6 should be getting taught in central orgs. Training at Saint Hill would be purely organizational.

The HAS course is now one week of PE plus thirty to forty nights of more theory on how it is: basic data. There will be a book of PE lectures, with words defined, etc. The PE evening has one period of reading the text, one period of discussing the words, with attention to people who have earlier

misunderstood words or subjects, etc., and a third period in which the students write up whatever examples of what was in the text that they can give, from life. This gives quiet people a chance to say something. The PE textbook covers the whole field of ontology very thoroughly. This is applied philosophy. That is how you can describe scientology to people. Your advertising for the PE course is just that people can learn how to get along better in life than they have been. People are generally aware that they can get along better.

The philosophy of "Man is an animal" is saying, "There is nobody there to do anything about anything." How can a cell cure a cell?

The book that the PE students are being taught from is available for them to have and read. The phenomenon of getting more and more out of LRH's writings, each time you reread them -- instead of going into boredom -- is "only true of fairly searching truths ... and material in which new thought matter can be found. It is not true of [books that aren't] designed around the provocation of thought." People go into agreement, instead of boredom.

(Public presence is created. It is not "natural".)

LRH also intends to write a book, telling students and how to study and teach what they are studying and teaching, how to handle slow students, etc. That would answer all academic questions with regard to scientology. It would be a textbook on study. And if it worked for education, it would give ue a stable datum that some part of scientology worked, showing that it is a workable subject. The only trouble that LRH is having with this project is making the textbook complicated enough for college professors to respect it and use it. These people look down on things that are easily understood.

Things like awe and reverence shouldn't be mixed in with education. "I know that if [a college professor] sees something simply phrased, in its totality of simplicity, then he will immediately relegate it to the first grade ... teacher. I know better than to use 'prerogative' when I mean 'right', [but the professor] absolutely dies if he doesn't have an adverbial clause modifying a participial phrase of some character, ... which syntaxes itself to death."

People have the idea that there are certain poses and pretences and styles that are necessary. However, when you enter a falsity into a subject, it may endure longer, but it won't work right. If something isn't running right or is overly hard to handle, there is a lie connected with it. If the PC's PTP keeps hanging up and ot handling, despite your correct attempts to handle it, you can be sure that there is a lie connected with it. Either the PC isn't hung up in a PTP, or the PTP being put forward by him is a known and outrageous lie. Or it is continuing to be a PTP because the PC has told someone some falsehoods, connected with it. We cannot as-is it because it doesn't have in it what it is supposed to have in it. Anyhow, the problem is how much LRH will concede to the professors in order to get the comm line and study tech in, without going into too much falsity.

A book of policies is also being published, which will help to ensure that organizational expansion can occur in an orderly fashion.

Early on, some guys thought that scientology was "a business where you made a lot of bucks. No. Scientology is an activity which, if done well, gives you the additional embarrassment of getting rid of money."

LRH used to amuse himself at parties by telling people's fortunes by looking at their banks, wearing a bath towel on his head, with a Woolworth diamond.

You can't observe the PC without occupying the viewpoint of the auditor.

6411C10 SHSpec-46 PTP's, Overts, and ARC Breaks

There is another style of auditing between Level 0 and Level 2 [See HCOB 6Nov64 "Styles of Auditing"]. It is a version of Guiding Style, without repetitive commands. It is a guiding style that goes into itsa: coffee-shop style. [LRH is talking about Guiding Secondary Style, here. This is outlined in HCOB 12Nov64 "Scientology II. PC Level 0-IV; Definition Processes", p. 2.]

(You can herd PCs into line by multiple acknowledgment.)

The styles of auditing parallel the return of self-determinism to the auditor. Progression upwards through the styles of auditing goes along with an increase in the auditor's ability to occupy a viewpoint and therefore observe. The error in training is to demand more of the lower-level auditor than he can possibly deliver, e.g. having a Level 0 auditor finding out from the PC what is troubling him, before having him talk about it. Listen style is the hardest for the instructor to judge and, at first, for the student to do, because it is so simple that the student adds all sorts of complexities. You must adjust your supervision to this simplicity.

There are three [actually six] barriers to case improvement:

1. PTP's.

2. PTP's LD.

3. Overts and withholds.

4. Overts and withholds LD.

5. ARC breaks.

6. ARC breaks LB.

These are potentially present in any session at any level. We don't try to handle them at Level 0 and 1. They come into action at Level II, with the things given in The Book of Case Remedies. The woof and warp of any case is composed of a certain mental makeup of combination of a chronic or continuous nature. In any PC, there is a chronic case mess-up. Then you have those things that keep the basic aberrations from unraveling. These are the things that keep the case from being entered and that prevent the PC from being in session, given that he does have an auditor. Any of these things can be chronic or immediate, continuous or temporary.

An overt act will go into action only when a restraint is put on it, in the form of some sort of withhold. The person becomes guilty, etc. Since you have to have secrecy, you have to have censure. [And with no censure, there is no no need for secrecy.] When a being doesn't think an action is good, he goes into being made guilty. Hence the overt-motivator sequence. [Hence the connection between the feeling of guilt and, on the one hand, feeling that one has done wrong, and, on the other hand, the feeling that one will be punished.] The overt is prior to the withhold. You should classify overt, withhold, and missed withhold processes all under "overts". There are lots of things to know about overts and lots of processes for running them.

The present existence of a problem is worse than its problematic nature. The PTP's floatingness in time is what is peculiar to it and what makes it get in the way of auditing. It was looking at the PTP that got LRH into discovering GPM's. On a political-philosophical level, the problem appears as dialectical materialism, which says that force vs. force produces ideas. Dialectical materialism is making a philosophy of and deifying the problem. Although dialectical materialism says that force vs. force produces ideas, it is actually the other way 'round, since, actually, idea vs. idea produces force. The idea that force makes ideas is just an expression of the Man from Mud theory. If neither postulate of a problem overcomes the other, force accumulates on them, and the forces will counter-oppose. If they are in balance, they will hang up in time. Only those problems that are held in this delicate balance hang up and become PTP's. To get rid of a problem, one postulate or the other must give way. If one side can overbalance the other, the problem slips and doesn't remain a PTP. [Past problems may be "solved" by overbalancing, without really being resolved. These may still exist in the past, but they are not floating up to PT. PTP's still have an exact balance on both sides.] The Cold War of Russia vs. the U.S. has slipped, since the idea of co-existence crept into the U.S.S.R..

If, as an auditor, you realize that not every problem needs to be handled, but only the ones that are so delicately balanced, your job will seem easier, since there have been lots of problems in a thetan's whole existence. The balance is actually so delicate that any little nudge will change it and let it slip away. You sometimes see a PC struggling to hold onto a PTP that has been a way of life, after the auditor has knocked it off its pins. The PC has still got tremendous accumulated forces involved in its solution.

A routine is something you use to change an aspect of the PC's case. It always works, unless there is a PTP, overt, or ARC break in the way. An ARC break is actually a tickling of some major restimulation of something in R6. List 1 is adequate to key it out. It is a direct short-circuit into the bank. There are actually very few things in chronic restimulation in the bank. The primary one is difficulties with communication. That is the primary end-word that gets into restimulation. There is no real reason why anyone should communicate with anyone about anything. When you run, "Recall a time you communicated," you are actually running 268 GPM's all at once. So no wonder the PC feels better afterwards! And when something goes wrong with your comm cycle, that upsets the PC. Exactly what the PC does at that point is probably the root-word. When you quiet it down by locating and indicating the BPC, you just drop it back to its former status. You haven't done anything for the PC's case, but you have made him auditable.

The big buttons in the bank are:

1. Communication.

2. Time.

3. Havingness.

These things, like time, problems, and bits of items like havingness are the things that are in chronic restimulation. But the aberrative value of havingness, compared to communication and time, is miniscule. Communication is 'way back on the series. Communication and time are in restimulation all the time, or, for one thing, there wouldn't be any time. That is one reason why waiting is so upsetting. That means that you go after ARC breaks with a feather touch to key them out. Don't audit them, or you will mess the PC up by keying in "communication" harder.

Knowing that these three phenomena are what keep a case from being audited keeps you from being confused by all the possible manifestations, which do, in fact, boil down to these categories [PTP's, O/W, and ARC breaks]. The PC can be a troublesome case, a trouble source, because he has someone on the other side of him who doesn't want him to improve. He will try to get better to prove the other person wrong, which gives him a PTP, resulting in no case gain.

Overts carry a lot of different reactions, depending on things like the person's responsibility level. They are a source of change, not fixedness, in a case. The case shifts, does well at times, gets sporadic results, etc. The PC won't let himself get any better. He has odd computations, like the idea that if he gets strong, he might commit overts. You would get the same manifestation of roller-coaster gain in a PTS condition, if there is someone in the person's environment who keeps knocking him down whenever he gets better. The mechanism is a withhold.

When a person has a tremendous number of overts that remain constant, he is trying to solve a problem with overts. That is the usual reason for the overts. The overt can be on the part of the person or of society, over the course of an intensive or a longer cycle. You have to get sufficient gain to get the PC up high enough so that the gates don't get closed in your face, by his committing more overts before you get to audit him again. The reason the psychiatrist damages people is that his problem is that of preventing people from damaging other people. Your problem, then, would be a social problem, in dealing with the continuous PT overt case. You would have to solve this problem before you could make progress with the case. The no-change overt case goes up and down a little, unlike the PTP case. The PC may refrain from committing overts for awhile. So overts cause change on graphs constantly, but not steadily. With a fluctuating graph, you could also be facing a PTS situation. The main problem relating to overts is whether the PC will be damaged by motivators.

Running overts can backfire, if you let the PC get off only whole-track overts, because they are safe, or miniscule overts, critical thoughts, etc. Such a PC is dodging a continuous PT chain of overts.

The PC with continual out-rud is ARC breaky if you try to get him to put his attention elsewhere, because when you take his attention away from the charge of the out-rud, it hits him. He's got to have it remedied before he can be run on a routine. Fortunately, not all PCs need much remedying. The Book of Case Remedies is basically just a batch of methods for putting in ruds.

You can be as nice as you want about pulling withholds, but remember that it must be done, and that fact may put you beyond niceness once in awhile, e.g. you might have to say something like, "OK.

Come back for some more auditing when you have decided to tell me what you have done. That's LF'ing!"

6411C17 SHSpec-47 "Styles of Auditing"

[Reference: HCOB 6Nov64 "Styles of Auditing".]

Getting the different auditing styles clarified and formalized will make learning to audit easier. Over the years, many auditing styles have developed to deliver different processes. Repetitive commands came in in 1955-56, along with TR's. Muzzled auditing followed, to handle auditors who messed up PCs with interruptions, comments, etc. More recently, with LRH's work on the comm cycle and the discovery that auditors weren't really listening, listen style was developed. For prepchecking and sec checking, where you steer the PC around, another style was developed: guiding style. Now that we have all the processes, all the styles are there, in order of developing an auditor's skill, as he goes up the levels. The higher you go, the more precise your auditing is, but also the higher you go, the more sloppy your auditing may look.

At the level of R6, the PC is going through so much and changing so fast that the auditor has to be able to shift and change rapidly in order to keep up with the PC and his mind, and in order to do just what is necessary to keep the PC running down the bank.

A PC has to be up aways to be able to have all-style auditing. For the PC to be up to standing all-style auditing would require a high level of confidence in auditors and acquaintance with different styles of auditing. So the unpredictability of all-style auditing would throw the PC off, if this was the first style he had encountered. Auditing the PC at lower levels would give him more certainty. If you ran R6 on raw meat, you might get away with it, but the first mess you got into would be the end of the PC. He's got no confidence in auditing and no reliance on scientology's ability to handle PTP's, to fix him or rescue him, etc. There is a case factor also preventing a new PC from being audited on R6. The worse off someone is, the more "important" he is and the more exaggerated his ideas of his ability are. He's got hidden standards, out-confront, etc., etc. There isn't much you could do if you put the PC on R6 and he spun, so don't do it. You are making yourself the effect of his bank. Most people start their auditing in total desperation, in fear of going out the bottom. Getting up to the point where they know that they won't get any worse (Release) is a major improvement. It doesn't necessarily take a long time to do this. You might tend to overrun the PC unless you observe well and note the acceleration of gain that occurs. Don't cut off PC cogs. Furthermore, you are handling a level of case that is voluntarily trying to improve, which means that there is some spark of responsibility for self-improvement and some idea that the person can do something about it. People can go so far downscale that they think nothing can be done about anything. Then you get a socialist or a communist state to take care of them. One reason why governments call scientology a fake is that they have the opinion that nothing can be done, [and scientology is claiming that it can do something].

Through a PC's course of auditing, we must keep the PC winning so that "self at cause" keeps coming up. It is easier to make someone better than to make him worse. He resists getting worse but doesn't resist getting better. When he realizes that he can and must do something to get better, and that he will not get worse, be will be a Release.

The auditing styles can be plotted against the most likely win for the PC at a given stage of his auditing. How you audit a PC is at least as important as what you audit. Just the mechanics of auditing are therapeutic, regardless of the process they are applied to. First the PC discovers that he can talk to someone. Then he discovers that he can answer a question when he is asked one. there is some 8C in this that is beneficial, as well as duplication, which he has fallen away from. He can't be anything, because he can't duplicate anything. Unless you have gotten someone out of this kind of condition, he can't confront existence.

A thetan can only be what he can see. He can only see what he can duplicate. It is hard to get duplication of an accident or a crime, because a person can't be it. Therefore, he can't see it. This leads to a "slight occupational liability as an auditor. You are looking at a PC, all the time, that you don't particularly want to be. You're trying to improve him, aren't you?! Fortunately, it isn't necessary for you to be willing to be aberrated, to get well," because we have the whole anatomy of the reactive bank, and there is no sense in it. If the PC hadn't made the reactive mind and the GPM's, he would be virtually unaberratable. There would be no dwindling spiral, because the thetan would

have to determine to have something wrong with him. A thetan had to decide to be aberrated. He did it, but almost accidentally. Having done it, he was too stupid to get out of his trap.

There are different degrees of aberration, based on the locks and the tendency of the reactive mind to group, bunch up, and get into restimulation. There are some basic things that can go wrong with a thetan, which are above the level of the bank and GPM's. These include duplication and communication. Duplication and communication can be aberrated, regardless of end-words. There are end-words there too, but these are high-level ideas common to all thetans, with or without banks. A PC should be able to communicate and duplicate pretty well. They do improve, up to the point where he can confront his bank. At Level 0, the PC knows that he has communicated because the auditor received the communication. At Level I, the PC knows he has received a communication, because he has answered it and the auditor is satisfied with the fact that he has answered the communication. If the auditor lets the PC receive a communication or question that he doesn't answer, the PC is unsatisfied, because, knowing that he didn't answer the question, he starts doubting his ability to receive a communication. At this level, he finds that not only can he answer a question, but also he can answer it repetitively. This is a big change for many people. When a PC can answer a question repetitively that is even better than just being able to answer a question. That is why we say, "I will repeat the auditing command." [See Abridged Style below.]

Guiding style. At this level, we are handling the PC's finding out that there is something there. To the PC, the whole world is reasonless. He is starting out at a lower harmonic of the truth, namely that there is nothing there and that he has no reason to be upset about anything. He says, "I feel nervous today," and sees no cause for it. The biggest cog here is that there are causes for things. For one thing, he will realize that he is not just natively stupid or that life doesn't have to be a mess. Something could be causing the condition he is in. The PC needs to get the idea that conditions don't just happen, but are caused by things, and that be is "no longer just a pawn. If things cause things, you might be able to predict. If things cause things, you might be able to do something about something. If things cause things, you might be able to do something about yourself!!!"

Guiding Secondary Style. This comes out of guiding style auditing. Steer plus itsa is the process that goes with it. You find it and bleed it (Remedy A and B). Level II locates causes. Without knowing the cause, a person is dispersed all over the universe. Finding the cause, and then doing something about it, is terrific.

Abridged style. When he has learned all that, it is safe to run him on an abridged style. We can look and see what is going on. The reason why, at Levels I and II, you always say, "I'll repeat the auditing question," when the PC hasn't answered it is that you are teaching the PC that he can receive and answer an auditing question. At Level III, this is not necessary anymore, and it may be irritating to the PC. He already knows that he can get the command. So you have abridged style, in which the auditor and the PC can look and see what is going on. This is an abridgement of lower, not upper styles. The PC says he has a PTP. You don't guide him into it. You just ask, "What is it?" It usually blows, so you then drop it. The PC can as-is things more easily now. You audit purely against a finite result to the point of getting to happen what you want to have happen and no further. The PC learns that when he gets audited, something happens.

Direct style. Now we've got direct style auditing. Getting the exact result applies even more, here. You go direct to the result.

6412C15 SHSpec-49 Communication: A Gradient on Duplication

Level 0 and Level I are laid out, and the materials exist for Levels II, III, IV, and VI. [See HCOPL 11Dec64 "Full Table of Courses and Classifications".] The PE course is back down below Level 0, and the HAS course is in the academy, with a strict curriculum. It includes axioms and other bits and pieces. HQS is what old HCA/HPA was.

When you go all the way to the top, it is then very easy to see what lies between you and the bottom. That is what has happened. Mow we can see what an auditor has to go through and achieve to get all the way up. Unnecessary parts of training have been eliminated without leaving gaps that people could fall into.

You can tend to discount how much auditing you have had, when you get up near the top. That would be one reason why you would think you could take a new PC and run him at once on R6, thinking that he is where you are, as a case, when he isn't.

A person who is "perfect" and has no problems:

1. Is very delicate.

2. Commits overts.

The case who never finds anything to audit because he is "perfect" must be audited very delicately. A person may get a full complement of motivators from something, yet still assert that is was right. If such a person were to admit to or confront a single little fault, i.e. give up a service fac, it would be, to him, the final degradation. He is very overty, but he is at a point where, if he admitted that he had ever done anything wrong, he would slip over the edge of degradation that he has been clinging to and start asserting his rightness by being even wronger, like a kid breaking windows who keeps on doing it, trying to assert the rightness of what he is doing. Manifest insanity is a confirmation of an error. You have to increase the case's responsibility by a series of steps. The only trouble you have had with PCs has come from not going up through the steps necessary to keep the PC winning, getting gains that are real to the PC. The Book of Case Remedies is the totality of Level II (overts and PTP's), but the PC has to be gotten up to the point where he can be run on the processes in The Book of Case Remedies.

There are certain things senior to the bank, on which a thetan would be able to be aberrated, whether he had a bank or not, though without a bank, the thetan could get unaberrated again without auditing. The design of the bank is what gives the thetan the dwindling spiral. But if a thetan weren't aberrated and had no designed reactive mind, he could determine to spin in on a spiral, now that he has that skill, because he has done it. But he couldn't have realized how much trouble he would get into. He is capable of miscalculating, which is a fascinating ability to have. The thetan is natively capable of getting into more trouble than he can see. A thetan is capable of having these things happen or making things happen to himself. He is capable of setting up masses to suspend in time. The masses -- GPM's -- create time.

But it is difficult for a thetan to aberrate himself to such a degree that he can't recover. The only way he could recover is to block out duplication. (Cf. the Axioms: that which you don't as-is will endure forever.) If a thetan is unwilling to duplicate something, it will endure. The only way a thetan can erase something is to be willing to duplicate it. E.g., if you are unwilling to be like a person, you will get madder and madder at the person, to the point where he will disappear, not by being as-ised, but because you can't see him anymore. He is still there.

Thus you have a universe. A thetan is nothing, and he is unwilling to be something, so you get masses, and they endure because the thetan won't as-is them. So he makes a bank, which tells him what he should and shouldn't be willing to duplicate. This bank had two halves:

1. The cowboys in the white hats, which he was willing to duplicate (so they disappeared).

2. The cowboys in the black hats, which he wasn't willing to duplicate (so they became more real and solid). This leads to the dwindling spiral.

Communication can be a lower gradient on duplication that leads to more willingness to duplicate, as well as the other way around. The rough part of the bank is duplication. You could take some other part of the comm formula, drill it, and start to knock out the duplication hang-up. With communication, you might get over the obsession not to duplicate, without getting an obsession to duplicate. You knock out the ferocity of, "Don't ever be that!", as when you say to yourself, "I must never never never be a bum on skid row," [and then you must obsessively duplicate the bum by becoming one.] You get out of compulsive and inhibited actions by communication. If a person can't stand the thought of an auto accident, he won't be able to duplicate a car, communicate with it, or control it, and he will crash. The remedy would be to have him touch a car.

This shows why touch assists and processes of communication with aberrated body parts, or whatever, are so effective. "You become what you resist." In other words, "That which you are unwilling to duplicate will persist and eventually overwhelm." This is not to say that you have to obsessively duplicate either. Mere experiencing of something is non-therapeutic. Communication

with something is therapeutic. If you are afraid of being an alcoholic, don't try it out. Communicate with alcoholics or with something relating to this subject. Then the refusal to duplicate clicks out. Give the alcoholic a bottle or a glass to communicate with. But don't let him experience it. Run reach and withdraw on it, or on photos of skid-row bums.

Wilson, a newly-appeared political figure, has a 48 hour comm lag between his saying, "I will never ... " and his doing it. He is nearly nuts, and never notices that he is doing this. If he's "agin" it, he is going to be doing it to be it. "Why was I so angry about it yesterday? I'm it!" "The bank says that 50% of existence must be shunned ... and the other 50% is, 'Love it! Gotta be it! Cherish it!' So, of course, the universe will eventually become the 50% you mustn't have anything to do with." You do not have to experience something in order to duplicate it. The things that bug you are the things you mustn't be or have anything to do with. And if you can't comm with something, you can't hold it off. How do you keep one boat from smashing another if you mustn't have anything to do with a boat hook?

There are gradients in the field of duplication. Making drawings is a duplication and telling about them is communication, so that would help out a kid who was having trouble. You could get him up to drawing what he didn't like about school, drawing school in 3D, etc. [Cf. Play Therapy, in which the kid is encouraged to "demonstrate", with toys, the various aberrative parts of his life.] Just don't make it too steep a gradient. Having to experience is an out-gradient. You collapse terminals with the thing that you are experiencing. How can you hold anything off if you can't communicate with it? [Also, if you can't duplicate something, you can't handle it.] Putting it all on a communication activity would be less likely to go too steep. 8C is a steep process, because it asks the PC to communicate with MEST, which is the one thing he doesn't want to duplicate. Also, this process is run duplicatively.

Therefore, communication -- like, with the cowboys in the black hats -- is the key that unlocks duplication. It is what you monitor a case by and what you try to solve first, not only with regard to levels, but also at the beginning of every session. You could use a gradient of duplication, instead of a gradient of communication, though it is hard to assess the gradient properly, using duplication, and the PC will hit too steep a gradient and blow. If you approach the whole thing on a communication gradient, you will give the PC a very gentle gradient. "Communication" as a word, happens to be part of the reactive bank: an end-word. But this doesn't matter.

However, just because you have gotten the PC past Level 0, it doesn't mean that you have got rid of his reactive mind or his peculiarities as a thetan. You will never get rid of the latter. A cleared thetan, without a bank, will still have slump spots, centered around communication, duplication, making things, unmaking things, persistence, any value that time might be, and value there is to experience, etc. He will make and unmake pictures of things. He will have an aberratable pattern that isn't planned. Then he could just look at this small aberration, and it would as-is. He as-ises things very easily because he doesn't have it all hanging on earlier similars in a bank. There are certain factors in a person, regardless of his experiential track, for instance the fact that "communication knocks out refusals to duplicate." This comes up in a lot of cognitions. A non-duplication decision goes along with non-communication actions. 8C is hard because "you're asking him to communicate with MEST, and that is the one thing he will not be.... It makes quite a process." 8C also handles unwillingness to duplicate. A clever auditor always reestablishes the PC's communication where it ought to be, before going on to do anything else.

So if a PC is not in comm, you must find out why. We know the key points: withholds, PTP's, and overts. They all have out-of-comm to them. An overt is a regretted communication. A PTP is a started but not completed, and thereafter refused communication. A withhold is an unwillingness to communicate. If you partially communicate, with an unwillingness to communicate, you've got a missed withhold. This is a particular kind of problem.

A broader look at this area is given by the fact that the PC has a PTP because he is unwilling to duplicate something or someone. You've got to be careful not to throw the PC into the bank with no gradient. If the PC gets misemotional, you are on an out-gradient, because the person is experiencing something, rather than communicating. Push a person into a situation where there is a no-duplication decision and no communication with that, and: Powie! He interiorizes into that very point. This can also throw the PC into GPM's and end-words of duplication and communication and their negatives. Communication is the solvent that handles non-duplication. As you audit the PC normally, you've got a destimulative factor: you are putting the PC more thoroughly in comm with his bank, without throwing him into it, i.e., without experiencing it. If you skip the communication, you will get the

obsessive duplication, the experiencing, the dramatization. You could develop a process that would do this to the PC. One such process would be, "What wouldn't you mind going out of ARC with?" A more direct one would be, "What don't you like? Duplicate it," though the latter would be therapeutic on some PC's. Or, by making a guy wrong, you can prove to him that he is duplicating something that he has said he would never duplicate. This is the psychiatric approach: "You hate your father, so you are being him, aren't you?"

The reason why you can't just process a PC all the way North with communication is that you have to pay attention to the complexity of the bank, e.g. service facsimiles. The bank is complex enough, so that the PC will have to confront and undo it. You have to pay attention to the PC's physical peculiarities. The PC is going to run into some corner of the bank, and you have to pay attention to it. You must find areas that the PC can as-is and walk him into them. But you are not just auditing the PC vs. the bank. There is the environment, full of other people's banks, etc. So you have to make a fast gain. You have to have enough of a gradient so that the PC knows that he has made a gain, and enough gain so that he won't get squashed before the next session.

You can get rid of bad habits in the PC, not by a direct attack on them, but by a general comm process, washing out all unwillingness to duplicate. [If a thetan could duplicate, he wouldn't need a habit to handle it. Cf. earlier data on a circuit as a substitute for confront. See p. 47, above.] A person getting extricated from his own bank is also mixed up with other banks. Also, he is still eating.

Don't advise people to experience life. If you find some guy that is awfully slow to bring up the line, why, don't bring him up yourself. He has had plenty of time to do himself in, and some people have simply done a better job of it than others.

6503C02 SHSpec-53 Technology and Hidden Standards

"Economics and organizations are a matter of the MEST universe. Let me give you a tip: If someone around you or your organization is having trouble with organizational matters, you just processed them subjectively too long. It doesn't matter how long you process them subjectively now. They are not going to go anyplace. The trouble with them is objective. You want to give the objective-type processes, not subjective."

Organizational tech is being formed up into courses for the business world. It has taken two to three years to plow this line. Now that we have a product to put on the line, it will go like a crash. Dissemination techniques have been worked up out of the materials of scientology, which have only to be written up and issued.

LRH has found all the points where organizations don't expand and found what makes them not expand, what contracts them, etc. You end up with formulas that you can give to the janitor to apply to his job, and he will look them over and see that they make sense. His willingness to work was jammed by his ignorance of the law that governed that work, under its various conditions. All you have to do is to know and use the formulas. If you apply them backwards, you shrink and collapse.

It is no longer a question of our arriving before everything blows up. We have made all our deadlines. The questionable period is behind us. Organization is important to build scientology up to civilization level. Our intentions are good, so we will make it. It is now a foregone conclusion that we will make it. As soon as the materials are in your hands, you can't help but make it.

In the human race and in the mind, there is a barrier called the hidden standard. "When anyone is critical, they are apparently criticizing against a hidden standard of behavior. They seldom tell you what ... " the behavior should be -- only what it shouldn't be. Or, if they say what the behavior should be, it is in antipathetic terms. There is no definition of a "normal" person. [Hence "abnormal" is defined against a hidden standard.]

The communist ideal would be anonymous. This is weird. A person who is doing a job should make known that he is the one doing it. If someone isn't known, he gets no reward. It is possible to develop odd tests for deciding what is good or right, e.g. choosing a doctor for appointment to a hospital on the basis of his sports career. "Examination and selection of personnel gets into trouble continually, for lack of a ... proper standard." The hospital blames the medical school for not training good doctors. But the hospital is setting up a hidden standard and blaming the school for not

delivering, without saying what they want delivered. Marriages are made miserable by the hidden standards that spouses run on each other. They don't make clear what they want, when they say that they want a "good spouse". E.g., the wife says, "You are not an adequate husband." The husband says, "I guess I'm not an adequate husband," but the wife's standard remains hidden. She doesn't describe it to him. You could handle marital problems organizationally by finding hidden standards.

Auditors come up against this often. "You, as an auditor, have to face up to PCs who are running a hidden standard on you all the time." What you are looking at is not really a standard, but a perverted standard. It is not a real standard. "Nobody's ever acknowledged this standard [and that] holds it apart from the time track." The auditor should acknowledge the standard, so that it doesn't get parked on the time track. "The standard is the collection of non-acknowledgments [that the individual has]. If you want to end a cycle of action, acknowledge. If you don't want to end a cycle of action, don't acknowledge." In auditing, if you don't want to end a cycle, you half-acknowledge, as a way of keeping someone going. A full acknowledgment of a cycle ends it. Non-acknowledgment keeps it going. That is why people tend to get uglier, not prettier. No one ever says, "My, you look ugly today!" One reason why a person gets fixed on human bodies is that no one said, "Oh, I see you are a man, this lifetime!" This datum is very applicable to registrars, as well as auditors. "If you acknowledge the person before he arrives, ... he won't arrive." Nobody will appear for training or processing, if you acknowledge heavily. The right way to handle a letter from someone who announces his intention to come for training or processing is to be courteous and not too definite. Give some information, but not solid acknowledgments.

People generally work towards a beingness. They don't function so well just being a post. This is a question of acknowledgment, which ends cycle on the post. "Retirement is an acknowledgment of [a person's] total active life;" it ends the life. In many cases, it ends life in any form. Military commissions act as an invitation to overthrow one's superiors, because a commission is not granted by saying, "Thank you for having been a (lower post). You now have the right to work toward (commissioned post)." A corporal would function much better if, on attaining his new rank, he were to be congratulated, not on being a corporal, but on having been a private, and on having attained the right to work towards becoming lance corporal. If a person's rank or position is bestowed as an accomplishment, rather than as a challenge or a becomingness, then the cycle has been ended before it began, by being prematurely acknowledged. "The only way a person can get in trouble is to be George Smith, while he's pretending to be [his post. There is the post, which] is a set of beingnesses and lines and actions and policies all by itself, ... and there's a being, who runs the" set of beingnesses, lines, actions, and policies which is the hat. George Smith must not operate as George Smith, when he is supposed to be being or attaining, say, the post of D of T. There is a hat, and then there is a being who runs the hat. To get a hat on, you must put it in a category of being in the process of being attained. Once it is attained and acknowledged, it ends.

So, as an auditor, you have to be careful what and how and when you acknowledge. If Arthur says that he has had a horrible day at school, LRH doesn't acknowledge with, "Good!" He would use something more sympathetic and really acknowledge it, so that it could go onto the backtrack. You have the power to put someone's past on the past track and to give them a future. If you want to kill them dead, acknowledge everything with a crash. This gives them no future. Be a little doubtful about someone's future plans. Don't use certain, solid acknowledgments. Then give the discussion a good acknowledgment.

Recognize that a datum like this, with a lot of uses, could easily "gang agley", on the back track. It would get perverted, messed up, etc. From this datum could arise such things as hidden standards and amnesia. Getting shot is too solid an acknowledgment of a lifetime, so one forgets it. That is the basic mechanism behind non-recall of past lives. Things that aren't acknowledged, because they are totally out of agreement, while the good things are acknowledged -- these unacknowledged things bring about a condition where everything disappears out of the person's past except the non-acknowledged things that people thought were silly, or that they protested, or that they were upset about. "This gives you a decay of personality as a person ... moves along the" time track, whether the person has GPM's or not, though without GPM's, the person could do and undo the aberrations, almost at will.

A person should know that he has a tendency to collect all those things that were never acknowledged. That is because the individual has some dependency on the comm formula. As long as a person has any desire to communicate, he will be liable to malfunction of certain parts of the comm formula. And when these parts go awry, things do go weird. A person could regulate his conduct by knowing what parts of the comm formula were good, and what parts were bad -- which parts would natively get him

517

into trouble and which wouldn't. "If you're gonna associate with your fellow beings, ... you're ... going to have to use the communication formula," one way or another. You will have to know how it works, the part that acknowledgment plays, etc. The comm formula can have things go wrong with it, so there is a potential for native aberration. There is a direct source of direct aberration plus the native aberration of beings. The two can work together. GPM's, which are agreed-upon aberration, can hold lesser stuff (native aberration, e.g. failed acknowledgments, etc.) in place and give them aberrative force and importance.

Insanity could be two things:

1. The person's collection of unacknowledged things.

2. Outright GPM commands to be nuts.

A crazy person is doing a lot "of things that have never been agreed with, and therefore have never been acknowledged." [You don't have to agree with something in order to acknowledge it.] Where you have both factors working together, the GPM's make the unacknowledged things very solid and very much in force. You know that the PC will run into aberration of this sort at Levels VI and VII. [The latter is power processing.] He runs into the collection of non-agreed-with things.

The bank itself has lots of charge. The non-agreed-with things (locks) carry very little charge. The PC assigns the values wrong-way-to, especially at first, because he assigns aberration to what he can confront. So you've got:

1. The bank.

2. The accidents and incidents of livingness.

The power of these two is eight billion to one. But it appears to be the reverse, because that is all the thetan can confront. You can key out the locks and pat the bank back into place. This in itself is a fantastic improvement over what anyone has been able to accomplish before. There are hidden standards about what we are supposed to be accomplishing. Nobody will admit that you have reached any state, because they have never told you what state you were supposed to reach in the first place, amongst your fellow human beings. This kind of a cycle takes place: You finish the PC up in a session; he feels good. Then he runs into the human race after the session. They run a hidden standard on him and try to make him prove that he is now in a better state.

The hidden standard interferes with delivery. There is no point in talking to someone about clear or release. You've got to talk scientology in terms that are real, in relation to the goals of the person to whom you are talking, or you will trip all over his hidden standards. About the only standard you could have for clear is F/N at clear read. The standard for release is, "Do you think that you will get any worse?" People have hidden standards about who you should be to audit them, what condition they should be in, in order to have had a case gain, etc. You could run, "Who would I have to be to audit you?" and acknowledge the dickens out of it. For any condition you have described as a better condition in scientology, there is a hidden standard. And a hidden standard exists even for known standards. For instance, you say, "We require a pink sheet," but they keep bringing you green ones, saying, "Is this what you want?" What happens is that the individual, with his concatenation of non-acknowledged ideas, adds up to a non-observational point. He can't observe from this point. He can't tell where he is or what you are saying to him about how he should be, etc. [Cf. earlier material on service facs as a substitute for observation, "safe assumptions", etc. See HCOB 6Sep63 "Scientology Five -- Instructing in Scientology Auditing: Instructor's Task; D of P's Case Handling", HCOB 16Oct63 "R3SC Slow Assessment"]

The PC will keep trying to bail himself out, provided you don't overwhelm him with things to bail or give him nothing. Just give him things to bail with, within his understanding and ability to confront, and he will eventually float. In that way, you don't Q and A with his hidden standards.

"You never realize how much better you are than yesterday, because you are experiencing negative gain. [It is] no longer wrong with you, so of course you are not now worrying about it."

Just attesting a level and getting a certificate acknowledges the entire level: the session, the auditing, etc. The attestation keys it out and puts it on the back track. This way also, the PC doesn't get stuck in a win, a hidden standard.

Because of hidden standards, the only safe way to evaluate case progress is a mechanical method, such as a meter, and a completed cycle of processes. It so happens that if the PC does complete the cycle of processes, he will have case gain, and this can be strung out along levels with such basic processes that you don't have "different" PCs all the time.

An unwritten standard is hidden. You may feel that there is a hidden technical standard. This is an alter-is. What has happened is just that there is material that has not yet been released. Nobody is trying to hide any technology. Your best answer to the PC's hidden standards is to hold to your standard technology and just take the PC on up the line with no Q and A.

6503C09 SHSpec-54 The New Organizational Structure

Expansion shows up weaknesses. It is like turning on a magnifying glass.

The problem that a person has, who is not doing well in business, is that he is being and not doing. To understand an org, you must understand the formula of life: Living is having and following a purpose. ["Livingness" has to do with the doingness of life.]

Here is a further test of an org: Could you take a central org pattern and reduce it to city office size [See above, for description of what a city office is.], and have it still work? If the big pattern doesn't smoothly reduce, it won't smoothly expand.

Brief org structure:

Div 1: Idea. HCO: Issues data on processing.

Div 2: Management. Training and processing services.

Div 3: Pick up and police. Collects money and takes care of MEST. They are interlocked, so they stick together, but:

Divs 1 & 2 don't organize MEST.

Divs 2 & 3 don't handle communication.

Divs 1 & 3 don't train anybody in anything.

The ED of each board is the assistant ED of another board, higher in the hierarchy and located elsewhere. He judges only on statistics.

6503C16 SHSpec-55 The Progress and Future of Scientology

In 1950, people used to yammer at LRH about fixing up the organization. He was caught flat-footed when DMSMH was published. No one expected it to be a best-seller, but it was. And it stayed at the top of the list for months. The publishing firm that published it was overwhelmed by it. When others set up the foundation and asked LRH to run it, he said, "OK." But he had no management control. He proposed some ideas then, which are only now being put into action. Until about July, 1950, his attitude was, "Well, I just wrote it." The name "LRH" was getting very popular, but he was trying to avoid the hat. But he was setting the place up, giving eight hours or so of lecture a day, getting the building, the furniture, etc. The building had three main railroad lines -- one on each side. LRH used to fix up PCs that other auditors couldn't handle. He started the HAS course, using the data straight out of Book One. The students all went onto the original HCA course.

The word "Hubbard", in "Hubbard Dianetic Auditor" and in other titles, was chosen by the Elizabeth and L.A. auditors. LRH went along with it, with certain misgivings. A few days before the publication of DMSMH, Palmer, at the Explorer's Club, offered LRH an expedition to the Dodecanese

Islands, south of Greece, to find a sunken ship with statuary. The deeper into 1950 it got, the better the expedition looked! The organization took more and more of LRH's time. LRH was still telling people this kind of thing. The general manager said to LRH, "You must front up the organization. These people are depending on you." LRH found out that Joe Winter was squirreling, telling people that dianetics was developed by some nonexistent group of scientists and that auditing was an art with nothing scientific about it. Contemporary subjects were things like psychodrama [Moreno et al.]; these things looked good, but they didn't work.

So two hours after the first meeting [of the Dianetic Foundation?], LRH put his time on the line and took responsibility for the development of the subject, rather reluctantly. He wasn't prepared to make his life an open book, because it was too incredible for people to believe, and they would call him a liar.

LRH is not in bad favor with Washington senators, etc. In 1955, if he had wanted to, LRH could have gotten legislation passed that would have protected scientology. The FBI was very nice, when he wanted to find out who, out of about 200 staff people, were communists. They told him who were not communists: about thirty out of 200! There was an airplane waiting to take LRH to St. Louis and put him in a spin-bin. Fortunately, the people who were sent to get him weren't as well trained in combat as he was. He took care of them. This all occurred subsequent to LRH taking on his hat. It has taken fifteen years to get to a state where the hat could be worn, because LRH's hat assaults the foundations of the society we live in by talking about freeing Man, bettering Man, etc. Ours is a philosophy that says that people can't be lied to -- that we can see through the black magic spells. This is an interesting civilization, because people don't know who they are, where they are, where they are going, or what they are doing. You start laying truth on the line, and confusion starts to blow off. The early days of dianetics followed that rule. We got through it, because, in July [1955], LRH wore his hat of being him, and no one has been able to throw him off it since.

LRH is also capable of occupying a subordinate role. LRH worried for awhile that he was one of those guys who can only lead and cannot follow. However, he was delighted to find out, in the Navy, that he was also an excellent subordinate. But to occupy a top-dog role ... all the way up -- you know: there's no government or any mystic vision back of you -- and confront everything simultaneously, and stand there regardless of the dead cats, the alarm clocks, and bricks, and everything else which are coming your way ... -- that took some doing: And that's all you look at when you look at this early history. [It was] a stable datum, going into a very very aberrated world.... From where I looked, it looked awful lonesome, occasionally. It [took] some doing," and some confront. We have changed things in the world. We have changed psychology, for one thing. It wasn't done alone. Early staffs took a beating at times, e.g. in Philadelphia, when fifteen or twenty cops came to arrest LRH as a witness in a bankruptcy hearing. By the time the Federal Marshalls got to LRH, they were utterly demoralized. They took him downtown, before a judge, and there was great embarrassment, when the lies from the Wichita Foundation were uncovered.

But we have been standing still, waiting for the dead cats to clear from the air. Our early history is that of trying, at first unsuccessfully, to just hold a position. Putting in dianetics as a stable datum blew off enough confusion in the society so that we could move. For a long time, it was impossible to hold a position stably. Hence the way the early Foundations moved around. LRH was standing there as a being, but as an organization, we couldn't stand up. LRH's idea was to do his research and get it to the point where there was dependable gain there for every case -- easily attainable and deliverable. He paid no attention to the dead cats. That may have been rough on people. The group has been asking him to advance a line into society, while he has been fixing up the technology so that it could be delivered. He has kept organizations running, but he has not put much time in on organization, comparatively.

In the early days, "the reason we didn't deliver was that there was no way to enforce the way to do it." Dianetics got enturbulated because unstraight tech, poorly delivered, prevented case advance. And "there wasn't any way you could discipline the administration of the technology." To discipline the administration of the tech, the following is required:

1. You've got to have the technology, and not hidden standards.

2. You've got to be able to make it known.

3. You have to police its use, i.e. to make sure that it is that technology that is applied.

That is the 1-2-3 of an administration. Early on, we lacked not only the tech to handle simple things, like O/W and PT concerns of the PC, but also the means to see that what we did have got applied. Dianetics was not, and we are not, just an idea, a book, a copyright, or a nice philosophy lying in a book on a shelf. We are bringing live human beings up to recognition of their own beingness, and that is a live action. We don't face it, because it is easier to confront a concept than a live being. We have never been anything but beings, going through society. When we started up the line, it was the enturbulation of the trillions starting to blow. We had more ways to knock out the whole track than to get the overt out of the last hour. We had started to make a hole in the collective aberration of mankind. It was we, as beings, making the hole, not the idea, not with good tools, not with administration to enforce what tech we had.

You are perfectly right to say, "It's Ron's fault that it didn't all go smoothly." "I should have been an OT who came to earth and got ahold of someone named Moses and said, 'Hey, Moses! Here are some rules. Now you go back and front for me.' Is there anything wrong with that story? Can you imagine anyone doing that, if he had all that power? No, no! This didn't happen. It just required more nerve to stand up by yourself."

The people who attacked us are dead or in terrible shape. The organizations that attacked us are weaker. We have held the fort successfully, and we can now begin to do what we want, rather than what we have to do. We are holding our position as an organization now. We are able to get tech applied. Our organization takes the form we want it to take. In 1950, LRH said, "It will go as far as it works." He has been pushing the tech to its limit, despite pleas to take over the admin. "Things are becoming more orderly." Now LRH is in a position to put in administrative form and structure. We had gotten ourselves to a position where we were holding ourselves from expanding.

Now the instructor can wear his hat, in the course. "The action of administration is simply smoothing out the enturbulence of the environment." When you introduce someone to scientology, he can run into lots of confusion with the other people in his environment. He has changed, and they haven't. As an individual, he goes through what scientology, as a group, has gone through. However, it won't take him fifteen years to get up to a point where he can hold his case gain!

There is a terrific relationship between the environment, the individual, and the speed with which a process works. The earlier auditing on a case is "a race between the auditor and [the PC's] environment." That was true of the introduction of dianetics and scientology into the environment, also. That was also a race.

The guy who has an early win in scientology tells his friends, and confusion blows off, which may spin him in. He gets inval, etc. He has put in a stable datum and can't hold his position in the resultant confusion. You've got to get a process working on somebody, that is effective enough so that the environment won't knock him down faster than you can pull him up. You have to deliver to him the kind of technology that he can somehow stand up with. You must not unsettle him, e.g. with R6. You want him to be stable. Furthermore, you want to give him some administrative protection. Today, you have been given weapons of administrative protection for your PC, as well as a method of forcing a PC to take action and not keep messing up in his environment.

We are more powerful and things are more stable than ever before, and will continue to be so, as long as we follow the channels of the administrative system, as long as our mutual understanding of the existing situation and the lessons of what we have been through are applied. We have had lines that were blocked. LRH is pulling out the blocks, now, putting in comm lines, etc. The trick is to avoid unsettling lines that are already in and working. The goal is an accelerating curve. We are past the critical point of organizational case gain. Now we can hold our gains. Now we have to get in comm lines and put policy to work. If you want to strengthen an organization, just find the blocks to expansion and pull them out. Open up your comm lines, put your barriers on the edges of the lines to channel them, and put life into the group.

Last summer, LRH changed the whole org board to make it more workable. This action resulted in smoother flows and less upset. We are about to complete that reorganization, without cutting out any working lines, but paralleling them. Duplicative functions are being cut out, so there is less traffic. All we ask of a staff member is to discipline his comm line. There is no vast rush to get the tech all published. We need to get the organizational lines in first, so that when we hit the society with new material, there will be lines for the traffic to flow on.

The levels checksheets and processes are ready for release. The processes are simpler than you would expect.

Earlier technology was more advanced in some instances than later tech. For instance, the material in the Philadelphia Doctorate Course is Level VII material. The old technology was workable, ever since Excalibur was written in 1938. But the chances of it being received, followed, or applied were remote. We are now moving ahead to some law and order, which smooths things out. Man was too far down to know that he was confused. Now he can come up through the confusion.

6503C30 SHSpec-56 ARC Breaks and Generalities

The problem of getting materials out has to do with LRH's pen fingers and the short (only 24 hour) day. Nevertheless, expansion is going rapidly. What is interesting is the number of false data that you can get, that create a false impression. For instance, you can get the datum that "they say", when only one guy said it. We were thrown a curve last year. It was reported to LRH from at least two sources that the gradation program was unpopular. In fact, the gradation program alone was responsible for last year's organizational upsurge. LRH let the gradation program wobble and modified it, whereupon a decline set in. Most people think that it was the price shift at the start of the year that caused the decline. But the decline was coincident with LRH leaving for vacation. When investigated, it was found that registrars were using the confusion caused by the price shift to deny service. They sold a lot of auditing, saying, "The price will be prohibitive in thirty days," and everyone went into agreement with it. The registrars also confused the public about what they could get with what, in terms of memberships. Furthermore, there wasn't a price rise. The price dropped!

Unlike registrars in central orgs, LRH never talked about money. Someone would come in to a central org thinking about auditing, and someone at the org who had money problems himself gratuitously gave the would-be PC money problems. LRH never talked about money, yet people force a discussion of money on him. If processing works, the person who gets it is more able to have money. Since registraring to get money was never something that LRH had to do, he is considering removing interviews with the Reg as part of the Reg's hat. It must have been something added on the line that suppressed the inflow of money. It must have been the selling.

LRH used to explain every datum at least nine times in a lecture, before study tech came out. That got around misunderstood words, because the material was put in various ways. When telling students to do something, he has found that they will do what he said, so he has to be sure that he tells them what to do very very clearly. Instruction is basically trying to cover all of it so thoroughly that there are no gaps and no room for question on how to do it. An old process gets all the quirks and weird ways to do it ironed out as it gets used.

People in the L.A. org got the odd idea that a Class VI auditor would only audit Level VI material. No. Class VI auditors can run Level 0, only they would use E-meters, assess for the exact thing to run, etc. An auditor uses all the tools of the trade that he has mastered. If a Class VI auditor were doing a touch assist on a burned area and he could see that the area was not getting better fast, i.e., that there was no TA on the process, he would know that the PC must have something connected with the injury, like a withhold or an overt. Having the PC point to where it happened and where it is now is having him contact the environment and letting the whole incident come into view. Now the touch assist can go to work.

Never accept rumor as something on which to base any action or decision, except to investigate. Use statistics, which are particularities. If you don't have stats for each individual, you get chaos, because it is a generality. An organization will cause ARC breaks amongst its staff, if you can't get a statistic on everybody present, week in and week out. People will protest an organization as a slave-driving system, in the absence of stats. The stat has to be on each individual, or it is worthless. It must also be compared with former stats. This is what it takes to keep some activity or organization going for a long period of time. The Galactic Confederacy had a pretty good org board. The org lasted eighty trillion years. Its only flaw was not having any provision for change or improvement. It had two billion staff members in the central org. LRH set himself the problem of making an org board that could cover from one person to two billion.

When things aren't staticized, you get rumors, injustice, and authoritarianism, because a generality is operating. Earth organizations commonly attribute success wholly to the man at the top, when in fact

he is only 60% or 70% responsible. General MacArthur didn't win the war, though he was a bright cookie. In Korea, he didn't win, because he wasn't a good politician. He disobeyed a condition formula. He was in emergency and didn't promote. Public opinion is made out of someone's hat.

The moral is, that when you try to explain a condition with generalities that do not apply, you muck up the whole situation. That is how Russia will take the U.S. They have better propaganda. They are promoting communism, and who is promoting democracy? Wilson and Johnson are reorganizing economies in a period of decline -- emergency -- when they should promote what they cam eventually deliver, be prepared to deliver it, etc. They are advertising a crisis. "If you don't want to be something, don't postulate it." If you yell, "Crisis!", you will get a crisis. Apply the proper conditions formula. U.S. business operates an though it is in a perpetual condition of emergency. It uses heavy promotion, etc. American businesses never apply the condition for normal when they get there. So they never get out of emergency.

In emergency, you handle with a sledge hammer.

In normal, you handle with kid gloves.

All this has to do with dealing with what is actually going on. But you can never find out what is actually going on from having just a mass of something. There is nothing to compare it with. You can only find out what is happening with the individual bits of something, never with the masses. You get in trouble when you generalize what should be particular.

In scientology, we do make general statements about men. We can only get away with doing this because we have studied many individuals. When we say about "men" is actually a description of a thetan.

There is another interesting fact about generalities. We used to know fairly little about ARC breaks. Now we know that "an ARC break is a generality that should be a particularity." It was a single, but it was called a many. "Only an ARC break can worsen a graph," during processing, which makes an ARC break more serious than a PTP: "If there's no graph change, there's a PTP." There is nothing wrong with a generality per se, only with one that should be a particularity. If you get a generality when asking for an ARC break, get the PC to particularize it. You can fail to find the BPC by taking a generality as the BPC, instead of going on to find out who "they" is. You would still have to get the specific "who", and it may take several of these steps to get it. E.g.:

Aud -- Is there an ARC break?

PC -- Yes. The instructors are mean to me.

Aud -- Who is "the instructors"?

PC -- Pete.

Aud -- There is BPC. Has he failed to answer you?, etc.

PC -- No. It is actually the students.

Aud -- Who is "the students"?

PC -- Agnes ... I'd forgotten completely! She said I was a lousy auditor, yesterday!

"What is basically wrong with [the R6 Bank]? All the GPM's are generalities!" That is why people ARC break so hard on R6. The above datum concerning generalities also solves loss. The loss of something produces a generality of where it could be. When you lose something, it could be anywhere, which makes it a generality. This is a lie, so the person ARC breaks. "One of the ways to cure yourself of a [loss] is [to] remember that [the thing that was lost] can only be in one place, not in thousands of places.

"It's an 'everywhere' that should be a particularity." [It gives the individual an unflat listing question about "where?"]

"The test of 'What was the BPC?' is: 'When it is located, does the PC cheer up?'" If you have to locate it more, you haven't found the BPC.

6504C06 SHSpec-57 The Org Board and Livingness

[Reference: HCOPL 3Apr65. Not available in OEC volumes.]

HCOPL 3Apr65 gives basic organization in detail.

The present org board is an old Galactic Civilization board with a couple of departments missing.

The org board is a philosophical machine. A command chart covers only one aspect of organizational functioning. A true org board must take care of what happens. If a function is not expressed on the org board, it will be worn by everybody, unknowingly. When you put a box on an org board, it will be filled.

Men cannot work as a team without policy. Even bad policy will at least make a team, if it is followed. Policy is the extant agreement of the group. Without this agreement, you only get individual action.

If an organization is better organized than other organizations, it wouldn't have to do anything spectacular about the other organizations [by way of competing with them or battling with them]. Every war traces back to wild out-policy.

If we come up the line as people, as individuals, and also as part of the team, we won't get into all the trouble we got into as roarin', screamin' individuals, 'way back on the track. We will be able to make it all the way, because we will be able to keep order all the way.

Case stability depends upon the smooth organization of individuals. Without an organization, the tech would drop out, in time.

The organization must be close to flawless. Once you have put the organization in concrete and started it rolling, if it is almost right, you have had it, because it will become an all-devouring monster, and it will fail by the germs of its own destruction. And what destroys almost any organization is its own germs. It's the things it laid in. It's the things you did, not the things that were done to you. The only way you can come down is for having made a mistake yourself. There must always be that prior mistake. Sometimes it is very slight and unpredictable, apparently. When a curve goes down, there are lots of errors. There is no one major error. You must have understandings, not understanding.

There are 265 x 6 separate dynamic urges in Man and 265 x 6 x 18 separate causations. There was an effort to make them so numerous that no one could embrace them. [Actual GPM's?]

Organizational policy must be comprehensible. The org board must express:

1. Function.

2. Duties.

3. Sequences of actions.

4. Authorities. The org board gives the cycle of raw meat to OT: the cycles of actions that a person would undertake, from the public. It became a public org board, too. The public enters from the left and proceeds to the right.

In life:

1. You must have an impulse into a channel.

2. The edges of a channel must be held firm.

3. The barriers in the channel must be removed.

4. The non-compliance of forwardings in the channel must be taken care of.

5. The distractions must be removed from the borders of the channel.

6. There must be some place for something going down the channel to arrive at.

This is the definition of life. Life, without that channel, won't exist. That is livingness: going along a certain course, impelled by a purpose, with some place to arrive. This also gives us all the levels of the gradation program. Clear is a baby OT. His next bank is the physical universe.

The first point on the org board is the Office of LRH. This used to be HASI. This deals with:

1. Authority

2. LRH's material.

3. LRH's signature.

The main thing about this department is the issuance of conditions. The first cog is that there is a condition. Hence, this is the entrance point for raw meat. He thinks others will take care of him. However, he must recognize his condition, or he will die. Others tell him that his condition is that he will die. Scientology says, "You don't have to die, or get sick, etc." All processes from that point on contain a condition.

After you have a condition, you had better communicate with it. Hence the next department is the Department of Communications, and the name of the level is "communication".

The next level is "perception": the Department of Inspections and Reports. Communication must precede perception.

The next point is orientation. The individual finds out that he has been living in a nightmare. This is the Department of Compilation. After you have accumulated notes, you can put them together and hand them to people, so that they can get oriented. [Cf. these Briefing Course notes.]

Perceptions get compiled into understandings, so the next department is understandings, i.e. the Department of Publications. This department publishes what is to be understood or what is understood. Understanding is just telling yourself what is understood.

The next department, the Department of Promotion, is under "purposes". The only thing the Prom-Reg ever handles is purposes. The PC, at this level on the gradation chart, has arrived at "purposes", i.e. R6. He has gotten rid of false purposes; he has achieved the state of clear, in its new 1964 definition. [See tape 6409C03 SHSpec-38 "Clearing -- What It Is"]

The above is all under HCO. HCO is a double-barreled division.

If you cross two divisions on a hat, from that point on, you have jammed the ability of an organization to expand. Don't have one person on hats in two different divisions. Therefore six people are necessary, in order to have an org: one for each division. When an organization gets fairly big, you cross departmental hats at your peril.

Personnel housing Division 3 has to hold things together, e.g. the physical plant. It is also involved in financial planning.

Division 4 has to do with what you do, the doingness.

There has been a neglected factor [on the Galactic Confederation org board]: the product. An organization has to qualify the product. It must find out what made the product fall down. [I.e. there is a need for a "lost battles" division.] You must not let the person who trains students examine them.

Scientology is the ability to change conditions. But we have to decide what conditions we want to change. You have to convince people that the product of scientology is valuable. The alternative is sitting on an island, out of communication. [It is the product that is distributed.]

You can take your life and find out which division is missing.

Note that there are six divisions and sixteen departments. To expand the org board, each department would have primarily six sections, with sixteen sub-sections. Each one of these subsections, in turn, may have six "divisions", with sixteen "departments". Each divisional head knows all the department hats in his division, and something about all other departmental hats. This gives you, basically, six hats and a staff member hat. There should be two admin personnel for every tech person.

If any hats below you on the org board are empty, you are responsible for them.

6504C13 SHSpec-58 The Lowest Levels

Research is not wrapped up. A new datum has emerged, and research is going South. [LRH is researching power processing.] It is not surprising that the more one discovers in the upper reaches, the more understanding one has of fundamentals that apply to the bottom.

You've got R6EW. That is holding you nicely. "I'm putting the capper on the R6 GPM plot." R6 has developed into a series of star-rated processes. The first is the method of cleaning up out-ruds on yourself. It is a solo ruds process. Two-terminal auditing is too slow, at Level VI. Solo auditing all the GPM's on R6 takes about three months, at three to four hours per day. The end product of this auditing is clear, as we knew it in the earliest days: no reactive bank at all. A thetan experiences a sense of unfamiliarity at this level, and he runs into problems, like "How do you handle a body?" He has to learn to postulate with great rapidity. It is a condition of "too aware". He has to get used to reading people's minds. He finds that absolute zero is a proper temperature. Everything else is hot. It is in tiny, but observable motion, and it is bothersome, at first. He needs re-familiarization. He is not quite sure what he can do. His framework on whom he must fight changes. He can start wondering about his sanity, because previously sensible things seem foolish. He can also get solutions. He can do analyses of situations that were previously blank puzzles.

The road to OT is one of familiarity. A clear has trouble "trying to reconcile what has been going on in [his] life with what [he is] now. [He is] not really able to think very straight about how confused [he was].... Sometimes it's hard to understand why somebody else is confused." For instance, try to "wrap your wits around some guy's saying, 'But we gotta get the Republicans back in power!'" You know they are nutty, too, since you erased your confusion and don't have it around anymore as a standard. "Clear is not necessarily a very tolerant state, but it is not a very antagonistic state, either.... It's not negative.... One is far more positive about things than he ever was before. His reactions are far more vivid."

You have to realize that a thetan can become aberrated without being implanted or having GPM's. But what really made him unable was GPM's, which gave him wrong purposes and smashed him down, so that he couldn't have any purpose of his own. All his own real purposes are suppressed. When you get out into the open, your own purposes show up, and you start doing what you would like to do, not what your bank wants you to do. In scientology, we have been working with what the thetan wants. We only fail with other people when we treat them as other than a thetan, a being. All thetans want out, even those that are in an insane asylum, who fight everybody who comes in the door. Beings are basically good. One reason why the being has consented to have a bank is that it prevents everyone else from being bad. That is so far-fetched that no one would ever look for it as the philosophical fundamental in back of the aberration of Man.

There is aberration that a thetan can get into, based on his ignorance, his unfamiliarities, his decisions based on no data, etc. Scientology is built straight around what might happen to a thetan. GPM's gave him reverse purposes. He decided that, to keep others and himself good, he should have a bank to prevent himself and them from being bad. The idea was that Man is bad, and we have to do something to him to make him good. So we all have to agree to have a bank to keep us from being bad. But the bank cut off the thetan from all familiarity with himself as he was. The decision to do that -- to create a bank -- "somehow put him into a condition where he couldn't conceive of how he had been. It was a cut-off." He is like a guy in a coal pit who doesn't believe that there is a sun [or Plato's cave metaphor in The Republic]. He thinks that what he is in is a normal environment. He will say, "Look. You can see there is no sun or light. That's proof!" That was the barrier that made someone unsalvageable, before we knew about it.

"As you come up the line, your R gets ... violated [by the wog world]. The higher you get, the more your R is susceptible to violation, but, fortunately, the more capable you are of standing up to invalidation. It doesn't mean anything to you." It is vital that someone improve on a gradient, since a PC's "case gain must not outrun his capability of handling the new reality."

You can't travel the road to truth halfway. [See the tape: 6211C01 SHSpec-207 "The Road to Truth", above.] It is vital that LRH reorganize and perfect organizations now, because we are at the make-break point, where it requires a hard push at first, shifting over to a runaway forward motion. If we released a public book right now, we would cave ourselves in. The orgs have to be able to expand rapidly, before a flood of new people hits it. We can push the boom-button any time.

All of a sudden, LRH made a discovery that found the answer to cases that wouldn't run successfully on Level 0 [Power processing]. There are two levels below Level 0:

1. Conditions processes.

2. Existence processes. Existence is below conditions. This antiquated the plans for a boom. So there have been changes: There are three conditions processes.

Auditing the case on these below-zero processes is a walk in the park. However, it may take a Class VI to run them, because what flies off the case comes off so fast that the velocity might be too much for a co-auditor or a lower-level auditor. These processes handle the no-case-gain case. They were developed to handle cases that LRH had formerly handled with justice and ethics. These are the new conditions processes, which could be run at any point on a case, and which have an exact end-point, beyond which they won't run further.

Below the conditions processes is existence processing. An existence process is one in which a person recognizes something about existence. Mimicry gets at this sideways. Having these processes makes it hard to write a new public book, because they should be included in the discussion, but not enough is known about them yet to write about them. Since the new membership pricing system was created, based on the idea of having a new public book, the pricing is premature, which backs it up on the orgs. We will get the orgs to back up and get their organization and sign-up line well in hand. "Look around here and find something really real to you," is a process at the existence level. It was a wildcat process from upper-level tech that belongs at or towards the bottom. You get a person to find one thing that is really real, in the room. A basic undercutting command might be, "Are you?" "Something like that.... It's a familiarity, without contact or communication, and without an awareness of what familiarity is arriving. You get the shut-off? Because, as you've gone South, you've dropped orientation, you've dropped perception, ... communication, ... conditions, and you're [now] in existence.... That existence must be without any of the other things....[So] what is this level called 'Existence'? How would you audit something without understanding, orientation, perception, communication, or the recognition of a condition? ... What do we have left?" We don't know, but we will!

The new organizational plan is going in faster than it has been released. You can't keep an org out of it. Despite its current incompleteness, it is a big magnet that is trying to take existing departments and put them on it. It is unique, and it works because it is a parallel-line org board, not a vertical org board. "It operates left and right, not up and down." One odd characteristic is that each repeating department, as you go across the board from left to right, has nothing to do with the functions that follow it but "includes all of the functions which precede it. [Just] try to squeeze into a department, comfortably, some action which follows it on the ... board, to the right." You get trouble. "Try to get into the orientation department something about understanding.... Well, that has its own departmental functions, but ... the next one to ... the right [is] purposes. Now, let's put [purposes under understanding]. In other words, we're going to have purposes before we have understanding." You get a mess, organizationally or in auditing. E.g., "If you try to put something about promotion under understanding, why, people just sit around and 'understand' that there should be some promotion."

It was working with the org board that brought to light the lower sub-zero levels, because the org board is "not an org board at all. It's a philosophic machine, to which an organization is easily adapted.... It's an all-devouring monster. Anything that comes near it gets changed for the better." It gives answers to questions that we have had trouble with before, like personnel. An ad is kept placed; people come in; they get hired; they work for two weeks with a staff hat; they go to review; etc. It all gets done without having to go through any executive. An applicant who calls up for a job gets a call

two days later, saying, "Come on in." He gets a meter-check (for TA). Then he is routed through F.P. to his place of work for a two week temporary assignment, at the end of which he goes to review and is either kept on or told that he needs more training for the job. Even if review boots him out, he remains an applicant, needing some more preparation before he can have the job. Review also tells the labor exchange about him, to see if he can get other employment right away. Review also has a displaced person division, to give him a meal ticket, get him on a PE course, or co-audit, until he can function. Then he is hired on a provisional basis for a year. Review maintains a file of these people for periods of crush labor. The only way this whole system won't work is if you don't man up the posts. This employment system is also great for procurement. People come to work and stay to study. Thus anything that gets near the organization begins to move.

This new organizational structure improves things for the better, whether people like it or not: It has to be completed before we release the Field Staff Member program, which will give back-up to field auditors. Private practice a la MD's must be wrong, since it is failing. It takes quite a team to process PCs. It is possible to process PCs in an organization, but not in individual practice.

Suppose you had dissemination technology that would make it so anyone you talked to would immediately become a scientologist? It exists! It is only two or three weeks old, not yet released. The person who resists and protests it is the easiest to get. And if FSM's are sending in all sorts of cases, even very low-level cases, the organization must be able to handle them right off the bat. All auditors that were ever trained are now to be called FSM's. The pay is ten percent of the fee of the person you send in.

A Center is a nucleus of an organization. If it moves even vaguely in the direction of an org board, it will wind up becoming an organization so fast, it won't know what happened.

There is a policy that you can't be retrained for a level that you have already obtained. This goes along with the policy that a checksheet can't be changed, once you are on it.

There are at least twelve levels above Level VI, and St. Hill will be teaching those.

6504C27 SHSpec-59 Awareness Levels

[LRH makes several observations on recent organizational out-points.]

Wherever the public impinges on the organization, it enturbulates and erodes. It is the public that is in a confusion. We are putting the stable datum of an organization or a scientologist into the middle of the confusion. An individual cannot stand alone against the public in the midst of this confusion. He will get knocked appetite-over-tin-cup by the public, unless backed up by the organization. Every scientologist and org in the world is connected with the suppressive thing called "the society", so they would skid if left by themselves. You are dealing with a psychotic society. "There are thirty-two levels below 0, and the average public is at least fifteen levels below 0....And neurosis starts at ten [levels below 0]." It goes only a few levels down, then becomes psychosis. "Psychosis is an inability to observe. And that's your public."

Last year, when LRH first had a total reality on the exact character of the reactive mind; on exactly how it was there and exactly what it was calculated to make an individual do, he was shocked. Knowing that shock is an indication that there is something wrong with what he is shocked with, he went over the structure of the bank, suppressed, challenged, and ARC broke it. The shock was not actually with the reactive bank, but with the pretenses that had been made, about the character of Man. "I haven't cognited [heavily] for ages." LRH can't get his own TA up. Masses affect his body, but not him.

Here is some more data that LRH has found, on the subject of clear: A clear's time track is gone, so the eidetic memory talked about in Book One is there only if he puts it there. A clear recalls, not with pictures, but by knowing. "Pictures are completely unnecessary for any kind of a recall at all. [This is] probably the only change there's been, from the definition of a Book One clear." There are also energy phenomena, mentioned several years after Book One, like heating things up by looking at them. A clear can make something warm by staring at it. As a person goes on up, he takes both the new abilities and the lost disabilities for granted. The negative gain is gain by absence, and the positive gain is regaining his natural abilities, after all, so he may not notice the change, unless he mocks up what was wrong with him last week. So don't expect your PC always to be telling you

what a wonderful auditor you are. That is a bank phenomenon that will destimulate in three to ten days. The person's increased awareness may not be all pleasant. He can look at some dynamic or sphere of existence and see it clearly, with a shock.

"The common denominator of behavior is degree of awareness." That is what is held in common by all life. There is no such thing as being aware or not aware. It is all degrees of awareness -- a gradient, like all the scales: The difference between person A and person B is degree of awareness, or awareness of different things. There are certain things of which one would become aware in order to get, or as one got, a case advance. If you skip one or two or three of those, you can't become aware of this higher one. LRH plotted the Scale of Awareness to get the bridge down to homo sapiens, not having noticed the gap that he had created, between himself and the low-level PC. That is how he got thirty-two levels of awareness below Level 0. He suddenly found himself looking at the human race and it was a horrible shock. It felt weird. He got over it in about twenty-four hours, realizing that if you could deal with the average public PC, you could process a dog. "You are at least ten or twelve levels below communication, with the average public PC." The problem is: How do you process, when you don't have a comm line? Another problem is that as someone comes up in awareness, he goes through anti-social bands, as well as inoffensive ones. There are bands amongst them that are passive and propitiative. These are resting places, in which society doesn't worry about you; i.e. it doesn't try to suppress you.

These lower levels are jammed together, and it is a bit hard to tell the order, down near the bottom. The Awareness Scale measures what a person could become aware of. "If you find a person anyplace on [the Awareness]-Scale, ... then the next action which you have to do ... to give him a case gain, is to make him aware of the next level above that." For instance, someone below suffering might have a case gain by being made to suffer. You wouldn't necessarily process him up to this awareness. The lowest type of process you would use is mimicry. He would be aware that he was doing it because you were doing it.

"Awareness is always a matter of increasing perimeter [of reality]." You get concentric circles of awareness. For instance, a psycho is only aware out to his fist. Beyond that is delusion. Awareness can invert and "increase" into delusion, which puzzles you, since the person seems to be getting nuttier. Delusion is inverted awareness. "You've got to increase his awareness in the direction of sanity or reality." Process in the direction of something real. A person who is improving gets more and more aware of what is going on, inside a wider and wider perimeter. You could get a guy aware of a wall two feet in front of his face, and it could be a vast improvement. You can do this with 8C, increasing the distance to the wall when the PC touches it. Communication begins to come in.

"You can have action without awareness: [I.e. you can have the situation where] what the individual is aware of and what [he] is doing are not the same thing -- ever." Hence you get long-term headaches. "Therefore the observation of conduct ... will not diagnose [a] person, unless you have a little, secret [awareness] scale of your own. In other words, you'd have to know the secret of what the MEST universe dictates, as a gradient scale" of awareness. Observation of conduct will not lead to a solution of the situation, and Man falls down in thinks that it will. The field of psychology, etc., being entirely based on observation and labelling of conduct, comes up with inaccurate diagnoses and messed-up solutions. You can't watch a patient and decide that he is a "gymnastico potico" and a firebug who is compulsively attracted to water on that account. The reason this girl keeps going to the water fountain is because she is thirsty. She may be stuck in a French Foreign Legion engram in the Sahara. Therefore, the remedy might have nothing to do with water, fire, etc. The moment you grasp this principle, you get the stable datum: "Don't draw and conclusions from conduct." All unexpected conduct tells you is that "you don't know about something. But that is something to know." Labelling is bad science and leads to no solution. "All science [is, is the discovery that, or all science had to find out, to become science is that] when something isn't working, you haven't got the answer." This explains the advance of the physical sciences. The mental sciences got parked, by substituting authoritarian statements for searching for a workable answer.

If, as an auditor, you base what you do on what the PC is doing, you will go nuts, too. For instance, if the PC is nattering and the auditor agrees with the natter and takes the PC's data as a truth, nothing happens. Conduct can be used only as an indicator that, since the PC "is behaving in some way [that] you didn't expect, ... there is something about him that you didn't know." That you can ask the PC, regardless of whether it is a missed withhold or not. "What don't I know about you?" will resolve the situation. Labelling it won't. Never just label conduct that you don't understand. Know that you don't know what is going on and find out. Also consider what the PC can find out about himself.

The nuttier someone is, the harder he is to handle. He is less aware and you are less aware of what you don't know about him. Also, the nuttier the PC is, the harder it is to get his attention so that you can find out what he is aware of and what is going on and what you don't know. The "don't knows" are fabulous. You have to push to get the person to become aware enough -- to get him high enough on the Awareness Scale -- so that you can find out enough, So you can find out what you don't know about the person. The game would be, "What can I find out about this person, and what can he find out about himself?" By increasing that awareness scale, the person will get saner and saner, more and more aware, more and more himself. He can hit dynamic situations which he becomes aware of with a shock.

"You have to eat humble pie to begin this subject at all. You have to know that there is something in the universe you don't know. And that, for a person who is 'way down scale, is the most dangerous utterance that he could possibly make." He is so totally sealed off from things that "if everyone realized how blind he was [he thinks], they'd just eat him up. So he compensates for his unawareness by automatic mechanisms of pretense. [He lacks the] courage ... to say, 'Well, I don't know anything about that.' And yet he can't resolve any situation until he says, 'Well! Whaddya know! I've got an area where I don't know.'" Therefore, "When you see somebody behaving oddly, ... the only thing you know is that ... there's something you're certainly unaware of and [that] he is probably unaware that he is unaware of. He'll cover that up with a pretended awareness which doesn't exist [i.e. delusion]."

Having gone through despair on the subject, a person can come up to a realization that "there is something you can know ... about anything you confront.... You can know that you don't know, and that is the first thing you should know about it." Now you can take the action necessary to find out, and, in the process of finding out, the whole thing will clarify.

The amazing thing about aberration is that if you did find out about something, e.g. the internal government of Russia, it would either go clear or collapse. Just finding out what a situation is as-ises that situation. Running an engram out of an organization or an individual is just continuing to pull into view what people didn't know about the individual or organization. The only way in which you could fail to pull something into view is to suppose that you knew all there was to know about it and that there was nothing more to learn. A clear has become broadly aware of where he is unaware. When he spots something like this, he decides that:

1. He should find out.   or

2. It doesn't make any difference.

You can decide whether it is worth finding out, and if you do start finding out, it will collapse.

6505C11 SHSpec-60 ARC Breaks and PTP's -- The Differentiation

Releases are being made with power processing, with LRH D of P'ing and MSH CS'ing. It is getting very routine to get keyed-out clears in under fifty hours. We know that we can audit anybody 34 awareness levels below Level 0. [Note: at this time, the Awareness Scale was apparently in its present (1976) form.] The bulletins covering the power processes are too simple to be anything but confidential. The processes are too pure and simple to be generally released. They require both a great deal of training and a high case level. Therefore, power is to be made confidential. Power processes can only be audited in organizations. There is not enough control or sense among people like Homer and Berner to do it in the field. The idea of running end-words on raw meat!! It just overwhelms the PC and is tough to straighten out.

Clay table processes have been taken out of the processing line-up. When people process raw meat with the clay table, they neglect one thing rather uniformly: getting the questions answered. Only a few processes are left on students' auditing checksheets.

The international situation has improved. In the U.S., the senate and house are attacking, or are on the verge of attacking, the FDA. In Victoria, the report on the Inquiry is delayed. It will doubtless fizzle out.

People probably thought LRH was exaggerating, when he said that we were going to take the planet. But he has always meant exactly that. We are now just at the edge of dissemination as a phase in the development of scientology. Having the Minus-0 Awareness Level Scale is a great help in dissemination. The press will support you on "need of change", so you press this. They will go along with this. Whatever the press says is a protest. "Revolutions are popular until you give them the change that is to be made into. Then they cool off." The Scale of Awareness is a scale of what a person, group, or organization can be aware of. It is new. Having the Minus-0 Awareness Level Scale opens the door to bringing a person "right up the line to release on study alone, because it has a trick: If you can locate what a person is aware of on that scale, you only have to tell him about the next level, and he will become aware of that and experience a case change." Therefore, you can get case improvement by education. Don't confuse the level a person is at with his conduct. For instance, someone dramatizing hysteria, i.e. being hysterical, isn't necessarily, or even generally, aware of hysteria. Therefore, he isn't necessarily at the level of hysteria. We do know that a being must be aware -- and we mean analytically aware -- of something, to be at that awareness level. Something someone is dramatizing is above where he is and is overwhelming him. What he is aware of can be discovered he what he "talks about or seems to be alert to."

There are lower levels than 34 below zero. But power reaches to the bottom and gives a release. The two levels below level -34 [Unexistence] are False Causation [-35] and Reasonableness [-36]. These levels are below Uncausing [-32]. The human race generally is near the bottom end of the scale. A person who is aware of being hysterical is pretty high-toned [relatively speaking]. You can't pull an overt off the person at Uncausing. There "aren't any". "It just happens." "What will be, will be."

Religions fail by being below a perception of God. "The greatest ARC break operation that has ever been pulled in the history of the human race: The God who is everywhere [with] no mass [-- a] total generality ... total unlocatability ... total power ... total causation."

Will you please, please differentiate between ARC breaks and PTP's? Ninety percent of the PCs that you are doing ARC break assessments on are in fact in PTP's. The ARC break is usually after a PTP, unless it is a flagrant case of BPC. A PTP is postulate/counter-postulate. The PC is at war with something. He is not just worrying about something he doesn't like. He is agin something. For instance, a husband has an argument with his wife. One wants to go to the movies, and the other doesn't. This is a war, not an ARC break. But it could lead to an ARC break on both sides. Running the ARC break wouldn't help, though it would run. But running the problem will help. You could find the problem, where you might not ever find "the BPC". [So the sequence is:

1. Problem.

2. Overt.

3. ARC break.

If you clean up the BPC, the case won't improve, because the PTP is unhandled. They won't necessarily even feel better. You have to do something about the fractured postulate.

The condition of someone in a PTP isn't ARC broken, it's war. A postulate/counter-postulate adds up to war. "It would have done Hitler no good to have run him on an ARC break." He might have been on a PTP, though. Probably it would have required power processing to stop him, though. One commits intentional overts as "a solution to a problem." When you define an overt as a solution to a PTP, you can solve any case. When overts are defined as ARC breaks, they are closed to solution. The resolution of the case is, "Who have you been mean to?" Process the PC at cause -- always. A person commits intentional overts for only one reason: they are solutions to problems. Knowing this, even low-level cases are open to solution. But when you define an overt or series of overts as an ARC break, you close the case to a solution. Because a case is usually struggling along at a low cause-level, the question, "Have you committed an overt?" will be hard for him to answer, because he has never committed an overt, because it was all vitally necessary and therefore totally justified. You should ask the more penetrating question, "Why is it so vitally necessary and why is it justified?" It is because there was a problem requiring a solution [the solution being the overt]. What throws you is that the problem is so buried in the past that it is impossible to see the connection between the overts and the problem. The problem is frequently on the past track . Often it has nothing to do with PT. The person is still solving a problem relating to an earlier relationship. It is still PT to him. Hence it is still a PTP to him. If you trace it back, you will find that it made sense, somewhere earlier, in a screwy

sort of way. A guy who is always smashing up his car might be solving a problem with Daddy, who never let him use the car, by making the car unuseable. "You look on a lot of things as overts which are, in actual fact, vitally necessary solutions to urgent immediate problems of survival. The only thing wrong with them is ... 'When?'" You could ask a guy, "When?", with a finger snap, and get, say, "1932". Then you could ask, "What problem did you have in 1932?" You will get many, many manifestations, but amongst them will not be disinterest. If you told someone the right problem, he would change his conduct, having cognited that his solution was nuts. These solutions are daffy, because of dropped-out time. The solution is to an ancient problem, which is gone, leaving an overt.

To get the major problem on someone's track may take a power process. But if the person has some fundamental problem in his life, it has formed innumerable locks, which have moved up to PT, and they are the overts and withholds that he is dramatizing in PT. If you are clever, you can get at these locks. You don't have to ask for overts, if you ask for solutions to the problem. The old process: "Tell me a problem./What solutions have you had?", modified to "What solutions have you put into effect to solve [that problem]?", could be reworded as, "How have you attempted to solve that problem?" So you can just use:

"Tell me a problem."

"What solutions did you put into effect to solve this problem?" This would give you O/W. Or you could use:

"What have you done to solve that problem?"

"How have you attempted to solve that problem?", or

"What would solve the problem?", or

"What action of yours was a solution to the problem?" Some such process would get the overts off. Any action the person took to solve the problem was to some degree an overt, because it was against another postulate.

An ARC break is a charge that has been restimulated on the back track, which hasn't moved into full consciousness and therefore hasn't been identified. The PC avoids the area. "An ARC break is BPC [and] hasn't anything to do with solutions to problems. [A guy] who is failing to complete a comm cycle because somebody won't acknowledge it ... only has, really, the BPC of a missed withhold:" an inadvertent missed withhold. A missed withhold can be inadvertent, not intended. It looks and feels much like an actual missed withhold. If you won't acknowledge the fact that the PC has answered the question, you bypass the charge of his answer. But the better part of it is that you have given him a problem, since he intended to answer it. This is a PTP, by definition. He is trying to solve it [by force]. Then he ARC breaks, but that is secondary. It will solve rapidly by asking, "What problem have you had in auditing?", especially on a PC who has been roughed up by not being acknowledged. Eventually, the PC would give you, "The problem of getting someone to listen to me." Then, to get the PC's overts on auditors, ask, "Then how did you go about solving it?" You get a string of overts by getting PTP's. For instance:

"What problem have you had with me about auditing?"

"Well ... Very often you didn't seem to listen to me."

"Well, how did you handle [solve] this?"

"I stopped telling you right answers." [So the PC has an ARC break, a PTP, and a missed withhold!]

You can be misled by the BPC and the fact that, yes, there is an ARC break. But the ARC break isn't fully clean-up-able unless you find the problem that it is based on. If you clean up the problem and the problems that the PC has had in his auditing, a whole string of ARC breaks and a whole string of overts will blow.

This is the case because awareness of problems is 'way South -- below minus thirty-four. Cause [overts] is 'way North. So if you try to pull problems directly with O/W, the PC would already have

to be so high-toned that it wouldn't have any effect on him if you did pull the problems. You can discuss problems with anybody. It seems to be the case that where there is life, there are problems.

Where are ARC breaks and BPC, of course. To get an ARC break, just throw an end-word into restimulation. Get a total generality hitting the person outside his awareness, and you will see an ARC break on the generality of it. The whole bank is the most total generality that one can state that is still the truth. When a generality in the bank is restimulated, the person cannot identify the threat, and he feels terrible, not knowing. This is a true ARC break. The PC cannot locate the source of this horrible feeling. It isn't because he is sick to his stomach. It is that he doesn't know why he is sick to his stomach. If you give someone a wrong item off a GPM, he will go from Tone 40 to Tone -40 so fast that he looks like a dive bomber: That is an ARC break. But someone who is ARC broken with an instructor really has a problem and some overts which were solutions.

Auditors can get stuck in the win of successful ARC break assessments and do them on people who really have PTP's. They will get loses that way. Problems are far more common than real ARC breaks.

An experimental, non-therapeutic, but very educational process is, "Invent a problem." You will see black masses show up, as the PC's bank collapses on him. If you ran, "Invent a solution," and the solutions that the PC gave you were all really invented solutions, the mass would also move in. But if you ran, "Think of (or recall) a problem/solution," the mass would move off. You could do, "Think of a problem./ Invent a solution," and the mass will move in. Any totally new inventedness tends to collapse the bank. If you started knocking out a bunch of whole-track problems, you would find the mass going away. Similarly with whole-track solutions. The near-far action of it is very interesting. This makes Problems of Comparable Magnitude able to bring mass in, if you are really inventing, which is hard to do. The main message is that "you can move mental masses around with the idea of problems and solutions." Why? Because of the basic definitions of problems and solutions. A solution is an effort to bat a problem away, which usually fails. The problem, being postulate/counter-postulate, puts the opposite postulate across from you in a hurry, when you think of it. A person's problem is thought of as a mass. He calls a PTP "it" because it is an "it" to him: a mental mass that he tries to bat away. Postulate/counter-postulate gives you a mass. "So, whether he sees it or not, [when a person gets a problem showing up, he] gets a mass show[ing] up, and whether he realizes it or not, the thing he tries to do about it is to do something about it to move it away from him. But his effort ... will move it closer to him. So he's in a situation, when he has a problem, that he has to do something about something ... to get rid of the something which is moving in on him." This phenomenon of mass moving in happens in life, too. The PC normally responds by trying to do something to it to push it away. But that effort will move it closer to him. The guy has a "huge, fundamental" problem. You get it and ask, "Well, all right. Is that your problem?", and he will say, "Well, no. Really the problem was something else." You ask the same question again, and he says, "No. My problem was so and so and so." The PC denies each problem as he as-ises it. They are as-ising in the course of getting down to the main problem.

Sometimes you have a problem of missingness. There is nothing there to confront. This leads to a "Where is it?" This kind of problem fringes into a generality and borders on the ARC break. This is where the problem fringes on an ARC break. That is why problems and ARC breaks appear to be cousins. "It's gone," and "Where can I find it?" are borderline to the ARC break. So it is easy to confuse them. But failures to solve ARC breaks should have clued you in to the fact that there is something else wrong. Fifty percent of the reactive bank is devoted to the compulsion to make a reactive bank. On every process except R6, you should ask about problems, not ARC breaks, unless you realize that you have goofed in the comm cycle. In that case, LRH would ask about specific parts of the formula, not do a long list.

You don't have overts in the absence of a problem. The problem may be gone, but the solutions are still forthcoming. You can run responsibility on problems, problems and solutions, and any number of things.

The basic mechanism of the mind is that "it needs a problem situation to lock up time. [Nothing] else can stop [a person] on the time track." For instance, World War II is still being fought in literature. It was a problem with a lot of solutions, and civilization is to a large degree still stuck in it, as witness the Sunday Supplements, TV programs, etc. A night club could be mocked up like an air raid shelter and make a fortune. World War II was a postulate/counter-postulate that is still more real to people than PT. "Any point of the time track where a civilization is stuck [is seen] as more real than any new

period." It is the same with PCs. If your PC isn't paying close attention, you can assume that the PC is stuck somewhere in back time. You can get his attention by finding out where he is locked in time and entering that prior time period. If you trigger the back time period, you will find yourself there with him.

You get the PC's overts by going after problems, but, if he is below causation, he won't recognize them as overts, because they are necessary solutions. Just ask for the problem.

6505C18 SHSpec-61 Organization and Ethics

[References: HCOPL 1May65 III "Organization -- The Design of the Organization", and the policy letters on staff status: pp. vi-vii in OEC Vol. 1.]

Staff status policy letters have been issued. On the new org board, we will remedy an old evil by putting after the person's name his certification and classification as an auditor, his grade as a PC, and his staff status. In the past, in trying to appoint someone at a distance, LRH had trouble knowing who was there. Now, copies of org boards will be exchanged between orgs, and it will be easy, in filling posts, to see who is qualified for promotion.

To be a staff member in Tech, one needs to have a technical certificate that covers basics of the organization. An admin terminal needs a basic cert on the org. Then he is qualified as provisional (Staff Status I). They can be transferred without permission. Staff Status II is "general staff member". This individual has worked for and attained a solid position. From there on, it goes up to "in-charge" (Head of a sub-section. This is the lowest exec rating.). An "officer" is in charge of a section. For instance, the cramming officer is in charge of the cramming section. Then there are titles that are not associated with rank or status, e.g. "communicator". A post can also have "deputies". A post assigned locally is "deputy". One assigned from St. Hill would be "acting" for awhile. Then the "acting" prefix is removed, and the person has full status. "Acting" or "deputy" do not refer to rank. They refer to permanency. A deputy is somebody who is in there temporarily. A small breath of air could dislodge him. "Acting" denotes a St. Hill appointment. After a short time, up to a year, the "acting" prefix is dropped. Then the person becomes the "(title)" without the prefix. A "Deputy HCO Exec Sec" is someone holding the post until confirmed. It is not at all permanent. "Acting HCO Exec Sec" is a St. Hill appointment and therefore official. To be an "acting", the person would have to have the appropriate staff status for the post. This is not true of a deputy. But a deputy doesn't draw the pay of an acting. You put a person on a post to see how they do. You can't wait, to fill posts, for someone with the proper staff status. So we have the "deputy" rating. This appointment must be confirmed by St. Hill, to get an "acting" rating and full pay. "Acting" applies until a person knows his hat cold and can apply it.

Policy letters are pouring out, covering everything from organizational theory to nit-picky details of minor hats.

Ethics is there to hold the lines and to get technology in, i.e. to make it possible for tech to go in. That is its sole purpose, and it is fabulously successful in fulfilling that purpose. "Ethics is the tourniquet before the doctor arrives." Its purpose is to quiet the turbulence down long enough to allow the auditor to come in. You carry ethics in until you get tech in. It has looked like the publication of someone as an SP has the same effect as a public hanging. Cancelling someone's certs has the effect of getting him back in, all straightened up, within two to two and a half years. Not cancelling the certs results in his going off into the wilds and never showing up again. Peter Crundall, for example, had his certs cancelled five or six years ago, when he was screaming and howling about something. He had to get 500 hours of auditing at his own expense. Now he is being the featured lecturer at an org. It took about two years for him to get his auditing started, and he got it all handled. So it is an unkind thing to do, not to bring order into a scientology area.

Man has a tremendous reaction to "justice". The purpose of ethics is to get in tech. But Man's law and Man's justice is not like that. Man wants to squash people who get in his way. His "justice" has no end product, save punishment. It does not straighten out the community. Therefore it doesn't work. Police forces have bad morale, because there is no end product of penal action. People know this and react against it. And some, on an A=A=A basis, will react against ethics in scientology the same way: You jar people's banks when you present the idea of ethics. Be that as it may, a greater proportion of people in scientology today favor a decent ethics system than are batting back at it. This

is because they see that a good ethics system will give them better training, processing, and a better grip of on scientology. You can't sentence someone to technology or to getting better. You can sentence him to not getting better. No one is forcing us to help people. If someone keeps getting in the way, it is pretty normal to stop wanting to assist him.

If you feel like blowing up organizations, you should very carefully look up the justice actions of organizations and huge governments etc., and compare these things. If you do this, you find some astonishing data. The taut ship, the viciously conducted regiment, the harshly run empire -- all these survive and flourish with high esprit de corps almost forever. The sloppy ones succumb rapidly. LRH got interested in this phenomenon while reading Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. The only long periods of progressive rule, recovery from barbarian attacks, and freedom from internal upsets were periods when the emperor was a nut. The "good" emperors got killed within a few months. This didn't jibe with LRH's experience in handling discipline on a ship. He realized that what works for a small, intimate group to keep the peace is different from what is needed for a big group which gets lots of confusion. In an org, the points of enturbulation are the ones where the public impinges, e.g. the line of getting the PC from the Reg to the D of P. This line keeps going out. LRH used to wonder if there was something wrong with us, to allow us to get enturbulated in this way. Then he looked at society in general and saw how much worse off their condition is. Society is deteriorating. We are gradiently doing better and better.

As we expand, we reach straight out into the tumult of society. We had to have tools to extend our reach so that we could get our jobs done in time. LRH found that as people moved up towards OT, a certain disdain occurred. He saw that ethics would be necessary, so that OT's would take orderly bites out of people, when they got annoyed by the disaster to that extent. There is a need for an ethics system, because a sufficiently powerful being, annoyed at something, is "liable to straighten [it] up with such thoroughness that hardly anybody would ever recover.... And unless they have some orderly method of straightening things up," they will straighten things up in their own way, and it will make a Hell of a mess. The laws of ethics need to be known and understood. They need to be predictable. They cannot be capricious. The question is, "Are you for just shooting somebody down without warning, or do you want ethics? Do you want law that just freakishly strikes down everybody in sight, or do you want the kind of law that says, "Here is the path, narrow as it may seem.'?" In acting on these lines, we have ethics rattling around in the orgs. People are getting used to the tools. You can give someone a shock with a heavy use of ethics. It can be very effective, used lightly. Used in this way, ethics backs up tech most amazingly.

LRH has just discovered the PTS case: its cause and handling. Never audit a PTS. The rollercoaster case is one that we have never been able to handle before. He is connected to an SP, and until ethics makes him disconnect or handle the SP, he will continue to rollercoaster. Ethics can label the suppressive, if nothing else. You give the PTS case the policy letter covering PTS'ness. You don't have to issue an ethics order unless tech doesn't go in, i.e. unless he can't or won't handle or disconnect. You can insist that a PTS bring the SP in, if necessary, for auditing. If things went that far, you could threaten the PTS person with not getting the SP audited unless the PTS person gets him in before he is labeled an SP.

Suppressives are pretty crazy. The SP has got to fight. He is back on the track, fighting the Ugbugs. He is in an old PTP. He is taking the actions, in PT, that would solve the problem with the Ugbugs. He is back on the track, fighting an enemy that no longer exists." 99.999999999% of his attention units are at some exact, precise past period of the track, and in that ... instant, he is fighting off something and is trying to handle something by some means, [which are] the [ones] he is using in PT." He has no problems with you, and vice versa." He isn't up there with you, and you aren't back there with him...." That's the whole anatomy of psychosis: "Given associative restimulators and A=A=A, you've got a mad-dog type." He's just defending himself, in some mad insanity, against things which are no longer there." [Hence the use of power processes on psychotics.] You can assume that the SP has problems in PT, but those are not the problem that he wants to solve. That problem is on the back track, and it is loaded with cross-associations and identifications. He misidentifies anyone who approaches or tries to help him, in an effort to defend himself. He is driven down to the first dynamic to such a degree that no one must get any better. When he is driven down into the first dynamic, he must destroy all around him. No one must get any better, because they are the flying saucer people. Once scientology is known to be an effective way to help people, watch out! International City is being looked at by a group connected to the U.N. We are having an effect.

The true anti-scientologist isn't trying to be convinced. He is trying to stop you! You are the green alligator he is fighting 7000 years ago, and if you (or anyone else -- they are all the green alligator) got any better, you would be stronger, and that would tear it, and you would eat him up (he thinks). Insanity is just a total stuckness on the track in a fight. This is a point that you prove instantly and utterly when you are running power (Class VII) processes on someone. Power handles the SP and the insane. The SP can be processed to sanity in under fifty hours, but you had better have the organization and the ethics to hold things together. You have to label PTS's and SP's, to get the tech in. "An ethics action lasts until, tech is in.... You use English to get tech in.... You stop it when you've got tech in," even if stopping at that point leaves unfinished cycles of action along the way. "It's not a question of 'Where does the ethics proceed?' ... It's, 'How long do you have to hold the area down?'"

An organization will run, as long as it has channels, and as long as particles on the channels don't carom off the sides of the channels and collide with the working parts of the organization. If you can bring that about, you can have an organization that would have a total capability of pouring through it practically the whole of the human race. Lacking clean and definite flow channels, your volume stays small because of all the barriers and stoppages that occur. If the channel isn't kept open, you can't handle the load.

Scientology "is probably the only outfit that ever hit this planet that meant exactly what it said and was doing exactly what it was doing [and what it said it was doing] and was doing exactly nothing else." Scientology doesn't have the time to do half the things that it has been accused of.

An SP, saying, "I never said that!", believes that he really didn't. And he is right, in a sense." How the Hell could he say anything? He hasn't been there for seven trillion years."

"I'm sure that [many entheta-ish people believe] that we've ... gone stark, staring mad, with all this 'justice'. No. We're just having a little fun with justice, just now, and when we learn about it, why, we'll be able to control fairly well a wide sphere of public in such a way that they don't all get destroyed.... The main danger to them is not ethics. It's having their silly heads blown off because they make somebody mad."

You've got to have ethics in to handle non-scientologists. If you put discipline in right at the start, you can work very nicely with non-scientologists. Make sure that they know what ethics is, how it works, etc. Society is losing its grip. We are putting in order, to make an orderly show for the future.

6505C25 SHSpec-62 The Five Conditions

"If it isn't written, it isn't true" is laid down, so that rumors and verbal orders don't foul things up.

"A condition is an operating state." Each condition has a formula that must be applied, in order to change the state [for the better]. Don't mis-apply formulas. If you know the conditions and their formulas, you blow a lot of the mystery that the rest of the world is sitting in.

EMERGENCY

Emergency is the most common state on this planet. It is the condition of stats going the wrong way (usually down) over some significant period. For instance, it is declared by a down stat for four consecutive weeks. If a stat that should go up goes down, or vice versa, you've got Emergency. The condition has to be declared by Secretarial Executive Directive, which is a causative order. Certain steps then have to be done. The first action is: promote, if an organization, or produce, if an individual. When this has been done, but not before, economize. Don't economize on promoting. If you do, you "inhibit getting out anything, in order to produce enough money to raise the stat." If this happens, you will find yourself smaller and weaker after recovering from the crisis.

(Taxation is a page out of Das Kapital: "From each according to his ability to pay; to each according to his need.")

Don't economize until after you have promoted or produced. If an artist in need of money economized first on materials, he would have little or nothing to draw with; therefore he would have little to sell, so he would have trouble getting out of the financial hole. After promotion is well in hand, economize

and prepare to deliver. If you apply the Affluence formula and economize, when you are in Emergency you will either stay in Emergency or, if you recover, the organization will be smaller and of less scope. Also, part of the Emergency formula is to change your operating basis, or you will head back into another condition of emergency. You've got to stiffen discipline. You have to stop going down to the pub every night. Do your homework. Be a little more regular on the job. Work a little harder. Don't goof quite so much. If the activity does not come out of the condition of emergency after that state has been assigned, then you have to use discipline, because life itself is going to discipline the individual very cruelly.

[Cog: That is why protecting a person from the consequences of his actions is out-ethics. You should give the person a consequence beforehand, that parallels life but anticipates it.] If the steps of Emergency are not taken successfully (even if they are taken), and the condition of Emergency is prolonged, it has to walk forward into an ethics matter, because someone must be sitting on most of the comm lines, goofing like crazy. There must be some ethical problem involved, for the condition to be continuing.

NORMAL OPERATION

This is the next condition up from Emergency. It isn't a stable, unchanging state, because everything in the MEST universe either expands or contracts. Nothing stays really unchanging. There are "laws" against it. So in order for Normal Operation to be a stable state, it must be a continual small increase. There must be a "gradual, routine increase". The way you maintain a small increase is to just let everything continue. Don't change anything. Don't put in any harsh discipline. Ethics and justice is mild and reasonable. Carefully observe every slightest rise of a statistic to see what bettered it and do that. For every slight worsening, find out why. Usually it is something non-standard. Remedy it. Jockey, change, and repair, back and forth. Keep an OIC board. This keeps your improving statistics going up.

A statistic that stays level isn't Normal Operation. It's Emergency, because one should be expanding, if only to keep up with inflation. The stat must keep pace with the world around it. For instance, a salary that doesn't rise over two to three years is a "stable" (really a down) statistic and will tend to crash. What looks level is really declining. If one then economizes, which is the Affluence formula, then you will really be in an Emergency: Continuing this practice will result in collapse, sooner or later. Matter, and everything else in this universe, obeys these laws or conditions. The Roman Empire went into Affluence brought about bv Julius Caesar, but it violated the AFFLUENCE FORMULA.

They didn't deliver, and they didn't economize. Instead, they squandered the wealth of the Empire on so-called conquest. They treated the condition as Normal. Julius Caesar violated the commercial Pax Romana Normal Op, which was stable, by going off conquering tribes, etc. Britain was trading with Rome very happily. Then Caesar came over and fought, added Britain to the Empire, gave them slavery, not civilization, and the Empire collapsed.

In the year 0 A.D. or 1 A.D., the Chinese conquered Russia in Siberia, driving people West. A wave of displacement took place, with the Russians driving Eastern European peoples into Western Europe. Rome didn't handle them; it didn't resettle them, or whatever, They had boundaries to defend, so they resisted the barbarian invasions and got overwhelmed. It was all a matter of the wrong condition being applied. The Russians, who were in Emergency, didn't apply that condition either.

There is no such thing as a no-condition state. A state of emergency persists until it is handled. Even if one loses, one gets stuck in the incident and goes on. Even after something has gone down to collapse, it persists. The condition continues all the way down, even beyond death. "The dwindling spiral is really just applying the wrong formula for the condition."

AFFLUENCE

The condition of Affluence is one which is dangerous, surprisingly enough. For instance, a gambler who hits it big is in danger of getting himself in debt instantly. The first thing to do now is economize. You must economize first. Then make very sure that you don't buy anything with any future commitment to it [E.g. installment purchases]. Don't hire anybody with any future commitments. That is all part of that economizing. Clamp it down. Find every bill and debt you can pay and pay them. Now, invest the remainder in service facilities. Make it more possible to deliver. Discover

what caused the condition of Affluence, and strengthen it. Conduct research to discover what caused it. It is something you are doing, no doubt.

POWER AND POWER CHANGE

The condition above Affluence is power change. For instance, someone is very successful and gets a promotion. The correct formula is usually violated. The new man errs by changing things. The formula for Power Change is, just because power has changed, "Don't change anything." "A new broom sweeps clean," violates this formula. If the operation was successful as it was running, the new exec would be silly to change things. But that is what people usually do. It is easy to inherit successful hats. Just step in the boots and don't walk. All the pressure points will come to you to make changes. But the person before you must have resisted these successfully. If your predecessor didn't sign it, don't sign it. Don't do anything. Keep your eyes open. Learn the ropes. See how the place is running. Apply Normal Operation to it, if it is in Normal Op.

There are only two circumstances that need replacement: success or disaster. If it is successful, there is nothing to change. If someone can keep an organization doing well, he is eventually promoted creditably and moves up to a higher power position. He would be leaving his organization [or his post] in a condition of Power. If you move into the position of someone who left in disgrace, so the place is in Emergency, just apply the Emergency formula: promote, for starters. Keep the promotion going until stats start to rise. Then economize like mad.

A condition of Power is most interesting. It is peculiar, in that it apparently belies what you would normally think or expect to do as an operating thetan, because that is a condition of power. What you mustn't do is disconnect. That will bring about catastrophe, for you and for anyone else. "It's the violation of that condition alone that's brought about implanting, trapping and an antagonism towards thetans." A guy who becomes powerful on Wall Street and disconnects from his old home town friends exemplifies this. They resent it. People are, in fact, so used to the Power formula being violated that they don't expect celebrities that they used to know to talk to them. They think you are going to disconnect. It is hard to get people to continue talking to you, because they feel that you are superior. You have to break down the communication barrier. When you come back from Saint Hill, people may be in awe of you somewhat. Again, it is up to you to break down the comm barrier. People will be sure that you don't want to be in comm anymore. Beings in the universe fully expect you to violate the Power formula. If an organization gets to the point where it is fully self-sufficient, in no need of PCs, students, etc., and disconnects from those around it, people in the community will start thinking about implants, mistakes, and violating any freedom a thetan might have. They will get very suppressive. They are being denied service, for one thing. One of the most dangerous things we could do would be not to make what we know available.

When you move out of a position on a Power Change, the only way you can disconnect is to "take ownership and responsibility for your connections." The condition of Power Change is a fellow assuming a position that has been held from Power. To disconnect, you have to make a record of all of your lines. You show what is there, so that the replacement can then see what not to change. Make a record of your whole post, or you will be stuck with a piece of that post to the end of time. Also, you might check in once in awhile, to see how your replacement is doing. A guy gets a time track by not taking responsibility for something.

In this universe, it is a foul trick to permit death. People write a Last Will and Testament, but they don't take responsibility for their former positions by transferring their lines and writing up the post for their successors. [Probably also have trouble checking in from time to time!] Do all you can to make the post occupiable.

For fun, look at the condition of a government and the formula it is applying.

(Keynes' economic law is "Increase want.")

6506C08 SHSpec-63 Handling the PTS

LRH is working on the final plots of R6 GPM's. Some corrections have been needed. He has found three GPM's run out of the middle of the bank by mistake, which turned on bursitis. He has the first six GPM's of the track run out absolutely correctly.

Doubt and wonder about ethics is appearing in some places. All we are doing is developing systems to handle the public. Students and staff are colliding with ethics, which has the benefit of giving them familiarity with it. "If you don't have a system of law and order, you will never have law and order. You will just have cruelty, duress, suddenness, revenge," sudden acts of surprising retribution, etc. Without uniform justice, you would get chaos, especially with OT's in operation. Clausewitz said that war is a means of bringing about a more amenable frame of mind on the part of the enemy. In his ignorance of this principle, FDR kept World War II going after Germany and Japan were ready to surrender, by demanding unconditional surrender. This was a costly and stupid thing to do. If you fail to halt war when a more amenable frame of mind has been reached, you are a fool. War should not go beyond that point. This principle should be kept in mind by scientologists and orgs, when under attack. There are elements of the society that are at war with scientology, because they are stuck in past incidents of fighting enemies. You should take action against someone who is trying to keep you from doing your job, but how much action? Just enough to being about a more amenable frame of mind. All you want to enforce on the entheta artist in the environment is a certain degree of politeness. Don't get fixated on the entheta.

We want to bring service to the 80+% who are doing well and contentedly. Since fixating on the 20% who are snarling and fuming takes attention from the 80%, we should simply cut comm with the 20%. Once there is a set procedure for handling SP's, once the executive can enforce a little more politeness on his environment, the exec can then reach, because he has a method of doing so. Now there is something he can do about it.

You want the auditor and the executive in a frame of mind to service the 80%, not the 20%. Execs tend to wind up with the entheta comm, because they are supposed to handle it.

One tends to get fixated on the "maybe" cases -- the ones that aren't running perfectly smoothly. There are only two sources of difficulty with cases:

1. The auditing comm cycle.

2. PTS. You can make mistakes everywhere else and still get by. Of course, there is also the GAE as a source of difficulty. You can check out both: the auditor to review to have his comm cycle checked out and the PC to ethics to see if he is PTS. The D of P doesn't get a chance to talk in detail to the auditor and the PC. This can be done in Qual. You don't just let the poor comm cycle continue, hoping that it will get better. If the auditor is uncooperative, he goes to ethics, until he has a more amenable frame of mind.

In an exec cannot handle the isolated goofers, he will get savage towards everybody. If you cannot handle the criminal, you pass suppressive laws that penalize everybody. [Inspection before the fact.] Governments police everybody because of the goofs of a few. Most arbitrary rulings by any authority result from failures to handle the guy who goofed, with subsequent desperation and savagery. [Cf. earlier statement by LRH that an organization is only necessary when there is a failure to handle an individual.]

A PC who just won't run on average processing is PTS or an SP, inevitably and invariably. LRH found that we couldn't handle the PTS individual with auditing, especially with processing below the level of Power processing. PTS's are likely to come to you for help, so you had better know that they need ethics or power processing. Anything else will make the PTS individual rollercoaster, because someone is ARC breaking him faster than you can fix him up. When you say that "a person has been suppressed by the environment faster than you could process him out of it," what you mean is that there is an SP in the environment who wrecks his gains. The PTS PC often doesn't spot the SP.

You must get the PTS individual to ethics and find the SP. Suppressive persons commonly speak in total generalities. They broaden and generalize entheta, so their identity broadens and generalizes. People commonly can't spot the SP because of the generality around him. Check the PTS individual for who he is connected to that doesn't like scientology. Do this check on a meter, and watch it fall off the pin. Have the PT individual handle or disconnect. If you get the wrong person, the PC won't handle or disconnect. If you are right, he will. The PTS gives enough trouble, so that you may not care to help him forther. But when you do attempt to find the SP, you should hunt and punch around enough to get a good result. If you find the right person as the SP, the PC's face will light up, the TA will blow down, and the PC will then handle or disconnect with VGI's.

No TA = no case gain = PTS or SP. Trying to process a PTS will:

1. Raise his tone.

2. Thereby double the SP's attacks on him.

3. Therefore cave him in worse than he was to begin with. You can tell a PTS by looking for roller-coaster: periodic gains and collapse. No gain ever, or no TA (less than ten divs) = SP. That is all you need to look for. You've got to have ethics to handle this.

With this data, you can make releases, handle students' cases, Free Scientology Center cases, etc. You don't have to slam the door in anybody's face. The PTS gets told to handle or disconnect before he gets more auditing. The SP gets told that he has a very rough case, which can only be handled at St. Hill. "In a couple of years, we'll have auditors here who can handle you here," you could say. "In the meantime, stay away, because it's very restimulative to you." This is true, too!

It is an unkindness not to label someone suppressive, who actually is an SP. One way to handle someone who sends in entheta comm is simply to deadfile him. You have to bring about a more amenable frame of mind on his part before you audit him or comm with him. Don't let auditors go on flubbing. Send them to ethics, so that they realize the importance of applying the tech right.

Know also that we will have an impact on this society; that organizations will fold up under the onslaught of the technology, no matter how nice and theetie-weetie we are. We've got to hold the line and give service while we expand. We would like to have organizations smoothly reorganize.

To run power processing, we need all the back-up of the organizations: ethics, D of P, and full admin. There is no one nastier than someone who has been dished by power processes, by the way. It would be disaster to have someone trying to run power in the field. It isn't the D of P'ing or the auditing that is hard to do. It is the fact that it needs to become an assembly line, which requires a high degree of perfection of organization. Even on lower-level processes, it is best to have a team, to handle PTS's, SP's, and admin. Psychoanalysis had a certain degree of workability. It got across the idea that psychosomatic illness stems from the mind. The mind monitors and dominates structure. "If the mind is left alone, in a large number of cases, the endocrine treatment [as in the time when LRH psychoanalyzed half of a group of people who were taking male hormones and found that those he talked with responded better to the hormones than the others] will not monitor structure.... But when you remove a few psychic blocks, ... all of a sudden ... it bites, and monitors structure.... You could change ... diet, exercise, ... operating environment ... -- anything," and it would make no difference. LRH just used Freudian analysis on that project: "what we would call, today, 'straightwire'." But as a subject, psychoanalysis has failed, because the individual practitioner had no way to ride herd on or handle the PTS's and SP's in his practice. Furthermore, he had no free time or attention to do research. He might have discovered power processing if he had. The subject never grew, because it never developed an organization that would carry forward the research.

Our danger is only that, as we move forward, the technology will get shattered by alter-is. That must be guarded against. Then the technology must be applied. Now it collides with society, psychiatry, doctors, etc." You say, "All I want to do is go free.' OK. You go into a condition of power. Now the most serious thing you can do is to disconnect. It's the quickest way to bring about a collapse. You have been woven into the race and the universe too long to just suddenly pack it up. You pack it up; it'll pack you up."

We have a double route [to enlightenment]: by study and by processing. We haven't begun to explore what can be done by study alone. One area you can't go through with study and thought alone is the R6 bank. Mere study won't help a person, beyond release. He'd finish up at Level V [Grade V]. There is a tiger between release and clear. You aren't going to go through the H6 bank by just changing your mind. That has to be gotten rid of utterly. Release might or might not occur just from the cognitions you would get from increased understanding.

The Gradation Chart actually goes as many as seventy levels below -34. The interpretation of the scale is tricky, because it is what the person is aware of, not what he manifests. That a person is always "numb" does not place him at -10 on the scale [Numbness]. What is important is, "Is this person aware of the fact that he is always numb?" If a guy could only be aware of false causes, without knowing that they were false, then he would be at "false cause" on the scale. If he knew that a false

cause was false, he would be above that level, as when he is willing to accept your statement that babies come from under cabbage leaves, because it is a false cause. Let's say the guy says, "Hey: What do you know: I just realized that I'm always after changes!" Well, there he is, at -4 [Need of Change]. You might say that the PC's level on the Awareness Scale is his "cognition level". The guy who never cogs is just not being trained or processed at the level where he could cognite. He is over his head. Cogs come on a gradient, too.

Power processing takes anyone, no matter where he is, and "yanks them up with a thud to [Level] IV. "The PC recovers a terrific ability to know, to be aware, without necessarily attaining any more [knowledge] than [he] knew before." Probably, this will just be redoubled at clear and OT. Here, also, he can create things, which he couldn't do before. He will not know more about how to do that by having been [a clear or an OT], but his present level of beingness is such that his ability to grasp and act upon the potential [of a situation], to assimilate and accomplish at that particular line [whatever line he is in] is just lightning-fast. He only knows what he knew before as well as he knew it before. No matter how clear you clear him, he only knows what he knew before. You don't increase his knowledge. You increase his awareness of his present [environment].

An individual will never make it without being trained in something." The first thing he's going to be aware of, as he moves out of a comatose Wog state into a higher level of action, ... is scientology.... It's the first thing there to be aware of, ... to study, and [it] leads to a higher ability level." The cruelest thing you could do to somebody would be to audit him all the way to clear with no auditor training. "He has this terrific potential to know, and you haven't made it possible for him to assimilate the technology which has brought him to this state." It puts him in a dreadful confusion. He has no understanding. He wonders, "How did I get here? Where's "here'?" It would be better to audit him up to release, then train him up as far as he's been audited (Level IV), then give him tools to go on up to clear, then give him an organization to use those benefits in. He needs to know how others function. Let him know. Then you have given him a familiarity with the existence around him. He has increased his span of knowledge of what is in scientology. He has increased his organizational scope. He has come up to an understanding of the usefulness of the various tools of scientology, and he has also found out that these new states are moving up into a type of civilization that can also exist. This will raise his responsibility.

With all this, you are not going to have a lot of catastrophe. You are going to have happy people. This is taking a totality of responsibility. You must take responsibility for powerful knowledge. Look what happened to the atom bomb. The nut who invented that took no responsibility for it. We have a powerful technology. for the first time, we have a total grip on knowledge of the universe and can bring people up with an express elevator. We take as much responsibility as possible. You have to take responsibility for knowledge to the degree that it is powerful. We had better measure up to our power, in all ways.

6506C29 SHSpec-64 The Well-Rounded Auditor

MSH audited LRH to first-stage release on 24Feb63. They went ahead. He went keyed-out OT. Then he did more research and plowed himself into the R6 bank. Then he developed power processes. Power processes were totally predicted, not empirical. "There they should be, ... and there they were." LRH ran the power processes solo. When he got to the end, all that was there was beginning of track and the R6 bank. He backed off and looked for processes that would enable someone to have an ability back. He got third stage release (Va). [See HCOB 28Jun65 "Releases, Different Kinds", HCOB 12Jul65 "States of Being Attained by Processing", HCOB 5Aug65 "Release Stages", and pp. 733-738, below.] You can run it too far: into the bank, i.e. into R6EW. But now you are at the correct end of

A third stage release can go into and out of the R6 bank at will. He is also able to have selective abilities. [This probably made Class VI easier.]

We are getting an interesting reaction from orgs: "Why are you sending us a Class VII [Note: At this point, a Class VII is a power auditor.]? We're releasing all the people we want on 0, I, and II." The differences between the stages of release are basically differences of stability. The fellow has been gotten to a state where he can postulate, when he is released. At Level IV, a person can remain a keyed-out clear until he makes a postulate wrong-way-to and keys himself in again, and the R6 bank

541

kicks him in the teeth. A power release is more stable. We still don't get a keyed-out OT at will, although it does occur sometimes, during power processing.

It is easy to overrun a first stage release. We have cleared many people, by the Book One definition of "clear", and then overrun them, because the auditor didn't recognize a floating needle. After that, the PC could get very ARC breaky. All that could be done with a PC like this is to run him on power and bring him to a higher degree of stability. Power can also be overrun. If you overrun power and then audit someone on ordinary processes within power processing, you would really be in trouble, because where is only one thing there to hack at, and that's the H6 bank. You could audit some selective abilities with power plus -- run him up to third stage release, playing tag with the R6 bank -- then go on to audit R6.

It is highly unlikely that a person will make clear, unless he has been released on power. The route through the bank is too hard, when it lies across an engram that will revivify. You are sitting in an engram, trying to run R6, and it won't as-is properly. That is the trouble with it.

It is interesting to watch raw meat on power. They don't know about the R6 bank. They feel wonderful and full of awe, because they don't know what the Hell happened or what is going on, after being run on power processes.

Technical advances are out of this world, administratively. R6 and power look very simple and elementary. The trick in instructing Class VII [Note: Class VII is now power auditing] is to get the simplicity of the processes and procedures duplicated, when the students are used to complexity. Confusion has to blow off. You run power processes muzzled.

The study materials have more to them than would at first appear to be the case. The evaluation of importances is one area. For instance a darkroom worker who works for LRH on weekends knows lots of tricks, but he doesn't know fundamental importances. LRH spotted the similarity to new auditors who aren't fully trained in fundamentals. They want tricks and short-cuts, all of which are interesting, but unimportant. It isn't the tricks that get anyone anywhere. That is what psychiatry and psychology do. They collect tricks like stamp collectors, but they have no effective standard basic tech. "I have never heard one of them utter one essential piece of information that would have led to the resolution of a case. Fantastic hors d'oeuvres; no main course." So the study phenomenon is "There's the fellow who knows it and can do it, and the there's the fellow who knows all the tricks and can't do it." It is out evaluation of importances. You can take a basically sound piece of data, e.g., that a PC who never looks at the auditor or who slews around to sit sideways in the chair is ARC broken, and twist it to something like, "Never acknowledge a PC until he looks at you." If you did this on power, the PC would go "round the bend. He'd go on automatic.

There is mainline information, and then there are tidbits. An auditor in training should differentiate between:

1. Mainline data, which is very senior.

2. Data you should know to apply the senior data.

3. "Parsley" data: data that, if you use it, it will make you look very clever. Nice data, but of no great value.

When someone like LRH shifts a senior datum, people go adrift. For instance "Audit the PC in front of you," was senior, before grades and organization. An org auditor doesn't audit the PC in front of him at all. The auditor now audits the process. If he sees BI's or runs into trouble, he sends the PC to review. There is a policy letter now, with all the things on it that could be wrong with the PC [HCOPL 7Apr70RA "Green Form"]. It is asking too much to expect the auditor to pick up the right one in session, with no form, out of 44 possibilities, especially when the PC may have overts on that auditor. The PC should be repaired by some other auditor. The auditor may be part of what is wrong. Hence the PC needs another auditor.

Review auditors must be experts in assessment. They pick up any read and straighten out whatever needs to be fixed. Whatever the problem is, it is not standard tech that is the problem. The review auditor is in a different division [Qual]. The D of P [apparently covers also the CS post at this time] is forbidden ever to interview a PC or talk to an auditor about a PC. Only what can be statisticized is the

concern of the D of P: total TA, process run, hours in session, etc. If the auditor is trying to talk to the D of P about cases, he gets a job endangerment chit. If a PC doesn't gain in processing, there are reasons why. But knowing little tricks won't tell you what they are. You can't put beings together again with a cute little trick.

The auditor's job is to audit standard processes on the PC, with a standard comm cycle, on a standard gradation program. The D of P does standard D of P'ing. He goes over the session and checks TA for the session. He picks up the next folder. The PC's goal is "Not to have too much trouble in this session." The total TA was 27 divs for a 2 1/2 hour session. The PC is not in trouble -- continue the process. Next folder: no goals or gains. PC restive; didn't want to run any processes. How many hours were wasted here? All morning and all afternoon. The PC was ARC broken through it all. Auditor to ethics and PC to review.

Handled in this way, cases keep winning. If the PC rollercoasters, he goes to review, then to the examiner, then to ethics. If the PC can't spot the SP, ethics just keeps working it over. There is someone who uses generalities that keep the PC from spotting him. If you get the right one, the PTS's face lights like a Christmas tree. If you get the wrong one, it won't, and it is like indicating the wrong BPC. The condition doesn't change. That is the only time ethics lays an egg. When the PTS situation is handled, the PC goes back to the HGC, and the auditor takes up from where he left off. "Ethical standard matches case level." Ethics has as a purpose making people better, not punishing people.

Suppose the Org Exec Sec sees declining stats in the HGC -- processing is not as successful as before. Now is the time to look at all the review chits. He finds that auditing cycles are out on several auditors. He tells the D of P. The D of P sends these auditors for special training and gets their comm cycle in. Lower classed auditors have lower ethical standards.

To be an excellent review auditor, you must be a crackerjack assesser, be able to make the E-meter sit up and sing, know the processes called for on the Green Form, be able to audit routine auditing on the grades, be able to CS any folder, know when to send a PC to review and when to review auditors, know when a process is flat, know what GI's and BI's can be read from a folder, know what process should be run next, know what is good TA and poor TA, and be a cryptographer, so you don't get misunderstoods. You should know which auditor to assign to which PC. Your auditors are not all releases, and you know that there are quirks that make auditor A audit poorly with certain PCs. If you drop out one of those skills, you are that much less a complete auditor.

There is no review for power processing, so power processing is done in review, with two Class VII's, CS'ing each other.

An auditor in training is not being trained as a one-man-band. He gets tired and quits auditing, if he tries. But he should be able to do the above actions, so that he understands what is happening when he audits.

You only change the standard pattern of the session when the PC gets non-standard. The PC goes to review when he is a flat ball-bearing. The auditor should know how to do a Green Form, not because he is going to do one in standard session, but because, as the org grows, more review auditors will be needed.

The effects of out-tech are slower to appear in the HGC (maybe six months) than in the academy (a few days).

People are always fighting to own this planet. That's silly! Why don't they just go ahead and own it, as we are doing?

6507C27 SHSpec-65 Stages of Release

One of the interesting things about releases is that we have been making them for years and auditors have been going on by them, running more processes. There were probably releases being made in 1951. From 1957 on, when LRH made lots of keyed-out clears at an ACC (The 19th American ACC (6Jan-14Feb58): Tech Bulletins Vol. III, p. 204], auditors should have observed what was happening. The longer they cleaned cleans, the more upset the PC became. In exoneration, they didn't realize that it is not OK to run a process beyond a floating needle. This goes from ground zero to clear. "Our

main problem ... is overrun." If someone got an F/N on Self-Analysis, it would be a goof to run more recall-type processes.

The first level of the case is recognition of the environment. So if you asked a person to look around and spot where he was, and the needle floated, you can't run any CCH's. Or if you got an F/N on the first objective process, the rest of them are null and void. If you go on, you are cleaning a clean. [This is the groundwork for Quickie Grades.]

Even on power, if the needle floats, even if the expected EP isn't there, you end off. Fortunately, you can run the rest of the power processes. But when one process goes free, that's it for that process.

"Our main problem ... is overrun." This has happened many times to LRH. LRH says he was overrun so much that he "must have been running other people's banks." R6 is the exception to ending off when you get an F/N, because all other processes deal with key-out of the R6 bank, whereas R6 is total erasure. This doesn't apply to GPM's. When you get an F/N, you can't contact them, and you are in trouble. "R6 is the only process which is dealing with a total erasure. All other[s deal] with locks on R6. [The levels ultimately begin] with the reactive bank. There's just the guy [and] the possibility that he could get aberrated.... On top of that, the R6 bank is built, and then on top of [that] is built a tremendous accumulation that we know as "end words', ... and on top of those is erected a whole series of whole track incidents and other types of GPM's, known as "implants'." [See Fig. 28] The latter prevented permanent releases, by restimulating the original bank (the R6 bank). Engrams are among and on top of implant GPMs. Secondaries are on top of those, with locks on the top. Engrams are restimulations of end-words. End-words are restimulations of the R6 bank. The whole trick in running R6EW is to get only end-words, not to pick up R6 material itself. Surrounding the lot is the physical universe, which could also be considered a sort of bank.

What you are doing with a PC is carving away at this stack of stuff. It contains significances and masses, spaces and energies. It is also plotted against time. But that is all there is in it. The machinery and circuits in it are just combinations of energies and significances, and, as such, they are just a special case of the above. This combination of energies and significances comprises a mass that sits there in its own made-up space, plotted against the PC's experiential track, known as time. There is nothing else in the bank, although the bank says there is.

Freud and psychoanalysis were popular because they had more R6 in their technologies than other systems. They had some written end-words, on which they were basing everything. By "transference", Freud meant that the PC flipped into another valence. The Freudians recognized recovery in terms of "release of affect", by which they meant an emotional discharge, especially grief. They didn't recognize other emotions besides grief. Nor did they recognize underlying engrams. "All anyone has ever been trying to do when he was sincerely trying to help somebody with his mind, was reduce the effect of this thing called 'the reactive mind' [or the 'subconscious mind' or the 'unconscious mind'] upon the individual himself." There are many such psychotherapies on the whole track. If anyone discovered scientology by himself, he probably freed himself and took off. There is no trace of such an occurrence in the bank, however. There are many instances on the track where people attacked the GPM's of the R6 bank, chewed an item or two out, or crushed one, or some such. They would take a picture of the area where someone had been and hit a big clapstick in front of the photograph, to make it look like it exploded. They did this when the thetan was anaten or comatose. The thetan would get the idea and take his own picture of his misemotional or painful experience, and smack it with a couple of beams and snap out of it. That is what psychotherapy was in the Galactic Confederacy.

There were also suppressive technologies, which are easily mistaken for helpful technologies. Implanters developed techniques to have effects on people. There are many technologies calculated to have an effect on people. When a suppressive studies scientology, he does so from the viewpoint of trying to have an effect on someone. The SP evaluates his action as an auditor by how much effect it had on the PC, not by whether it made the PC better. The whole subject of alchemy was devoted to throwing the whole R6 level into restimulation -- throwing the guy into his R6 bank and letting the guy cook, thereafter. The alchemists had no other goal. Their books, writings and practices make it obvious. It was the lead of human beings that they wanted to transmute into the gold of spirit. Transmutation of metals had nothing to do with alchemy. It was transmutation of life that they were talking about.

Their books are full of R6 dichotomies. If you get one of the guys who has been into alchemy on power, and all that comes off is dichotomies. He has been plowed into R6 since time immemorial. You will have to find the practice that got him into it and fish him out. Hypnotism is another practice that is only intended to make people more compliant, not to better them. "You have to wake people up to make them better, not put them to sleep." You don't want suggestibility. You want self-determinism. Some states, on the whole track, had a thought tower to pick up hostile thoughts and record them, so that the person indulging in "crimethink" would be turned in for brainwashing. This is a swindle. There never was such a thing. A person was implanted with that idea and placed under a compulsion to report to the police if he had a bad thought. There was another idea, on the whole track, for controlling thetans. You would take a "piece of a thetan" and keep it in a lab. If the thetan escaped, they would touch the piece of a thetan with hot rods. This was also a swindle.

The rule still holds, that processing a PC who is determined to succumb won't work, because there isn't enough agreement in the session. That is why you have an argument with hypnotists: your purpose is different from theirs. The common denominator of suppressive technologies is lies. The common denominator of good technology is truth. "The whole test of sincerity is, 'Is the fellow doing what he says he's doing? Or is he doing something else?' These two questions have to be answered about any government, movement, or individual: 'Is there a falsity on the line?'" All these downgrade subjects have a falsity on the line. They say they are trying to make people well, but their statistics show what is really occurring.

People "assume that the psychiatrist is there to help the person ... and he isn't. [It's an apparency. As mentioned above, the question is,] 'With psychiatry in charge, is the world saner?' No. Their stats are ... not just down. [They are] runaway down.... Since psychiatry has entered the field of criminology, ... crime ... is fabulously on the increase.... There's a falsity on the line. What you understand he's doing is not what he's doing." Psychiatric research is done by deep-sixing every scrap of data that doesn't agree with the theory being pushed. If you tried that in engineering, bridges and buildings would collapse. But if some "scientist, is telling you, "Oh. Well, you have to be very learned to know about this," you may swallow it, if you are not careful. This is also true in the field of art.

As an auditor, you know that when the PC finds and articulates the problem, it blows. Saying that it is something else won't do it. So you see that the basic crime in this universe isn't making or destroying things. It is altering truth. "Any subject has a few alter-ises in it. Otherwise it would just disappear." But how many alter-ises does it have? That is the question. If it has many, it will harm, instead of helping people. It will prove to be striving to create effects on people. Subjects with a lot of alter-is are harmful, and subjects with relatively little alter-is are helpful. Evil practices are identified by the falsity that is connected with them.

"The worse off a PC is, the more he thinks he's got in his mind." He gets on an additive line. "He collects and accumulates therapies ... like a pack rat." The medical student who "gets" every disease he reads about is "on an additive line, and in the direction of 'additive', ... we actually approach evil. On the direction of subtraction, we approach good." Therefore scientology is based on truth. "The isness, not the alter-isness, is what we care about." It is "What is in the mind?", not, "Why is it in the mind?"

"Cleaning a clean brings about the manifestations of evil, [because, since] there's not anything there to be cleaned," the PC has to put something there. You are therefore adding. It is adding, because there is nothing, there to be cleaned. Therefore, the PC and the auditor have to put something there, before anything will happen. There are only five or six kinds of things in the mind. When you are out of one of them, you have to put something there to run it out. There is a reactive mind, with certain elements. When you have disconnected the PC from that class of element, he has ceased to be an effect of it, and you can regard it as gone. The R6 GPM's won't disappear by someone changing his mind or postulates, because the R6 bank is a tangle of boobytrapped postulates. There wouldn't be anything else in the mind if the R6 bank weren't there. There would be no thing or isness.

A PC gets a full, "no blanks" time track, with solid locks, because it all relates somehow to some secondary or engram somewhere on the track. You start with the R6 bank. Then, on top of it, you get a wogginess and wooziness on the subject of postulates. He accumulates R6EW locks. Then his own goals, as locks, get stacked up on this. And implants are overlaid on top of this. Then you get whole track engrams, then secondaries, then locks. Eventually, with time, when the thetan finally became human, everything was a lock on something earlier in the bank, and he made a picture of it. "Yesterday runs like an engram." "He couldn't look at anything in the universe, right now, without it

hanging up on some experience he's had that he didn't like.... There's the bank." So the thetan gets a full time track.

The thetan is also surrounded by the physical universe, which gives him problems. Additionally, there are other people's universes, which are different, experientially. This can also give him a PTP that doesn't have anything to do with a mental image picture ... or reactive bank, but it can restimulate the reactive bank and [thus] be harder to solve." A PTP can exist as such, independent of the bank. If you get your hand caught in a clothes wringer, it is a PTP. It doesn't necessarily have anything to do with the bank. The fact that a thetan's attention is stuck on a PTP keeps him from putting his attention on anything else, so he makes no gain. You can usually handle the problem on the basis that it is a problem because he doesn't think he can handle it. He has entered a lie into it, so he doesn't try to do anything about it, so it continues to be a problem. The lie in a problem is:

1. That it exists and is a problem.   or 2. That one can do nothing about it to handle it.

If the auditor could get the PC to confront the problem, to take it apart and get its elements and take the lies out of the problem, the PC could probably confront it, and it would cease to be a problem. However, the problem isn't necessarily entirely in the PC's mind every time.

An ARC break is a situation where the PC feels under some sort of attack from an unknown source. In its inception, an ARC break is actually an incomplete cycle of action. In all likelihood, there is some big lie entered into it. But the main upset is that the PC couldn't complete what he was doing. A PC isn't auditable when he is in an ARC break, because he can't put his attention on anything else.

It is presence of time that makes a PTP.

As human beings, all of us have, to some degree, an under-the-gun existence. "The amount of duress that a person is under is proportionate to the degree that he thinks it threatens his survival." You can tolerate quite a bit of it, unless you are on the skids already. When the PC is upset, the auditor can't get away with making mistakes. When the PC is feeling good, he can get away with some.

If you have managed to get the PC disconnected from his ARC breaks, PTP's, etc. and then go on auditing him on them, you are invalidating his ability to confront. You are giving him the idea that he ought to be bothered by them. When you see the F/N, don't give two more commands. Don't get him to itsa some more. Send him to the examiner. Let the PC have his win. One more command and you are cleaning a clean. He is out of that out-rud. The connectors to the bank are gone in that area. In trying to find an overrun after the fact, "you're looking in the 'gone-ness' for the 'what went-ness' ... and you're looking through a mass of, 'It wasn't there anyway-ness', afterwards."

A release isn't just disconnected from the bank. He has erased a stratum of it.

In rehabbing, you are getting rid of additives.

Third stage release [Grade Va] leads the PC through the physical environment contact with the bank and ends up cutting off the R6EW top. Just going off the top of those floating end-words, you can get the PC off of what pins him into those end-words. You can just separate that. Each of the Grade V and Va processes is run to F/N. There are four processes on Va, one having to do with people, one with where the PC has been, etc. Power processing is very close to the truth. Therefore it must be run very standardly.

After running Va, there is nothing between the PC and the [R6] bank itself. Now, of course, he can dive off the shade of this, and he has no protective coating between him and the R6 bank. It stands there, naked and raw. He's got the R6EW spans that are lying in and amongst the GPM's, etc. He can run those like a shot. R6EW can run to F/N. There is actually a Fourth Stage Release on R6EW. Running GPM's, one can go to F/N, thus getting a "Fifth Stage Release" by running GPM's. But these aren't important. The state of clear is what is important. You don't want to go free of the body and leave some of the bank around to key in later.

In rehabbing, you get the liability that you may find yourself working on the next stage up, and the rehab process is not calculated to handle the next stage.

6509C09 SHSpec-66 Classification and Gradation

We have twenty people going for clear. We are really getting an assembly line going. The world is going downhill, but we are reversing the curve. All the laws passed to hit Mr. Big end up hitting the worker. The effect of the [East Grinstead City] Council's refusal to permit building as soon as needed is to make the staff work harder, in very little space. The Maharaja of Jaipur, who used to own St. Hill, wanted to build forty cottages and a polo field. The city planners denied him permission, so he sold St. Hill to LRH. Furthermore, the council never meets. They didn't meet all August, during the best building weather.

Technical advances now consist of improvements in application of the existing technology. A technology that cannot be applied is not useful. Some things aren't even meant to be applied e.g. pure mathematics. LRH, while he was in college, suggested applying an abstruse form of mathematics to aerial navigation. He was told that he would be flunked out of college if he continued. This mathematical principle was later developed, by the Navy, into Loran. We have had more technology than we have had application. There was a bug in the application, which was not teaching auditors to recognize F/N's. So the only thing holding up scientology has been the failure on the part of auditors, to know or recognize the floating needle. The trouble that we had with R2-12 was that it is too fast. You have to be on your toes, because your PC will go release, perhaps before you have finished the first list. Overrun on K-2-12 can be terrible. Unfortunately, it was done regularly. We overran our success point by many years, on this process.

The main trouble you have today isn't getting a result. It is recognizing that you have gotten it. Saint Hill students have had trouble getting classified for Levels III and IV, because of the problem of auditing someone up to Grades 3 and 4. People went release before they got to the processes required for those classification levels.

Tech exists. Now we need to get it applied. We have enough tech. On a world basis, we need the technology of dissemination supplied. This tech is in the FSM appointment letter, if you can see it, and it is also released elsewhere.

We are used to being improved or fixed by being passive and letting things be done to us. But the individual is what we are interested in as a final product. It is interesting how long it can sometimes take for the individual to find himself. Somewhere around Fourth Stage Release [R6EW E.P.], the individual finds himself with an answer to the question, "Who am I?" -- namely, "I'm me," not as an intellectual knowledge, but as a total connection with self, all the way back. What has disappeared is all the times when the individual has been various identities. The gains he gets can seem microscopic, yet full of impact, as he goes up the line. These gains can get incredibly simple. As things blow and stops get as-ised, the individual feels that he could always have done whatever ability he has just attained. He could have, but he didn't! So any commentary about the ability of a thetan has to come off as an invalidation by understatement. Any assertion of ability is thus an invalidation. "You could make the wildest statement you could possibly dream up and then assert that as your own ability. [Eventually] you'd have to get it off your case as invalidation of self."

Recovery from illness could be related to dissemination. You might have a pain in the head and not know it until you become aware of it, and it blows, so that you feel much better. What the PC assigns as a gain is generally a great understatement of the real gain.

The Route: The Bridge. When you first say to someone, "We will make you better," they immediately ask, "Better what? A better bank robber? Or is my lumbosis going to be better?" The difficulty is in trying to communicate what we are trying to do in scientology to someone who has no inkling that that sort of thing can happen. Telling someone who thinks that he is a body that he is himself is very hard. People tell each other that Man is an animal, and when he dies, he is gone -- dead. This happens, even though they don't believe it of themselves.

Man has only believed that he is an animal for the past 75-90 years. Psychology has changed since DMSMH was published. It used to say that Man's intelligence and condition couldn't be changed. It is therefore difficult to tell someone on the street that he can get better. You have to show him. You can use a graph [The Classification and Gradation Chart], showing that there are these various states, so he sees that there is a place to go. He can get a reality on the level just above where he is. By visualizing the graph, he will see which way to go. However, it is unlikely that he will have any reality on the levels beyond the next level up. Life is improved on a gradient, not by leaps into OT

from DB. If you buy the idea that you could become OT by inspection, etc., then you are also buying the idea that you don't have anything to do with life. Because it is you and your awareness that is improving not the attendant and appendant machinery with which you are surrounded. We are handling life.

You must give an individual a gradient that is real to him. For instance, to a sick man, not hurting is real. After you have handled this, then you could get him to consider sitting up. If you ignore the gradient, you can advance a person more rapidly than he can tolerate. When you promise a person that he will made too big a jump in too little time, you set him up to get a big lose. People on this planet were not issued an instruction book on themselves. How do you learn about yourself? You learn by studying one lesson at a time, by getting one improvement at a time. You can advance a person beyond his tolerance rate, in processing.

The bridge we have is across an actual chasm. The way across is by the bridge, not off the edge. The Gradation and Classification plan is designed to prevent people from going into the abyss. The grade chart prevents loses by providing a gradient. Ethics is the traffic cop. The chart has an elastic bottom. Some people start from zero; some people start from lower states. Level -34 is Unexistence. There are states "way below Unexistence on the awareness scale, but someone in one of these states won't be able to read the chart.

As a person at a given level on the awareness chart improves, he is likely to become aware of the next level. But he can't skip levels. His position on the awareness chart is not a question of his behavior or what he is dramatizing. It is what he as a being is aware of. "A person ... at Unexistence, when he improves, becomes aware of disconnection [Level -33]. Misconnection would be an improvement over no existence at all. He gets the idea that he's disconnected from things. He becomes aware of -- alert to -- the fact that in life, he is actually disconnected." A person at Fixidity [Level -27] won't find power real, but he will become aware of ridicule or Glee [Level -26]. Laugh at him, and he'll notice. The Awareness Scale doesn't show what the guy is dramatizing. It is not his behavior that counts. It is what he, himself, as a being, is aware of. It is what he's aware of, not what you are aware of about him. If the person is aware that he is Introverted [Level -11], he can then and only then become aware of the fact that he is numb [Numbness = Level -10]. At this level, the individual gets no reaction from life.

Need of Change [Level -4] is a very high state. "Most homo sapiens wonder how they can endure the thing they can't change." The one thing scientology does do for sure is to change conditions. So someone has to be up to Level -4 before he can become a scientologist. A person who has to be helped may not be aware of help or the possibility of it. Someone who only wants to receive help and doesn't want to give it, isn't really up to the Help level [Level -11. Being aware of help is a six-flow operation. A person who is unwilling to help others is not up to Help on the Awareness Chart. Someone moving up the chart through the levels does achieve the awareness at each level.

Above that, the person has recognition. He sees where he is. His orientation becomes better. He begins to recognize himself and others for what they are. He gets up to where he can communicate, then perceive, then get oriented. You can't find out where you are unless you can perceive where you are. Then comes understanding, then enlightenment. "Enlightenment never takes place before understanding." People think it can and modern universities are dedicated to it. Above that, a guy "gets a return of his energy, ... an adjustment. He becomes aware of the fact of a body, and that he is not a body. He [gets to where he can] predict. He goes into action. He [sees himself as] capable of production. He knows a result when he sees one. He can review the things of his life and take care of it. He regains his ability. His own purposes start coming out straight. (He didn't ever realize he was really running on other people's purposes.) He gets a clearing of his entire past and other purposes and a realization of himself. And then he goes into a state where he is capable of power [comprising Conditions, Existence, and Source -- the top of the Scale of Awareness]. But by the time he gets into that state, he is, of course, totally responsible and can be trusted with it. Otherwise, he won't make it."

The grades approximate these steps. The Gradation Chart parallels and makes possible the attainment of these awareness levels. There are four states of release up to Grade 6. Then you get clear. This is another state of release. An OT is capable of operating, with or without a body. He is himself; he is independent of the universe around him. The only thing that stands in the way of just getting a person to become of each level, one after another, is the machines and odds and ends that he has around him

and that have to be dealt with. It is hard for a person to get close to himself [and confront these things]. You have to know the secret of dealing with these things.

The actual length of time that it took to find and develop the bridge is more than fifteen or thirty years. It would be hard for most people to believe how long it has taken. But, anyhow, it has been done.

6509C21 SHSpec-67 Out Tech

[References: HCOB 13Sep65 "Out Tech and How to Get It In" and HCOB 21Sep65 "Out Tech".]

Teachers tend to say that everything is important. We are in a good position to select out the important data from all the data that we have. Someone at the HAS level can't do this. To him, every datum looks as important as every other datum. The guy at the bottom of the ladder is drowning in a sea of data that is unevaluated. This is true both in life and in scientology. The person is already overwhelmed with the confusions of life, which also overwhelm him with data. So he goes on a retreat from the whole thing. The hardest thing a thetan has to do, and "the most important thing that a thetan can recover is his ability to evaluate importances: [to know] what's important and what isn't."

The value of administration of processing is a different thing from what is processed. The duplicative question, which is basic to auditing, is "the examination of the mind for the apparent answer to the question; the knocking out, then, of this, that, and the other thing, until the individual can take a look at it and see before him some data that is important." The repetitive process itself is therapeutic. Repetitive processes "permit the individual to examine his mind and environment and, out of it, [to] select the unimportances and importances." The duplicative question is unique to scientology. Other things work because of this duplicative action. Moreover, to find out what is important and unimportant, the person has to find out what is and what isn't. He would get a great clarification of things, because he is being presented with certain vistas of existence and conditions of existence, and he is examining them, and he is taking them in, or he is knocking them out. He is handling existence and reorienting himself.

Someone can get things clarified by getting more data about life from study. However, as he does this, he is straightening up his own mind, and his real gain, when the chips are all the way down, largely depends on the auditor. Someone who is drowning in the sea of life gets a repetitive command from an auditor and as-ises various confusions. The PC's statements on the question are handled and as-ised. Those statements are then acknowledged by the auditor, making a full cycle of the situation. Only then can the PC get up to a point where he himself might, all by himself, confront his own mind. Only when he's got his mind straightened out can he really benefit from new data. He's got his own mind and life so mixed up that he has completely forgotten what a mind is all about, and in a large majority of cases, people aren't even aware that they have minds. At best, they think that they are minds, and perhaps that they have souls. Saving oneself seems too egoistical, so one saves one's soul.

Man is at effect. He looks for the one-shot clear, or "enlightenment"." It's not that scientology is slow. It's that Man has gone so far down. "But the big gains aren't so much at the top. They are at the bottom -- getting started. These gains are startling. Just getting the idea that there is a road out can be a big win. The individual has had a lot of loses on this line. To him, scientology is like a straw in the ocean. Helped by an auditor, the person can look at himself and life and make more gains. It is a lone ladder, contrary to the general idea and desire for a fast way to the top. The person makes his first real gains on coming to realize that there is a road out.

So there is a dependency on:

1. The disseminator.

2. The intro lecturer.

3. The course supervisor.

They all perform vital functions, and they can produce more dramatic results than you would ever expect, being used to auditing as the way to get changes. The changes on the chart are made in

session, but the biggest mistake you could make would be not teaching scientology and not disseminating.

People in society are very confused and distracted. One of the soundest ways to reach them is to talk about communication and telling them that scientology exists and, as their friend, is interested in helping them. You tell a person that if he could communicate to his environment better, he could handle it better. You tell him that if he were to talk to his wife, it would come out better. The only dicey thing there, is that he has been punished, perhaps, for communicating, so it might be difficult along the way.

Dissemination and teaching lines can be a bit wobbly, but if the individual makes some gains, he will still do OK. But auditing lines can't afford to be wobbly. When the person gets to auditing, that is where there is no room for shakiness or flubbiness. Now, tech is tech. The comm cycle has to be good. The questions have to be understood by and acceptable to the PC. They must also be answered [and acknowledged]. Up to the point of getting the person in session, it is debatable exactly what the correct technical action (in disseminating to him) is, because you are disseminating into such a confusion: life as it exists. It is still debatable what it is best to lecture to people about. A common denominator is that lecturing about communication is a good idea. But auditing isn't debatable. It works with precision, if it is applied with precision. There must be no GAE's in auditing. There is leeway in dissemination but not in auditing, which must be standard. All troubles in auditing stem from auditor goofs. So don't butter up a nattery PC. Pull his withholds.

The ability to observe and tell whether what is being done is right or wrong is harder to do in auditing than in disseminating or in course supervising. The auditor can make tiny mistakes that upset the PC, so that the PC acts up. The casual observer would say that it is a difficult PC, when in fact it was auditor goofs. You have to be a good auditor to observe good and bad auditing. You will get some gain (30% to 40%, of potential) even out of bad auditing just by duplicative questions and by the fact that someone is interested in the PC. However, full gain only comes from precise right auditing.

What we mean by "out tech" is "not getting the whole, 100% gains available on every PC," not just obvious goofs. Out tech is what is happening when the fine points of auditing are missing and when what really goes wrong with cases is not understood. When there is out tech, the auditor is, to be sure, sitting there giving the auditing command, but he is making lots of goofs with it.

What does it take to make a good auditor? First, we have the GAE's [See HCOB 21Sep65 "Out Tech"]. There are only five GAE's:

1. Can't handle and read the E-meter. He doesn't see reads. He overcompensates when bringing the TA back to Set, giving falsely large amounts of TA action.

2. Doesn't know and can't apply technical data. This used to be "Can't read and apply an HCOB." This also includes non-duplication of CS's and not knowing that you haven't done what you were supposed to have done.

3. Can't get or keep a PC in session. This is very often the case. The PC's attention is on something other than the auditing. You have to be able to see when the PC is not in session, distracted, etc. There is a little body of technology in this area. You have to get the PC's attention by finding out what it is on and as-ising it. Note and find the ARC break, PTP, or missed withhold, and handle it. The auditor who would try to audit a PC whose attention is elsewhere is applying tech to nobody. The most obvious and silly version of this mistake is where no one got the PC an auditor, despite the PC wanting and having paid for auditing. Or the auditor is so wedded to form that when the PC comes in already in session, the auditor carefully takes the PC out of session, in order to start the session!

4. Can't complete an auditing cycle. This accounts for the PC who itsas obsessively. This PC has been prematurely acknowledged in life or in auditing, and this has happened so much that he feels as though he has never been acknowledged. E.g. a kid says, "Mommy, I just had a great idea ... ," whereupon Mommy says, "That's wonderful, dear." Failed acknowledgment and a host of other errors will also give rise to obsessive itsa, such as not asking the question, not acknowledging, Q and A, etc. There are hundreds of ways to stop an auditing cycle. One is not to start one, as when the auditor just doesn't give the command. The auditor can always polish up his comm cycle and make it better, but when it is fouling up the PC, it is grossly out, with Q and A, no question, no ack, etc.

5. Can't complete a repetitive auditing cycle. Auditors used to have immense trouble just asking the same question repetitively. The TR's and Op Pro by Dup were developed to handle this inability in auditors. As an auditing supervisor, these are the things to look for, not aspects of the auditor's case. Don't audit the auditor, as a first action. After you find the GAE, maybe the auditor could be audited, say, on his missed withholds. There are really only four [actually six] things that can be wrong with a PC:

1. The PC is suppressive. A suppressive is someone who doesn't get case gain, because he has continuing overts, not because auditing wasn't applied well. Only about 2 1/2% of PCs are suppressive. It is very hard to get this PC to give up the overts or to be made auditable for real case gain. About the only way in which we can do it is with power processing. Occasionally, someone can be over-audited so far, especially on R6EW, that they thereafter get case gain and will act slightly suppressive. They have to be rehabilitated. But a true suppressive has never had any case gain or TA. He is continually committing little overts, because to him, everyone is an enemy. Each individual is an "everyone" to the SP, who is busy fighting everyone. The SP is a "paranoid" who doesn't change. Institutional cases are all PTS's or SP's. That is why LRH has said, "Don't fool with the insane." He didn't know exactly why, but now we know. The psychiatrist is professionally a PTS.

2. The PC is PTS. The PC who is PTS roller-coasters in auditing. This is the psychiatrists' "manic-depressive" case. He feels good after auditing and then feels bad. The paranoid or catatonic who doesn't change is the suppressive. A PTS doesn't have to see the SP between sessions. He only has to think, "What will Joe think about this?" or "What would Joe say?" The SP could be 10,000 miles away. Ethics officers sometimes have trouble finding the SP, but there is one on the case. The SP speaks in generalities, which puts up a fog, making the SP hard to find. If you audit the PTS and get him better, the SP will do something to destroy him, so it is dangerous to audit him. If you give a PTS too much gain, the SP will either commit suicide or murder him. Most of our troubles have come from auditing PTS's, who then "threaten" the SP, who then incites the PTS and others to cause our problems. You have to find the right SP. Finding him gives a very positive result, not just a tiny change. When you correctly spot the SP in a PTS's case, the PTS lights up like a spotlight.

3. The PC is ARC broken.

4. The PC has a PTP of long duration. This includes hidden standards.

5. The PC has a withhold or a misunderstood word. The misunderstood word is just a withhold of understanding. The PC is withholding himself from the understanding, or vice versa.

6. The PC has continuous withheld overts. This makes the PC a suppressive.The eleven items discussed in this lecture [i.e. 5 GAE's and the 6 things that can be wrong with a PC, given above] are the only things that will act as barriers on a case. "Processes are things that work, if these six things aren't out" with the PC, and when auditors don't have GAE's. If they don't work, one or more of these is why. That is all that drives tech out. A D of P who doesn't look at these barriers to processing can't make anything work. If these [eleven] reasons why processing doesn't work are OK, almost any process will work, unless it is overrun. In other words, the only other reason why a process doesn't work is that it has worked all the way to a result and it is done. Overrun is either a problem or an ARC break. [Hence in fits into the above schema.] If the five GAE's are not present, then, if the case is not progressing, 1-6 are present. You can just assess these six things and find out what is wrong with the case. So these things are the points of out tech. "The whole environment is trying to feed [the CS] different data than these." Analysis of out tech would result in getting tech in, by not allowing GAE's and by detecting and handling the things that are wrong with PCs.

A person's case is helped by the fact that, as he advances, he becomes more and more capable of selecting importances. "As you get on up the line, the selection of importances becomes more and more an ability that is easily practiced."

6510C14 SHSpec-68 Briefing to Review Auditors

There are three key data that go out in an org and therefore are essential to be known by the Department of Review, that LRH hasn't been able to teach Tech, Qual or orgs. You will hit them in Review, because no one else will have gotten them:

1. A HIGH TA IS OVERRUN.

There is no other reason for a high TA. Review's problem is to find what was overrun and how it was overrun. When someone comes in who has never been audited, and who has never been near another "therapy" or practice, and whose TA is at 5.0, he has still been overrun on something. You just have your work cut out for you in finding it. Don't throw away the datum, the way everyone else has. Using this datum, you are likely to find some interesting things. Say someone went release on Christianity at age six, or on exercise at age twenty, and then went on past that point, doing it some more. Releases don't only happen in scientology. It is likely to be some wisdom or therapy that released him. They are all failed technologies. All past wisdoms may have had technologies that have been alter-ised and lost. We almost went that route by not recognizing the state of release and the phenomenon of the F/N.

What has been overrun is not necessarily what the PC was running when the TA went high. You might have overrun some earlier release. It may, for instance, be a restimulation "of an earlier overrun communication release." The PC could have been a problems release and gotten keyed in again on a ruds question. If the HGC or field auditor didn't repair it by asking, as a first question, "What was overrun?", they would never solve it. They would get the wrong overrun. You must find what, exactly, the release was on. Which or what one was it? Get the right when and the right what, and the TA will blow down, and the needle will float. You've got to rehab the right release to get the high TA down . There could be other overruns on the case, too, but there is one that is making the high TA. Get that, and the rehab tech will get it to F/N, quickly or less quickly.

2. A ROLLER-COASTER CASE HAS AN SP IN THE VICINITY.

The anatomy of the PTS is that of a problem: postulate/counter-postulate. The person's purpose (postulate) has been or is being suppressed (counter-postulate). There is no other source of roller-coaster. An SP gives the PTS a problem. When the PC roller-coasters, he has run into a postulate/counter-postulate situation since his last gain. A PTS really does make trouble for the auditor, the org, and himself. Ethics exists to get tech in. If it is ever used to throw tech out, it is being used suppressively.

Search and discovery is used to find the suppressions that a person has had in life. The S and D question is:

1. "What's been your main purpose in life?"

2. "Who opposed it?"

This often makes a problems release in minutes. With a PTS or with any problem you want to solve, "find the source of the counter-postulate.... Man gets "solutions' to problems.... He leaves the [two opposed postulates] in place, not knowing the definition of a problem, and then "solves' the resulting collision, as in Dialectical Materialism -- the anatomy of a problem gone mad. "Any idea is the product of two forces," is the backbone of Dialectical Materialism." To solve a problem, look over the whole perimeter of counter-postulates and find what is the source of the problem. If you handle the problem for the PC, often the problem will evaporate for the other person, also. Problems sometimes evaporate in the physical universe when you find the source of the counter-postulate. In ethics, "when you see that the disconnection or the handle ... causes an enormous problem for the [PTS] or for the other person from whom they are disconnecting, you have invariably found the wrong person.... PTS is the manifestation of a postulate/counter-postulate." Find who, when, where, and what. You could list, "What purpose of yours has been thwarted?" You can get a Grade I release with this.

Suppressives are now to be lo ated in Review, because ethics has flubbed it too much. PTS's go to ethics after Review to have note made of the fact that they ar PTS and to get a statement made of handle or disconnect.

A PTS condition can be caused by a suppressive action, as well as by a suppressive person. For instance, if you overrun a PC past release, the PC goes PTS to the auditor, just as a mechanical action. Self-auditing is a potential hidden source of overrun. You don't declare the auditor an SP. It was a suppressive act, that's all. The definition of PTS is "connected to a suppressive person or action." The action could be inadvertent.

So you find the suppressive person. The person may have only been suppressive for five minutes, or he may have been suppressive for a lifetime. Someone could be PTS and overrun. In that case, you must get the suppression off and rehab the process.

A suppressive person isn't someone with horns. It is someone who has had a counter-postulate to the PC. A person may occasionally commit suppressive acts, or he may be habitually suppressive. Someone who is routinely suppressive in life, invalidative of scientology, and trying to keep people from getting well is a social menace. He is the subject of ethics. He is the one who gets declared, not the auditor who overran a process from some inadvertent or stupid mistake.

When you tell a person the right SP, it is like locating and indicating BPC. You should get a blowdown and GI's. If the PC again roller-coasters, you've got another SP. So there could be several SP's on the case. You don't go looking for all of them at the same time, but [after you find one suppressive] look for another one. If you found all the SP's and suppressive actions in a person's lifetime, he would be a problems release. And if he goes release on problems, he won't go PTS again, unless he goes home and starts self-auditing. He can overrun himself on self-auditing, so be aware of that.

3. THE SOURCE OF OVERTS IS AN EARLIER MISUNDERSTOOD WORD.

The source of the overt is the other key datum that has been missed: A misunderstood word causes individuation, which leads to overts. The word that a student is arguing with the course supervisor about is later than the one that the student really misunderstood. Any confusion, stupidity, or upset in study always stems from a misunderstood word earlier than the one he is upset about. It is always earlier! So the source of the overt is in the formula:

1. Something is misunderstood.

2. The person individuates.

3. He commits overts against the misunderstood thing.

If what the person thought was the misunderstood was the misunderstood, the problem would have blown. So it is always earlier. This datum is the key datum in the area of study and comprehension of existence. It regulates a person's I.Q.

The Review action is to look for the earlier area and the earlier word that was misunderstood. [Cf. Method 1 Word Clearing] You can unburden a few words earlier than where you think the misunderstood word is, then get the misunderstood just before it. You can date the time of the misunderstood. You should ask what subject the PC was in. A person isn't upset with studying. It is only a misunderstood word. It is not case, and it is not the environment. Remember that you are handling fringes on end-words, so don't push all the way back into R6. Just find what was happening before he hit the thing he doesn't understand.

So these three data are the only ones that are really important in Review:

1. High TA = overrun .

2. Roller-coaster = PTS = Who is the SP? That question is the source of hang-ups on the track. You must find the counter-postulate and the source of the counter-postulate.

3. Confusion comes from a misunderstood word earlier than the one the person is confused about.

6607C19 SHSpec-69 About Rhodesia

LRH has just come back from Rhodesia. Around February, 1966, LRH was holding the mock-up [his body] together with sticking plaster. The organization was going fine. Tech was wrapped up. LRH put things on "wait" -- his case, for one thing. He decided to take a vacation. He spent thirty days in Las Palmas. The organization was running fine. Clear No. 1 (John McMasters) was made during February of 1966, while LRH was in Las Palmas. LRH decided to go to South Africa. He wanted to locate an alternate base for OT's, in case of war or political takeover. He couldn't figure out

why he couldn't do this. [The reason was that he hadn't defined the purpose of such a base. The purpose was:

1. An alternate base for scientology, in case of war or political takeover.

2. To serve as a base from which to put in ethics on the planet, so tech could go in.

3. To put in economics, so that people can support orgs and the orgs can flourish. [See later part of this lecture.]

LRH went to Rhodesia. He conceived of a type of constitution they could use to solve their difficulties. The government liked it. LRH recalled that he had some assets in South Africa. He decided to invest them. He bought a house and learned that he could buy a hotel in the wilderness for 5500 pounds, and did. He bought a farm. He was watching the economics and behavior of the Wog world and getting a kick out of being out there, making friends with tough characters (his usual friends). Rhodesian culture is still Victorian. It is a small civilization in the middle of a howling wilderness. It is more sophisticated than London.

Rhodesia has lots of land, minerals, precious metals, and a beautiful climate. It is untouched and could easily be developed. LRH met the governmental high-ups. He was very acceptable to them. He didn't discuss scientology at all. He was examining the Wog world, and he didn't want to un-wog it. He went on TV and radio. He had no authority, but he was solving lots of problems. Each individual Rhodesian would agree with LRH's solutions, but warned him that no other Rhodesian would agree with him, because the solutions were too advanced.

LRH went down to his hotel at Lake Kariba. He supplied the hotel with two-ton trucks. Local industry started to use his trucks to transport goods, and the area boomed. LRH started a furniture factory. A colony started to sprout. Just the fact of LRH's being interested in the country and seeing hope for it caused production to rise.

Then LRH wondered how he was going to leave, to go back to Saint Hill. He was woven too tightly into the picture, with a staff of nine personal staff and twenty-nine general staff, the pick of the ex-consular domestic staffs. White Rhodesians kept telling LRH how to handle the African. He realized that they didn't know anything about Africans, because they didn't recognize that they were people. They would say, "They are sullen. You've got to watch them." But the reason they are sullen is no acknowledgment, bad 8C, over-expectation, and out-gradient. They were taking people with no experiential background in politics or economics and expecting more of them than they were trained to do. LRH made his staff happy by telling them that they weren't Rhodesians anymore, that they were Americans. They were very spit-and-polish, enthusiastic, and hard-working. So in four months, LRH was very acceptable to both races and even to extreme moderates, as well as to extreme rightest whites.

A reporter from the London Daily Mail told the Minister of Information what a bad fellow LRH was. The minister instantly told prime minister Smith what a bad fellow he was. Smith told the cabinet the same story, and the next morning the Rhodesian Front Committee was charging down [to see LRH], when they found out that his visa wasn't going to be extended, because they knew that it was all lies. Smith had been built up as too fair and too honest. His popularity had begun to decline, because he hadn't worked miracles, and because his communication was going out. Then he told the Committee various things, such as, that LRH's business associates were complaining about him. LRH had, in fact, only three business associates, and one of them was there and denied the story. Smith said that LRH had been deported from Australia. But LRH's passport had no record of having entered Australia. He said that LRH was wanted all over and had a criminal record. These people, however, knew that LRH's credit was in the stars all over the world. They saw Smith's feet of clay and walked out. So LRH could leave, covered with laurels.

As a result of this expedition, LRH found out that you can't locate a base that you don't know the purpose of. That was why he had trouble locating "OT Base". Now he knows what "OT Base" has to do. It has to put in ethics on a planetary basis, so that tech can be gotten in. As you associate with the public and try to tell them about scientology, you have trouble with the public, because their ethics are out, and for no other reason. One SP in Rhodesia has wrecked the country, and is keeping the whole scene enturbulated.

The only real threat to scientology is that an atom war or a political takeover could prevent the organization from going ahead to clear people. In addition to ethics, but less vital than ethics, economics has to be gotten straightened out. Economics is a very simple subject, with very plain laws. It has nothing to do with politics and ideology. Actually, economics exists as a subject, the purpose of which is to get people enough to eat, etc. Man violates the laws of economics all the time for ideological and political purposes. The already existing economic systems of the planet are usable in a modified form, and we need them to improve, in order to allow for an expansion of our organization. There has to be a workable enough economics on the planet so that people can support orgs and the orgs can flourish and expand. A total subsidy of processing doesn't work, because there is no contribution from the PC. People have to contribute to benefit from auditing. So the economic purpose is a secondary purpose of OT Base. Also, ethics is hard to get in on starving people!

Ethics is out on earth, and the out ethics prevents easy dissemination. Nearly every human being on this planet that is in trouble, is in trouble because ethics are out. In England, someone stole and sold LRH's research papers, which were then represented as the current practice of scientology -- a very different thing. People are killed in wars because of one SP in the government. The only reason for war is a few SP's. We could go and sort out key SP's in international situations. What we would do about it is something else.

Political systems exist only to solve the problem of succession of rulers. Otherwise, everyone could agree on a benevolent monarchy. The answer is, of course, not to have successors. Clear the monarch! But political systems are not concerned with the happiness or productivity of people.

The only source of our individual, personal difficulties is not having ethics in, in the society around us. The only reason why you are having difficulty as an individual is not having ethics in, in your immediate environment. We've got to shift gears in our emphasis. We have been getting ethics in on our fellow scientologists with great enthusiasm. Now we are familiar with the system and how it works. We have erred by getting ethics in too heavily on scientologists and too lightly on the environment. It is time to reverse the emphasis. "There isn't any point in getting ethics in on a willing person," just because he is stupid. Doing that just makes the person sullen. Ethics should be directed at willful acts of sabotage.

A real SP is not just anyone. He intends to damage you. He is a real nut. He intends to knock you down. He is not just a difficult person. He is a real monster. Upgrade your idea of what an SP is like. SP's amount only to 2.5% of Mankind. Find out if the guy is driving people into sanitariums, strewing social wreckage about, and smashing statistics. We have only had one real SP on staff. Just because a person shows up on an S and D doesn't mean that he is a real SP. Maybe he is just making someone unhappy. Don't fling the title around lightly, within scientology. Outside scientology, don't worry about making a mistake and accusing someone wrongly. Just get ethics in real hard first and correct the mistakes later. We've got to put in ethics fast to prevent disaster.

It was great to find that the organization could continue without LRH. It was great to find that you could make more clears. You made No. 22 to celebrate his return.

LRH's immediate program is to finish his own clearing. He has found that people don't make it with their grades out. Then he will start OT research. Every time he tries to put together the scope of OT, he has to run off the invalidation. Any statement you can make about OT falls short of the truth.

6607C21 SHSpec-70 Dianetic Auditing

Processes today are so fast that auditors cannot be trained. [See above.] LRH wrote a bulletin in April [HCOB 3Apr66 "Dianetic Auditing Course"] which is now going into effect, to handle this situation. If auditors can't audit, no auditing gets done, and no one makes it up the line. Follow the fundamentals. Get your question answered. Don't change the process because the PC goes unconscious. Drills on TR's are not enough, by themselves, to make a smooth auditor. Releases can be made with dianetic auditing. LRH has done it for years. The earliest "clears" were dianetic releases. They were more or less stable, but they were in much better shape than they had been in.

Don't go using dianetic auditing in practice (Joke:). Dianetics is practice auditing. However, these processes can heal, though not with uniformity, since the whole reactive mind is the cause of very severe illnesses. The way to make someone well is to make a thetan clear. Therefore clearing is the

real "cure" for illness. So don't specialize in dianetic key-outs. But a slower process is needed to give auditors practice at auditing. They must get to where they are used to the comm cycle, can read a meter, get some wins, etc. All the bugs have been ironed out of dianetic auditing. Even turning on visio, which used to be hard, is easy if you get the exact duration of the incident. Teaching someone dianetics gives him very basic fundamentals. HCOB 3Apr66 gives an improvement on old dianetic technique, since it doesn't require repeater technique, etc. [It was a simplified version of dianetics compared to the earlier R3R technique (which was closer to modern dianetic technique). It involved simply locating an incident within the PC's conscious recall and running through it repeatedly until the PC is up to tone 4.0 (cheerful) on it, then taking another incident within the PC's conscious recall and doing the same thing.]

The mind is:

1. A literal record of experience, plotted against time, from the earliest moment of aberration until now. + 2. Additional ideas the fellow got about it. + 3. Other things he may have mocked up or created on top of it in mental mass. + 4. Some machines. + 5. Some valences.

These make circuits that talk to the PC -- the Arabs' "demons". A circuit is an endowed life object. You can audit any of these, to greater or lesser profit. Mental mass is mass, but the mass of it is very slight, compared to the real object one makes a picture of. For auditing purposes, when you do an S and D, you are not looking for pictures. You are looking for a valence. If you want to change someone's personality graph, audit out some valences. The graph is just a picture of the person's valences. He is hardly there at all.

In dianetic auditing, neglect the machines, the valences, and the illusions. The psychiatrist and the psychologist addressed things that the person himself mocked up: his illusions. They only invalidated the illusions without finding why the person was creating them. You are only interested in experience, not illusion. Illusion is a surface manifestation that evaporates when real experience appears. "Illusion is the product of the actual," and if you attack the illusion in dianetic auditing, you prevent the PC from contacting the actual. The actual is so bizarre that humans tend to invalidate it by confusing it with illusion. Thus people are prone to call the actual and illusion both illusion. As with dub-in, newspaper stories are untrue but usually based on a real event. The newspaper is the modern gossip. Newspapers specialize in creating illusions. "News" is a social illusion of an event. If you are running an engram, the PC may start by confronting illusion, then come up to confronting [the incident]. So the "incident" may change as he audits it. A PC's confront gets better as he audits dub-in, and he begins to see the real event. The PC can himself be confused by the change. Don't evaluate for him about the reality of the incident he is running. Just put him through it again. A thetan is a busy little bee. He goes along, making pictures. He clutches them to his thetanish bosom, then wonders why he feels sick.

A person isn't aberrated by pleasure, though he can get hung up in a magnitudinous win. Pleasure moments don't run out.

Secondaries contain misemotion. Any emotion or misemotion may be contained in a secondary. "The tone scale was plotted from the behavior of secondaries, as they were audited." Any aberrative secondary is based on an engram -- an experience, or a picture, of pain and unconsciousness. This was originally thought to be cellular memory, hence the word, "engram". Whenever someone is hurt, he makes a complete, exact record of what happened, that is fantastically accurate with respect to time. A thetan does not make errors reactively about time. He gets confused analytically about it. The exact date of each incident is recorded but [the incident] is unconfrontable if he can't get [the date]. He records what he can't confront, and that is where he gets engrams and secondaries.

The E-meter sees deeper than the PC can, but it doesn't see all the way down. It reads on things that are close to being confronted. It reaches what the PC isn't confronting but could confront. It won't register on the totally unconfrontable. Eventually, the being can confront as much as the meter can see -- when he is clear. You can unflatten things that you have flattened, by continuing to go over them. In running engrams, you should get them down to where there is no more TA action.

The aberrative mind -- the mind being approached by dianetic auditing -- is the mind of events. The events are often approachable through locks. What a person knows about is not aberrative.

Someone can do a total switch in valence. He can "become" another person, with that person's characteristics. So a PC in a given valence in an incident may see another person in the incident as opposite, who actually represents the PC, in his own valence in the incident. So if you notice a certain trait in the PC, ask the PC who had characteristics opposite to the ones that the PC is manifesting. The PC will spot the person he had switched with, who objected to the characteristics that the PC had before the switch, but that appear opposite to the PC, because the PC is in that person's valence, looking at himself. When you ask the PC this question, the valence will as-is, and the PC will then get a true perception of the other person. In running engrams, the PC may thus go into and out of various valences.

A this-lifetime address to the situation is recommended, because the PC might have an infinite number of [incidents to run]. But you can err in dianetic auditing by running too late on the chain. You may be able to stay in this lifetime and key the PC out, but you can't insist on staying in this lifetime. The danger is in:

1. Trying to erase an incident that is getting more solid, because it is too late on the chain. You should go earlier.

2. Not getting the charge off incidents contacted, before going earlier. This is the opposite error. You can hit the incidents too lightly, not get enough charge off, and keep going back too quickly. If you do this, the PC will wind up in a ball, overwhelmed with the charge. He will be all messed up. A PC may, himself, skip several incidents and get himself into the glue. If the latter occurs, just treat that session as an incident and erase it as a lock. This is something we have almost forgotten how to do in scientology. It is quite easy and effective. You can erase anything, if you are good. You can always go through something once, but if it is a chain, watch it about going through it more than once.

The whole of dianetic auditing is the tracing of experience. The rules for it are in HCOB 3Apr66, plus this lecture.

Additional thoughts: If you get a PC stuck in some lifetime, run out its death. The lives that are especially aberrative are the ones in which the PC almost made it.

There is no total bank release at the level of dianetics. There are only releases on particular subjects. The releases you get are by chain, not from a whole class of experience. Total bank releases exist only at scientology Levels 0-V. You can get minus releases from the minus awareness scale. In fact, you can assess the minus levels of the awareness chart and sometimes produce a release just by assessing them and finding where the PC is stuck at. But don't go by an F/N during this procedure.

Any dianetic auditing is better than no dianetic auditing. That is still true, although some scientology auditor may knock the PC around. If the PC is groggy at the end of a dianetic session, have him look around and notice things in the room.

Audit the PC on locks and/or secondaries, at first. Running secondaries will drop the PC into engrams. Don't try to cure his lumbosis by running out the engram that gave him his lumbosis.

Auditing to cure something is giving the PC attention because he's got lumbosis, i.e. rewarding a down statistic. It puts the being at effect, and he will deteriorate as a being. You have the technology of total recovery of the being. If you audit towards that, you will be helping the PC. Audit towards improving the PC's confront and his abilities, not towards curing his illness. His illness is his hidden standard. He is saying, "Cure my medicosis, and I will believe in scientology." Audit the being, not the illness.

There is value in dianetic auditing. It solves the problems that Freud was attacking. But compared to scientology, it is nothing. Don't get stuck in the wins that you will have with it. The road out is the road up through the grades. Use dianetic auditing to learn the fundamentals about the human mind and to learn how to audit. Dianetics is not currently for the psychotic, the neurotic, and the sick.

6607C26 SHSpec-71 The Classification Chart and Auditing

Auditing means to listen and compute, and to get a result on a PC, who is a person with aberrations and difficulties. Auditing has to be done in a professional, standard manner. Since the beginning of

Wogdom, there has been off-beat activity going on. That is no reason to perpetuate it. "The psychiatrist exists for the good of the society, and to Hell with the patient." Our situation does not compare with earlier mental therapies. We are not even trying for the same result. We are clearing people by erasing reactive minds. Unlike psychotherapies, auditing is not a social criticism.

We know the answer to why the PC behaves the way he does. We also know why the wog behaves the way he does. Scientology is a road out that increases the person's abilities, taking him out of his identification of A=A=A. The road has milestones, which we call "grades". There are also levels. On grades, there are certain abilities gained. But these grades are not composed of single points, despite the names given on the Gradation Chart. That is the rough public rendition. It is really not possible to enter the upper grades without having attained the lower grades. Trying to do so results in disasters. The whole track falls between [Grade] V, which enables the PC to confront whole track, and [Grade] VI, but it doesn't necessarily appear in either, though it may.

Besides the disasters that occur from an out gradient, other disasters come from not following standard tech. Standard tech is contained only in HCOB's, not in any books. "If I haven't signed it, it isn't true." Some day we will publish then all in consecutive order, all corrected. The main bugbear of someone studying scientology is that he conceives that every time he reads something new, it wipes out the old. This concept is based on the fact that he didn't understand the old material that he had read in the first place. So he doesn't realize that it can be integrated with the new material that has just been issued. Something developed later doesn't replace something developed earlier. The new does not wipe out the old. The old generally correlates well with the new. There are very few corrections. One significant correction is contained in the newly-found fact that you can overrun things. A lot of "old" processes "failed" because they worked so fast that the auditor didn't spot the release point when it occurred. This accounts for the poor results of R2-12, when it went wrong. It works very fast. We didn't know about overrun in those days.

With dianetics, you can have one release per chain, so don't try to escape from confronting engrams by "going release". PCs are entitled to make rapid gains and soar on up the line. That doesn't apply to students. Like a great singer, a student has to suffer to be great. He learns what errors can be made by being a PC who gets messed up. Someone who has never been overrun doesn't appreciate why it is undesirable. Getting bad auditing isn't necessarily disastrous. It teaches the student not to give bad auditing. I have been audited by dianetic auditors who were trained in an academy that taught only the "bubble theory". [?]

Nothing will help an aberrated being, short of processing. "Standard tech is a very very narrow path, and it's very easy to stray off of its edges." It is bounded on all sides by wrong things to do, in auditing. One wrong thing is to fail to handle PCs while auditing them. You must keep the PC handled, in order to audit him. One way to suppose that you couldn't handle PCs while auditing them is to think that you can't do anything about something which is above a PC's grade.

"You can always run an advanced process on a PC as a rudiment, as something to straighten the case out in a hurry." For instance, even though problems = Grade 1, you can always run Level 1 as a rudiment for Level 0. In fact [if the PC has a PTP], you had damn well better. It is not, "I'm sorry. We can't talk about your problems, because that's Grade 1, and you are only working on Grade 0. And at the Problems level, you may run into service facs, e.g. the PC's lumbosis. These can give you a hard time in making a problems release. After all, the reason why the chart is the way it is, is that the "Gradation Chart ... is made up only [at the level of the grades] of those things which you can't audit in the face of, and that is the genus of the chart, ... the real reason why I found the grades, and why.... There are certain things that, if you don't pay attention to them, prevent all progress in auditing and in life. So therefore they must be the keys to aberration. And That's where we got the ... chart." Only these factors have appeared as barriers to case gain, when not handled. "These are the super barriers to the track."

1. PTP's give rise to no TA, no as-ising, inability to concentrate, inability to answer auditing commands, and perhaps some degree of rising TA.

2. Missed withholds and overts cause a nattery, choppy, and mean PC.

3. ARC breaks give the PC a sad effect.

4. Communication problems lead to no communication. Unconsciousness is a communication problem. The CDEI scale can be applied to communication. For instance, O/W must be a higher grade than problems, because a person could confront having problems, when he couldn't confront an overt.

Don't think that because someone is a Grade IV release, he will never again have out-ruds of any sort. The product you have is a gross product. The release can last quite awhile or not. It is not gold. It is gilt, and it can tarnish. Sometimes it turns green. It is the temporariness of this state (which is, after all, a state of keyed-out clear) that boobytrapped the whole research line in the field of the mind. There are lower-scale harmonics of everything the thetan can do or be. The state of thetan exterior is what the Buddhists called a Bodhi. It is not a permanent state.

However, even though it is not permanent, release should not be underrated. It is accompanied by the experience of overcoming that which the person has been released on, and that improves his ability to confront. Also, a bit of erasure has occurred, which desensitizes the whole thing. So the releases made nowadays are more stable than the releases that were made in 1950. Now, we are approaching release on a gradient, and we know what grade of release we are making.

(Always be willing to give the PC a win.)

The clear cog is, "I'm mocking it up." Clears follow the rules of life, until they, themselves, have changed their minds about the rules. And when they do that, of course, they are OT's. "Oddly enough, OT processes are upper harmonics of the same things that prevent auditing, only they aren't processes."

If you want to audit, you must handle whatever rud is out, when it's out. If the PC at Grade IV isn't talking, he may be a communications release, but you will get nowhere until you get him in comm. Communication is the carrier wave of all processing.

"Someone who's a release is less likely to have out-ruds, but these things can still occur." Having the grades doesn't mean that you won't get ARC broken with yourself and with the auditor. If you want a good auditor at Grades VI and VII, become one.

There are interim release points on the chart that you are probably neglecting. Someone could get an F/N on a communications process, without being released on every aspect of communication. So he isn't necessarily a communications release. A lot of processes were dropped out of the lineup that shouldn't have been dropped. You will have to use tech from another grade, in running a grade. [At Level 0], you have valence processes as well as the usual comm processes. You have some more complicated comm processes at Grade 1. All along the line, there are lots of processes that someone could be released on.

R4H = R2H (Recall an ARC break. Date it. Assess. Indicate BPC.). CCH's were on Grade II. Also ARC processes, plus case remedies. At Level III, you get auditing by lists and overt/ justifications. There are also physical processes, meter dating, and cause and effect processes. Don't ignore grades processes as rudiments.

"PCs don't ever object to auditors unless they've got overts on them," no matter how lousy their auditing is. Pull the withhold. A PC audited over an ARC break protests, then screams, then fusses, then gets tired, and then gets sad and sadder. Neglecting rudiments will ruin a case. You will have to use them on all PCs, at one time or another. Don't ever fail to notice out-ruds or fail to put them in when they are out. That, and going non-standard, is the only thing that could bar a person from going clear.

6607C28 SHSpec-72 Dianetic Auditing and the Mind

When you are running engrams and secondaries, you are handling the human mind. What the mind was coating was the subject of scientology. It is coating the thetan, in other words: you, like a blob of glup. A person is a static. The subject of the mind has been considerably mucked about and misunderstood. The "engram" came from a theory that LRH developed at George Washington University. Man had no way to explain memory. If memory was a molecular phenomenon, Man has enough storage capacity in the brain to last three months. LRH wrote this up as proof that this isn't

how Man remembers. It is difficult to think about a mind, harder than thinking about a brain. Fortunately, the mind doesn't have to understand itself. LRH was there to understand it. You would have to be aware of the fact that an individual is able to create matter, energy, space, and time (in other words: pictures), before you could understand the mind. You don't have to ask or explain where a thetan came from. A thetan just is.

This gets us into a discussion of reality. No one has nailed this down, philosophically. In scientology, reality is what is. That is all you need to know about reality itself. A delusion is a reality for one person, out of agreement with others.

From these elements, it is possible to figure out why Man is trapped and why he acts and reacts as he does. You can figure this out, once you know the basic definitions. In dianetic processing, you have to know what the mind is. The thetan is a compulsive mocker-upper. He is stupid. That is the one flaw in a thetan. If you can get him over this mad obsession to:

1. Make a picture of everything that happens to him,

2. Then hide it from himself,

3. Then fix it up so it can impinge itself on his existence, you can get him out of the cage. "He dramatizes these pictures, or they enforce computations on him." He does this by dislocating himself in time.

The mind is:

1. Pictures that have been made of experiences.

2. Plotted against time.

3. Preserved in energy and mass in the vicinity of the being.

4. When restimulated, they are recreated without his analytical awareness. What is the mind that you are trying to get someone out of. The trick of it all is that "you cannot make a postulate or an intention through this mass called 'the mind'." Whenever you try, the mind is restimulated, so the thetan is not able to handle things or make things by postulate. A thetan's thought cannot go through the barricade of his mockups. When he tries to put forth an intention or postulate, it collides, "Splat!", with whatever engrams are in restimulation. The less creation of his experiences the person has around him, and the less he has around him to be restimulated, the more he can think or project his thoughts, and the bigger he gets. You can delete these experiences and thereby free the being and his intentions and postulates. Dianetic auditing is the activity by which these experiences can be deleted.

The PC may be messed up because he is trying to restrain himself from dramatizing. A person has a tendency to repeat, in action, what has happened to him in experience. He tends to replay now something that happened then, out of its time [and place]. The thetan could give himself disabilities to prevent himself from dramatizing.

You are dealing with the basic mind. The core of the reactive mind also has this same character, but it is so outrageous and overwhelming that you had better not touch it without the map. In view of the fact that the individual didn't know what happened, he sometimes told himself what happened and got the actual experience overlaid with another experience. This is how you get "too many Julius Caesars". Julius Caesar was pretty suppressive, which made him the winning side or valence. So a lot of people whom he affected and overwhelmed took on his valence.

A thetan has trouble remembering, when he is all smashed down in the mind. The effort to remember gets painful, so he would rather not remember. One of his favorite methods of handling the bank is almost as crazy as making the bank in the first place: It is forgetting about it.

When you start erasing the mind, the person may be upset at the point where you have erased his circuits and machinery and he hasn't remembered how to do things himself.

As far as auditing is concerned, dianetics is play. It is far more than Man could do before but its benefits are far far less than the benefits of scientology auditing. If you tried to erase the mind, picture

by picture, you would be at it a long time. Say you have had one pain per year and one major catastrophe every five or ten years. If you added them up over all your lifetimes, you would come up with too many to erase in any reasonable number of hours or years. This is why LRH addressed the thetan, rather than the thetan's mockups. With the grades, one could be clear in a few years, starting from the bottom and not going at a frantic pace.

In auditing engrams, there are some phenomena you should be aware of. A chain won't erase if you erase only the late end of it. The only way to solve a problem is to handle the elements it contains. If it contains past lives, you will fail to handle it if you don't handle past lives. If an incident gets heavier and more massy, hit the silk. Go earlier. If a chain has a basic before this lifetime, that is where you will have to go to get it. One of the symptoms of an incident going more solid is the PC bouncing out of it. The PC bounces out of the incident into the lock that he has just made in PT, running through the incident the first time, in this session. This can be manifested as the PC's repeating just what he said the first time. He has learned better than to go near the incident. This is the same mechanism that keeps his bank mocked up in the first place. He can't confront it, so he keeps it in PT. It would erase if he confronted it, but to do so is too painful. You can get this phenomenon if you use the meter to determine what to run. Don't use a meter to locate incidents. If you run what the PC can find, you've got something he can confront. "A man can remember what he can confront," and that is all he is going to remember. If he runs the engram from PT -- all conceptual and not in the incident, it is because the incident is really too much for him to confront.

A guy with amnesia is just a guy who is so spooked that he is not willing to remember anything. It is not just bouncers or holders which govern people's ability to move on the track. Someone who is about to be executed is terrified of the future. He will be stuck in the moment before the execution, or he will shoot earlier. Some people thus escape into the past track. Others are only willing to remember what happens after a traumatic experience.

It is only running PCs beyond their ability to confront which causes trouble in dianetic auditing. If you run the PC on what he can confront, you won't get into situations for which you need solutions. You could run the PC's chronic emotion. That would be a good project. There is probably a secondary for every engram. So you are likely to drop into engrams while running secondaries. The secondary lies right across the top of the engram. If you try to run loss, you end up running all the incidents on the track. There are also overt chains (the "motivator series"). Each engram has 2000 to 3000 locks. Each secondary also has 2000 to 3000 locks. Chains cross-connect and cross-reference with other chains. It would be impossible to take something that a PC was afraid of and trace it back to all the reasons why he was afraid of it. It will be found to occur in too many chains and locks.

The individual's experiential track is important because, when we clear someone, we get a new thing: a being without a bank who has experience. When you find yourself in a trap, it is a good idea to find out what the trap consists of. That is one benefit of engram running. [You will find that] there will be certain points of emphasis, but all thetans have had experience. There are no specialized thetans.

If you can't get the PC to run engrams, run breakfast. If that is not confrontable, have him run entering the auditing room. For some people, the flow of time from moment to moment is continuous pain. Don't try to get such individuals to confront heavy stuff.

6608C02 SHSpec-73 Suppressives and GAE's

Normally, there is no penalty for a crime of omission. In this society, it is being there and communicating that are the crimes that are mostly punished. But there are also crimes of omission. For an auditor, not being there and not communicating are the highest crimes.

In the area of tech, we have gone from total change to total no-change. The materials are all there. The road to clear, from raw meat to Grade IV, is very fast. That is something you can have trouble with is an auditor. It is over before you notice. There is a difference between wog and raw meat. A wog isn't even trying. Some processes are dangerously quick, so they are not even in the line-up, because they overrun too easily. R2-12 is one of these. The route is so fast that only GAE's can prevent someone from going. [Watch out! Here come quickie grades!]

Every thetan wants out, at least for himself, even the suppressive. A suppressive is a special breed of cat. He is someone with no case gain. The SP knows that he belongs in [the soup], so he is sure that

you want to put him in. An SP could be described as "someone who is always totally surrounded by Martians, no matter who you are." As an auditor, he will do nothing but commit GAE's. He won't just commit a few. He won't audit at all. But he will say, "See? I try to audit these guys, and it doesn't work, so it's a worthless fraud." He rewards only down statistics. He goofs up and vilifies every effort to make people better.

(The trouble with scientology in South Africa is that they are afraid that LRH will teach it to Africans!)

If registrars kept this no-case-gain fact in mind, it would save us lots of trouble. We wouldn't try to audit them. An SP will make no case gain and can't resist bragging about it. The registrar could route them to the ethics officer. Anyone has the right to complain about one auditor, but not about all auditors.

As an auditor, the suppressive is only happy when the PC gets worse, and he is sad when the PC gets better. An SP is in a state of constant attack on scientology. He commits overts 24 hours a day. You very seldom find out about it. Another characteristic is that he attacks wrong targets. He attacks those who are trying to help him. He will not complete a cycle of action. If by chance he does complete one, he will reverse it. "At no time during this lecture have I said that all existing governments on the planet today reward down statistics, choose wrong targets, fail to complete cycles of action, or commit continuous overts. I have not said that, and your inference on that subject is your own responsibility!" An SP believes that "you are trying to trick him into letting down his protective mechanisms long enough so that you can "stab him in the back."

If, as an auditor, you observe all these things and the PC is getting no case gain, you know that tech is out, because it isn't working. You, as an auditor, can be an ethics officer, if need be. You should know some ethics tech. You have to know how to locate overts that are so unreal that they don't read on a meter.

The heads of governments are suppressives. They do commit continuous overts, and they do the other things that SP's do. They would get no case gain if you audited them. Having them in the driver's seat is a dangerous situation. Ethics must be gotten in, not on a police state basis, but on a very narrow, precise basis.

The world is also full of PTS people. They are the ones who cause most of the trouble, hence the name. The PC who gets and loses case gain is roller-coastering. He has an SP somewhere on his lines, either directly or by restimulation. Auditing is fast, but it isn't fast enough to overcome the SP. You could take the PTS out of his restimulative environment, audit him up to Grade V, let him go back to the environment, and he would collapse. The reason why the PTS individual roller-coasters is that the suppressive person or valence will try to destroy him if he makes case gain. Therefore, don't audit a PTS. You may kill him. A PTS person could make it, however, [if he made it as far as the clearing course.] Grade VI is the make/break point. At Grade VI, you could barely make it in the presence of an SP. Below this, it is not possible.

Another way to handle the PTS individual is to do an S and D to find the suppressive. The S and D is an assessment, not auditing. It is an ethics action. Therefore you can't have GAE's during an assessment, because it is not auditing. You ought to get the ARC break handled by assessment first, before doing an S and D.

What can you do for an SP? The only known action that will change an SP is the last power process. He is the real psycho. The only place that it can be done is in an org that has Class VII's who could run it and a registrar who will throw him out when he comes in complaining of no case gain. Because getting him to answer the question could be very difficult. If you did do power on him, his next action would be Grade 0 or lower. But until you have total control of the environment and padded cells, send him to ethics. If it turns out that he has been well audited with no case gain, you are taking your life in your hands to put him in the HGC.

An SP got to be one by switching valences. Man is basically good, but he mocks up evil valences and gets into them. An SP is in a false, mocked-up valence, to which he has earlier assigned or postulated evil purposes or actions. Evil is the declaration and postulate that evil can exist, that's all. In the absence of such postulates, Man is good. Scientology would be very dangerous if that were not true. The suppressive first mocked up badness in another, then took on that valence. The suppressive got in the bad valence, committed overts, then was attacked by other beings. He is stuck in that second

562

incident. It is far more real than PT. He is living a nightmare. Anybody has a few of these realer-than-real pictures, but when most of us run into them, we are running back into them. The SP never left. You and I may go back to an incident of trauma, but an SP has never left it. The incident is more real to him than PT. To the SP, all life is the threat of this incident and the personnel in it. All life is this incident, and everyone in PT is one of the attackers. That is all there is to an SP. He continuously commits overts because (he thinks) he is defending himself. You could get in this state only if you had lots of overts before it. This makes the SP choose wrong targets. He can't complete cycles of action, because he is stuck in time. That is why the last power process works. A person commits overts, stacks up the bank until he can't move on the track, then gets the business. Institutions contain few SP. They mostly contain PTS's.

Power processes can blast the SP loose [from his stuck point on the track], so that he can then be normally audited. But how can he be audited [on power processing in the first place] by someone who is perceived as an enemy? How can a cop or the Roman Legion audit him?

Psychiatrists fail to put in ethics on their own profession. That is LRH's criticism of them. LRH's quarrel with governments and politics is the same. Any system that permits an evil man to rise to power is a bad system.

As an auditor, you are only at liberty to handle ethics if you yourself have clean hands, and if you have certainty that it is not your auditing that is the cause of no case gain. You must be satisfied that you don't commit GAE's before you can accurately spot an ethics problem. The difference between a confident and an unconfident auditor is that the unconfident auditor is one who feels that he may be committing GAE's.

The benefits of doing TR's are the benefits of the auditing comm cycle itself, apart from the processes used. We know that the tech is not inadequate. If you omit tech or add to tech, it fails to work. There was an additive, until recently. Auditors were quitting when a TA went low, saying that the PC could then only be audited on power. The truth is that a case that is chronically below 2.0 is in chronic apathy and won't really get over it until he gets power processing, but he can get gains on grades.

The easy way to know whether it is your error or the PC's condition that is causing auditing problems is to know the five GAE's. Your judgment on an ethics problem depends entirely on your confidence in avoiding GAE's. They are very obvious. You could detect them on a tape of your auditing. Be interested in what is going on with the PC. Observe how he is doing. Getting and keeping a PC in session is under the heading of observing the PC, which depends on a willingness to confront the PC.

"[Real] justice can never occur in the absence of an understanding of the human mind. Never." Our justice leaves artificial justice behind it. Justice is only necessary in an aberrated world or area.

6608C04 SHSpec-74 Dianetics, Scientology, and Society

Dianetics has an interesting history. It hit like a battering ram, and the planet hasn't recovered from the impact. It got neglected after 1951, but it is the entrance point to what the mind is all about. It gives a superficial explanation of what behavior is all about. It wrapped up the world of mental healing. It is a very junior subject. When it became clear that we were addressing the human spirit, working on his mind seemed of far lesser importance.

The backflash against dianetics and scientology is based on the fact that it works and that it is in competition with psychiatry, not that it is a fraud. Not all psychiatrists are really evil. Some are merely caught up in a routine that they can't escape. However, a lot of them are SP's. Those that aren't are pretty PTS. They don't understand what we are doing, nor do we understand what they are doing, because we don't have the same goals as the psychiatrists. On soliciting approval from psychiatrists: "I rarely go around zoos wondering if I am acceptable to the monkeys in the cages."

In unsuccessful activities, you get a change of titles, every once in awhile. Mental "healers" keep changing their titles. At present, they are "psychiatrists". In the 1920's, they were "alienists", etc. One reason that they are unsuccessful is that they give all their time to a down statistic and keep getting pulled under. If we were to approach the same area as our major purpose, we would, in order to make it, first have to be very well and successfully established in other fields. The west is a scientific barbarism, not really a civilization, yet. A man has to be pretty civilized, before he can be trusted with

much power. Current society has power without gentler social graces to restrain it. People in society are trying to control human behavior by brute force. This is a very crude technology. It is very dicey to put technology out for those who are accustomed to abusing technology. It would only be safe if the technology itself [or learning the technology] produced enough case gain to prevent their abusing it. A tech must be able to work rapidly enough to counteract the tendency to abuse tech.

Something peculiar is going to happen. You are taking off from the tremendous technical background of scientology and going back to its immediate entrance background. Of course this is very easy to clarify. It is best not to use dianetics as an entrance point [for dissemination purposes], but to get the person into scientology and then teach him dianetics as a training technique. We are advancing the most powerful psychosomatic technology on the planet as a training technique: As it advances, don't lose sight of scientology. It is great to be able to salvage the body so that you can salvage the being. There is a use for dianetics. But don't put fixing up a body above helping a being. Remember that you are salvaging a being, not his particular peculiarities. You could change someone's peculiarities by finding and running out engrams. If you had an individual with a certain aberration, you could find a chain of engrams to explain it, that, when run, would change his behavior. But there is some more basic reason for his being that way. His more fundamental life has been dedicated to going wrong in that direction, so of course he has accumulated a great number of incidents that demonstrate going wrong in that direction. A scientology technique could release him from this tendency to collect engrams. You had better be sure to go back far enough. For this, you need to have the concept of the spiritual nature of Man. "If you don't accept the spiritual nature of Man, you can't make dianetics work, because it goes back too far." There is a piece of scientology tech that gets him over his tendency to accumulate engrams on a subject: reach and withdraw. With this technique, you can bring the individual up to PT, without bothering to inquire about which mass is causing him to crack up airplanes. This could work for several lifetimes. Scientology is just that much stronger [than dianetics]. It is true that, in one lifetime, several experiences can ruin someone. It is true that as long as the "traumatic shock" is contained in a broken leg, healing can be normal or prolonged. If you ran the incident, even just this lifetime, you would reduce the time of healing from six weeks to two weeks. Use dianetics when injury or illness prevents auditing. Patch the PC up so that you can audit him. In other words, if actual advance of the being is seriously hindered by physical distractions, dianetics is useful as a means of getting rid of them. You might need to run out the PC's efforts to cure the illness. In a short space of time, it blew anyway on the auditing that the PC had had, but there was just a moment when it seemed too overwhelming to permit of actual auditing, so engram running was used to take the edge off." engram running has some use, and one ought to know how to do it. Spectacular things do happen with dianetic auditing. For instance a goiter the size of a large baseball could shrink and disappear in half an hour. The insane can sometimes run engrams and go sane. They are just PTS. They keep wanting to run the incident that the psychiatrist said wasn't true. LRH concluded that being sane or insane has nothing to do with someone's state of case. Many people in institutions have been put there for other causes than insanity. That is one of the things wrong with suspending civil rights because of insanity.

Making the able more able may not be as profitable as it could be, but it is much sounder as a basis for organizational and personal repute and growth. If you set up to cure lumbosis, you are standing on a slippery log across a roaring stream, picking up a boulder. You are in an enturbulated area, and it is risky and prone to relapse. It takes a lot of effort, and the auditor generally gets kicked in the teeth. LRH's records tend to show that it doesn't pay to reward the down statistic. It is getting so that government penalizes the up statistic and rewards the down statistic (rioters, welfare cases, etc.). You could probably be very agreeable with society by rewarding the down statistic, e.g. if you helped the retarded, etc. But when you are standing on a slippery log over a raging torrent, you don't lean over to lift a heavy rock out of the stream. [First build a bridge and bolt a derrick on it.] So we are swimming against the stream of society. So we are holding a constant purpose, trying to help our fellow man. Just doing that would get us someplace. The rest of society has been slipping. If we just held constant, we would win. But we are doing more than that. The size of our movement is growing. Everyone connected with it is getting more able as an individual. The 22 clears are just now enrolling on Part I of the OT Course. The first 30 clears are to get it free. So, as society sinks, we are on a rising platform.

LRH has received an unofficial statement that if he wanted permanent residence in Rhodesia, he could have it. The FDA thing has been dropped by the government. The lawyers are conferring to see how they can give the seized materials back without getting sued. LRH wasn't allowed to appear at the inquiry in Australia, because they knew that it would make them look silly. We win these things, but no one ever announces the fact in the papers. Scientology looks bad, legally, because the newspapers

and other media always report the suits, attacks, and entheta against scientology in banner headlines, and the fact that we always win -- (in court and elsewhere) is never reported. In general, entheta can just be dropped and neglected. This would always be safe for an OT. Further down the line, you must take rapid action.

The problem of what you do with what you know is determined by the framework of the society in which you are working. It is not always the same solution. A violinist who went to perform for some lumberjacks would do well to consider his audience, in deciding what to play. Working within the human race, you monitor your use of technology by the society. Dianetics could be a good entrance point in some societies, e.g. atheistic or materialistic ones. It wouldn't be so acceptable in Moslem or Buddhistic scientology, with its approach to Man as a spirit, wouldn't reach them. Your problem in disseminating is just how to tailor your approach to the group that you are addressing. In dissemination, you must present to a person only that part of a gradient of what you know about existence that the fellow doesn't have to protest and argue with to preserve his own integrity. You are trying to sell him what he already knows, down deep. But this is covered with a lot of false information. Somewhere, however, there is an entrance point. Get the other guy to contribute, somewhat, to the conversation, so you can have an agreement. Never give someone false data, just to get agreement. Your force and impact consists of the fact that you speak the truth. Truth is such a fast arrow that it goes through, without the guy knowing what is happening. He may feel that he is under attack. Give the person something he can use, e.g. data or processing. You can select the pieces of scientology that come nearest to his reality. Estimate the guy's position on the tone scale, his problems, his use for scientology data, etc., when disseminating. If you don't reach to the person's reality level, you will make him feel as though you are attacking him. Give people data they can use, or they won't have much use for it. If you do it right, the reaction you will get is, "Gee: Where has this been all my life?"

Dianetics has an important role in dissemination. It is the finest dissemination material. Use it. People aren't ready (for example) to hear about scientology's O/W techniques. But don't practice dianetics on people. Let them practice dianetics. The greater truth lies in scientology, but the experience lies in dianetics. It teaches people something about the mind. It gives new auditors practice in auditing. LRH has used meter dating with a newspaper reporter to disseminate. He got the reporter's last accident with the meter and managed to turn on somatics.

The statement in the Introduction to Book One that says that any two people can cure up to 70% of people's ills, was put there by Joe Winter, not LRH.

You can direct someone's attention to a picture and key out the picture. You could ask, "Has anyone in your family ever had that problem?" and key out the picture, just by getting him to look at it. Or you could ask, "Are you worried? Did you ever know anyone who was worried? Can you see them worrying?, etc." Just seeing his first picture gives a person case gain.

6608C16 SHSpec-75 Releases and Clears

The problem that we have had with releases is the problem of overrun. We have also had lots of unknown data on the extent of the bank. Buddha made the same mistake: not being aware of the existence of the bank or the mind, 2500 years ago. 10,000 years ago, there was a monk named Dharma. Dharma made the mistake of believing that you didn't have to do anything but become wise. From him comes the basic philosophical assumption that if you become wise, you become free. This is in the woof and warp of today's culture. The idea that an individual can exteriorize and that by doing so he can become free was part of Gautama Siddhartha Buddha's teaching. That hasn't become part of the popular culture yet, so we are slightly ahead of our time. It seems to take 10,000 years for such ideas (e.g. Dharma's idea, given above) to become central to a culture, so Buddha's idea (see above) has 7500 years to go and scientology, on the same time table, has 10,000, minus 16, years to go.

In other zones of the universe, the existence of the mind is known. In the Galactic Confederacy, they have a psychotherapy that consists of a recognition of the fact that, at a moment of fatal accident to a thetan, a picture is made. However, they think that it is a location, not a picture. They take a picture of the location where the thetan was hurt and show it to him with a movie clapstick-like thing slapped in front of it. Then the thetan is supposed to follow suit by doing the same thing to his picture, and thus be free of its effects. That is their way of making releases. That therapy is administered to the releases

in that society that pass for OT's. They are OT releases. That is the closest other therapy to scientology.

Today's concentration on education, universities, etc., is a result of Dharma's ideas on wisdom: the idea that education leads to freedom, that you can't have freedom and ignorance. He had a tough time. 10,000 years ago, Man was more of an animal than he is today, so it was more difficult for Dharma to communicate with them. [It is interesting that education is an outgrowth of a desire for wisdom. Hence scientology is in this mainline. This would be an interesting topic for a lecture or a chapter of a book: the estrangement of wisdom from education.] It was a terrific advance to get the idea of becoming free by becoming wise across to the savages of this planet, 10,000 years ago. This idea is now so widely accepted that the second-largest expenditure of taxes, after the military, is for education. At Dharma's time, there was the knowledge that freedom was attainable, but there was no tech. 7500 years later, Buddha discovered exteriorization. Gautama Siddhartha Buddha first exteriorized under a Bodhi tree. He thought you did it by becoming wise. One of G.S. Buddha's other ideas was that you should be civilized and polite. And Buddhism civilized three quarters of Asia. But exteriorization was not generally doable, to any great degree. The Tibetan Lamas came along later and squirreled, trying to develop an explanation of exteriorization or a technology to accomplish exteriorization.

We are the gainers, from this history, to the extent that there is a history and acceptance of the idea that the soul exists. Our gain is that the idea of the soul has been accepted by many for a long time. The idea that there is a soul that goes somewhere after death has dominated Graeco-Roman and Mohammedan thought for 2000 years. Socrates originated this idea, in the present philosophical tradition. There is a verbal tradition about Socrates in Greece, that Socrates held forth for the existence of a personal being or thetan. Buddhism advanced into the West through the Essenes and Christianity. Later, the Nicene Creed developed from the Dead Sea Scrolls. A hundred years after its development, it was advanced by Jesus of Nazareth, "a powerhouse with an already existing philosophy." The Christian church today has to contend with the embarrassing fact that the Dead Sea Scrolls predate Christ and yet contain the New Testament. This is just the advance of Buddhism in the Western world. Christ studied in the East for thirty years. By the time Gautama Siddhartha Buddha's ideas had gone from India through Greece, Spain, Ireland, etc., they were alter-ised to, "Man has a soul, but it is 'over there', and belongs to God, etc." Buddha' thought became unrecognizable.

There has never before been a clear, only releases. The most that was achieved by any of these former philosophies was release:

1. Dharma: Release by wisdom.

2. Buddhism: Release by exteriorization.

3. Christianity: Release by repentance and being good.

In scientology, we just let Bodhi (i.e. exteriorization) happen. It is not even that significant to us, because we are going for a permanent state. However, if, in the course of auditing someone, he goes exterior, you stop right there. If you go on, you bang him back into his body and into his bank, and he will be ARC broken. A PC exterior is on a harmonic of OT but can't have it. He has had a bunch of losses in the past -- bad experiences, like deaths, associated with exteriorization, and he snaps back in very soon, scared. He is not competent to cope with it. He isn't ready for it.

You can take someone who has been insane and have him go totally sane by exteriorizing him. You can also have someone go out, come back in, and never know it. The formula for popping someone out is, "Try not to be three feet back of your head."

Buddhism spread like wildfire, because it was such clear-cut truth. In one fell swoop, we have capitalized upon the idea that a man who is improved becomes free. We have brought Buddhism's twenty year effort to exteriorize down to twenty seconds. We have found what kept Dharma's efforts from perfection and what barriered Buddhism, in a culture that only accepts Dharma's idea but not yet Buddha's. Don't be discouraged by failures to get instant acceptance for scientology. But notice also that earlier missionaries had bank and therefore haven't had a pure version of the truth that they were spreading. The Christians civilized things somewhat, but there were too many vias to get very good results with Christianity: from Buddha, through Socrates, through the original form of Christianity, through organized Christianity, through various arguments of Christianity. Buddhism spread faster

than Christianity, because Buddha's ideas were closer to those of Dharma. Buddha was capitalizing on Dharma's idea that wisdom would make you free, which was acceptable to his society. It carried the implication that it was possible to be free. Asia knew that there was a possibility of Man becoming free -- a very hard message to get across.

"No matter how information is conveyed, if it is conveyed at all, and it is truth, it will take root." So scientology won't really take 10,000 years to get across. It will be more like fifty years, at the outside, given how fast Buddhism civilized Asia and Japan, and given:

1. The result that we can produce.

2. Modern communication.

3. The slightly more barbaric conditions 2500 years ago. "If you take half a century to get scientology around, you are really slow, man! You notice I said, 'you'!"

When you first address a being, then, you are capitalizing on the past indoctrination and belief of the being. You must take this into account. The Magna Carta is a direct result on education in Dharma, through the church. The Spanish Civil War of 1936 was also the result of the philosophy of Dharma, because, in the decade just before the war, paperback books were introduced. People read French and English philosophers and got the idea that, now that they knew something, they should be free. They actually resisted freedom though, so it backfired. Where you fail, in disseminating, is where you run into someone who doesn't have this assumption. People have to learn that individuals should be free or educated. A government that skimps on education is either one that hasn't heard of the philosophy of Dharma or one that suppresses this philosophy out of fear.

In the West, you are talking to a Christian people who, unfortunately, think of the soul as an owned commodity that they should not play with. They are stunned to think of someone exteriorizing. They are "really not up to the idea of Buddha, [though] they have [gotten the idea of] Dharma." Such people have gone past Dharma but haven't reached Buddha. It is to such people that you are trying to teach scientology. So don't go in over their heads. Fortunately, they do agree with the Gradation Scale of Release. They understand the idea of clear, as someone who doesn't have barriers to his thinking or to freedom of his mind. But they will not understand exteriorization, which is in the realm of OT. So talk about clear, but don't talk about OT.

There are many undercuts that you could teach him. Dianetics is not the lowest undercut. Only a relatively enlightened public will accept dianetics. The public will understand the idea of a communication release as a person who gets rid of his barriers to communication. They can get the idea that a person can communicate better, that a person can be released from an inability to communicate. A wog, who can't communicate, will think that communications release is great for stammerers and backwards children, etc. He thinks it's great for others, in short. But he will buy the idea. Likewise with problems. A wog will buy the idea that "Man would be better off if he could handle problems," and so on, up the line. There is a high probability that you will make a connection, somewhere. The idea that wisdom leads to freedom is basic on this chain. It "releases a man from imprisonment by ignorance and that is your first [form of] release. Teach a person that if he learned something, he would be freeer," and he will be "released from the idea that he can't know." This is the earliest stage of release. You would do well to argue with people on the basis of this first premise: the Dharmic fundamental, because Dharma's idea is the direct ancestor of scientology. There is a lower level of release, one you would use in processing animals. It is the idea that an animal could get an idea across to another animal. This is not communication.

"You have to know you're in something before you can get out of it." That is the main difficulty with communicating levels of release. And people (Psychologists, etc.) "are not aware of the mind. They see another bloke. They don't see any mind.... So he says there is no such thing as a mind," only a brain, which can be seen. But in fact, the brain is just a sort of neural shock absorber.

Looking at scientology as a "philosophy" is agreeable to people. When you put it this way, you are in agreement with the idea that a person can become freer, released from some of his travail, by becoming wiser. So use Dharma in dissemination. Your next level of release that is acceptable to the world at large is that Man is a spiritual being: Buddha's idea. However, don't use this. Wundt, of Leipzig, wiped out Buddha in the West, in 1879, when he introduced the idea that Man was an animal, so it was OK to kill him. This is like the Christian philosophy, advanced in the second or third century AD,

that Man was conceived in evil and was evil, so it was perfectly OK to kill, maim, etc. It was [and is] a justification for overts. The Christian has not found out that the psychologist is an atheist. This is partially due to the inarticulateness of the psychologist. The populace thinks that psychology is silly, but suppressives and governments support it because it prevents releasing. SP's support SP subjects and technologies. That is why the government supports psychology and psychiatry.

In disseminating, you could say, "You are a Christian, aren't you?" Then he has admitted that he is a spiritual being. Reincarnation was only barred in Christianity in the last few hundred years. The former idea was that guys who hadn't been good enough had to come back and live it all over again. If you can get someone to buy the idea that he is a spiritual being, he is released from a truth that could trap him. Possibly this is where you could introduce the idea of exteriorization, but I don't advise it.

Dianetics can give one a release from this one lifetime. That is a terrific release! You have "made" an immortal. The terrible consequences of death go away. You can start with the idea that there is a mind. A, looking at B, doesn't see B's mind, so he doesn't know that B has a mind. He may think that B only has a brain. You have to put across the idea that because this fellow [the fellow that you are talking to] has a mind, that that person has a mind. With dianetics, it would follow that he is immortal. Then he is released from the idea that Man is matter and that he only has one life. Fortunately, people do know that there is such a thing as a mind and mental things. They haven't gotten totally sold on the psychologists' theory that mind = brain. So you can move in and introduce the idea of the mind being composed of pictures. With a little dianetic auditing, the person will realize that he is immortal, and you will have released him from the idea that he is matter. So you should be aware that you can release people just by talking to them, up to a point, but remember: always stop at the "F/N VGI's". Don't try to just communicate the data up the chart. To do so overwhelms people. They have to come to realize it. As you progress up the grade chart, it becomes progressively more impossible to talk them out of what they are sitting in. At Levels VI and VII, it would be fatal.

(An ultimate release would be release from the universe.)

"When we say 'release' we mean 'freeing'. We can free someone from an idea that entraps him. Ideas are the only real traps and one can get released from them. There are many grades of release below Zero. At Zero and up, we are starting to free someone directly from his reactive mind, treating him as a spiritual being. At Level 0, we are pulling him out of a mass that tells him that he can't communicate. So we have to pull him out of mental masses, as well as out of ideas. At Level VII and up, we don't pull him out of mental mass. We erase it. We turn around and eat the tiger. That is a form of release that we call 'clear'. But this being at this level is still in the universe and associated with the body. There are [therefore] grades of release above clear. Not many people below the level of clear look any higher, though, because clear is a pretty triumphant level.

When you get an F/N, shut up, because you have just released the PC from something. You have to know why he got the F/N to get him through Qual [I.e. you have to know what he is released on.] Get this data from the auditing notes, not from the PC. Most stages of release have only relative degrees of stability, but a release never unreleases to the same degree of Stygian darkness that he was in before the release.

A clear is someone who has erased the barriers to his postulating freely. He can, at this point, easily postulate a bank, and some have done so, not realizing that that was what they were doing. A clear can postulate a bank and then not realize that he has done so, or that he can simply blow it.

We are making dianetic "clears". The trouble we had doing it earlier came only from over-auditing people. Also, don't ever try to teach a guy something that he already knows. It is an overrun. A released person doesn't tend to relapse, but he may run into the next higher level's sticky plaster. They haven't unreleased. They are just enterprising and speculative, and this drives them into the next level. Someone who has been released and comes in the next day with no F/N has just gotten into the next mass that he is going to confront.

Releases want others to be released and cleared. But don't release people to make them better for others' sakes. Being released is something that is a reward, not a right.

6608C18 SHSpec-76 Study and Intention

The name of the source becomes identified with the product. Like Kleenex, the name Dharma became identified with the product rather than with the source of the product, so that today, you can't find a correct definition of Dharma anywhere. The word, "Dharma" does not have its original meaning preserved. According to dictionaries, it means:

1. Supreme law.

2. The Caste system of India.

3. Fate.

4. Love.

5. The Way (in Buddhism).

2500 years ago, Gautama Siddhartha said that the Age of Love was to begin in the West in 2500 years. We started the Age of Love by making clears. They talk about love a lot. We are no longer in the Age of Reason, thank God!

A student should be aware of his intention in studying. Faulty source may be important in study. A student tends to assume that the source that he is studying from has some validity, but this isn't necessarily the case. In fact, it frequently isn't the case.

Difficult exams in universities don't correlate with excellence of graduates, because, for one thing, study is an area that attracts suppressives, like the areas of government or healing. For instance, in navigation, the method used is what is tested in exams. But the fact that you can navigate is all the sea cares about. Textbooks on navigation are often so complex that you have to know all about the subject before you can understand the bock. Many textbooks on the sea are full of nothing but disaster, in great detail. Coast pilots are particularly full of warnings and disasters. You could write any subject up to make it a suppressive subject, [by making it seem too dangerous to practice.] On the other hand, you can not give any cautions about the subject, like leaving out the fact that a wrongly-done S and D that gets the wrong suppressive will make the PC sick, because it restimulates [and bypasses] the right one. The mind has been made too dangerous to study.

The writers of textbooks need a knowledge of study materials.

"As you study, what do you intend to do with what you are studying?" For what purpose are you studying? Until you clarify that point, you can't study intelligently. The trouble with university education is that students study to pass exams, not to use the materials in practice. That is scholastic or academic study, which isn't worth much. This is why you get failures in practice after certification. If someone studies just for examinations, he doesn't have to know the exact meanings of the words. Thus we get very educated dumbbells.

Some subjects are taught suppressively and are therefore ethics subjects. Where a subject is very suppressive, it can be studied for examination, needing only to be memorized and spat back, but it can't be applied, because there was nothing there to be understood. Study gone wild leads to suicides. [Cf. French universities at exam time.] People who are very successful in life are frequently the drop-outs, who realize that university texts are not arranged to let you apply anything. Not a single philosopher except Mills stayed in school. A subject that is written up with a slant or curve is relatively inapplicable too. Economics is a good example. Economics hardly exists in its simple purity anymore. Similarly, psychoanalysis has no relation to Freud anymore. Scientology is studied along the same lines that it was researched on. It has no curve to it. If anything is inapplicable, you will soon run into it.

6608C23 SHSpec-77 Organization

A business org pattern wouldn't fit a scientology org because business orgs have never isolated the principles of organization. In a scientology org, you are handling life as a commodity, and you are handling life with a vessel made out of life. This is like trying to pour water into a pitcher made of water. In this situation, you will find out every frailty in an organization. But one law businesses have not violated: Any organization is better than no organization.

Individuals as such, operating together, will fall apart when they collide with an organized group. Brilliant leadership can only go so far. It needs execution. Otherwise it fails. An organization will normally win, unless it is confronted with a superior organization. An organization consists of a group of individuals with a common goal or purpose. There will never be an org that is perfect, because it is composed of individuals who are to a greater or lesser degree informed of the rules and in agreement with the purpose.

An organization must, to some degree, consist of sentient, irreducible individuals. It must depend on the individuals. For instance, literacy is a prerequisite for democracy. England does better than some other democracies because it has a high level of education. Individuals in the U.S. have so many and varying prejudices that none can really take hold. It also has a high level of education. Therefore it is the richest country in the world. Business management in the U.S. is very tight. In spite of bad leadership that will eventually cause trouble, the U.S. is doing well.

Organization also has drawbacks:

1. Limited power of choice of the individual.

2. An organization often swallows up the talents and potential contributions of the individual.

3. It often plays Hobb with the very principles that it is trying to forward.

4. Wrongly led, an organization becomes a machine that goes straight over the cliff to destruction. But the plus points prevail over the out-points. Organizations endure better than individuals. On the whole track, orgs best survived when led by keyed-out OT'. You would think that these individuals would be unorganizable because of their differences of opinion. Yes. They do have differences of opinions. But they still realize that it is better to be organized than not. They also recognize the liabilities of orgs. Higher posts shift a lot in OT organizations. The OT's are a minority group in charge of fantastic majorities.

An individual who puts together an organization without knowing how to do it makes a mess.

Law of Organization: A large organization is composed of groups, and a small organization is composed of individuals. When a large org is composed of individuals the individual gets devalued. You get a lack of comparability [between the individual and the group of which he is a member]. Therefore, the individual feels oppressed. "The people vs. John Jones" makes a paranoid. Therefore, the ideal form of organization is individuals composed into sub-groups. If you try to produce a group that is all composed of individuals and expand it, it goes all to [pieces]. An org will remain a small group as long as it is composed of individuals. Income tax is a violation of this principle, because the individual must report to the government once a year. Thus, quite apart from the economics of income tax [e.g. penalizing up stats], this will make the country grow smaller. Each person can be jumped on by the government without a buffer. You must cut out the situation of having an organization vs. an individual, and stick to the situation of the organization vs. a group.

A group does have an optimum size. Seven or eight subordinates is a lot. If a person had only two subordinates, he would loaf. So the optimum is somewhere between two and eight. So we can say that five is optimal. A big group, then, would be ten and a small group would be two or three. By the time you are getting up into a group of seven or eight, it is best to split things up into two groups. The members of each section look to their section leader. [This also means that an executive spends one sixth of his time consulting with higher management and five sixths of his time dealing with his five subordinates.] A director only looks to his section leaders, and an [Executive] Secretary only looks to directors. A danger condition would consist of an [Exec] Sec giving orders to section leaders, bypassing the director. When this happens, the org will get smaller.

You could move this organizational scheme out to where the org could contain the population of the planet. Size means nothing if you know this law of organization. Therefore you need an expandable and a contractable system. The lowest number in a group should be five to six people. Two people isn't really a group; it is a pair.

When the state breaks down the family as a group, the church, etc., the state shrinks.

When a manager becomes overworked, his area won't expand. Therefore, if you want to expand, make sure your manager isn't overworked.

You can't have a section that is independent of other sections. If you try to have such a section, it will float free and collapse. It must have service and communication connections with the rest of the group.

There are seven divisions on the Org Board. The Org Board is a cylinder, a circle. To show this fact, we put the seventh division in front of Div 1. You enter the org board at the first department of the first division. The org board is organized to impel a particle from the first division on out through the back door. Any particle entered early will shunt late. Div 7 doesn't necessarily catch what is ejected at Div 6, so there is a way out of the org board. If you violate the position of anything on this chart, you cut your throat.

The order of departments was found by trial and error. Earlier on, we got into trouble because we tried to put Origin or Construction in Dept. 9 [now (1976) the Department of Records, Assets, and Materials, in Div 3.] It belonged at Origin, so construction had to be back towards source. If something is mis-positioned on the board, it will be non-functional and will cease to work. The order of the divisions is:

1. HCO. You have to start with communications.

2. Dissem. Dissemination is necessary with the communication. You must tell people what you are going to make.

3. Organization Division (Treasury). This is the division that organizes the MEST for the assembly of products.

4. Tech. This division has to do with production.

5. Qual. This division deals with correction or adjustment.

6. Distribution. This division is to get rid of the product. This is also a sales division. When they are busy getting rid of the product, they are also making new customers that enter at Div. 1.

7. Executive. The first department would be the office of the E.D. or general manager.]

The problem in an organization is one of succession, but if you get management, you don't need succession. The LRH comm approves anything that is not against policy, that the ED wants to do. The U.S. should have the Office of George Washington. Each department should have less than or equal to five sections, or it should be written up again. Then you get subsections, units, subunits, etc.. The org board is a flow chart.

An other primary law of management, the fast-flow system of management: Don't inspect before it goes wrong. This just holds up the activities of the organization and puts in arbitraries. You don't run an organization by being super-nervous. You let something happen. Then you act. Don't put in permanent preventers. Let the flow go.

An organization must produce something. Everyone must have a stat.

The org pattern would do for a government. It is far more socialistic than socialism and far more communistic than communism. Socialism and communism are relatively conservative in comparison. You would introduce individual companies into your organization as service or production units.

The reason why divisions are in units of three departments is that you have the head of the division representing the thetan, and the three departments representing the mind, body, and product, respectively.

6608C25 SHSpec-78 The Anti-Social Personality

LRH has made a complete list of the characteristics of a suppressive person. The purpose of ethics is to get technology in. Ethics doesn't intend social betterment. It only intends to ensure case advance by getting suppressives out of the environment. An auditor must know about this, so that he can recognize and handle PTS and suppressive PCs. This ability to recognize and handle can prevent an auditor from having loses and invalidating himself when an SP doesn't make case gain. When PCs rollercoaster, don't blame the past auditor or the HGC. Blame the SP. A PC who is critical of an auditor has a missed withhold from that auditor. The PC who goes on nattering about the thousands of hours of auditing that he has received, with no gain is another matter. You can be too propitiative towards people, whereupon you can't help them anymore. You exert no control and don't give effective help. LRH never owed scientology to anyone. One of the earliest techniques for controlling PCs, taken from early dianetics, was to walk out on a PC who refused to be controlled, with the R-factor that the session would resume when the PC decided to follow the auditor's directions. At that point, LRH hadn't run into failed psychoanalytic cases and people who had been roughed up by psychotherapy. There were a lot of these people in the first Foundation. They were generally PTS or SP's. These cases are much harder to handle with auditing than criminals. The SP on the case may be nowhere near the PTS individual or the trouble that the PTS causes.

In early dianetics, a PC who got better and then crashed was said to have been "on a manic". A person who is "manic" and then gets depressed, however, has just run into an SP and has gone PTS. "There is no such thing as a 'manic'.... It's just that psychiatrists hate people in that condition, and so they promptly cave them in.... The guy says, 'Wow! At last I realize that I can be sane,' and 'Isn't the world wonderful?' [The psychiatrist says,] 'Ohmigawd! You're in a manic. We've got to give you eighteen extra shocks, [or pills,] etc.'" The psychiatrist says that euphoria is very bad. this explains away a person's getting better. And this will be used by SP's against you, as an argument against scientology. The only reason for cave-in or roller-coaster is an SP!!

Joe Winter's overt was making a deal with the publisher of Book One to write a book to get the M.D.'s into dianetics: A Doctor Looks at Dianetics. He claimed that dianetics was an art, a a "knack" that couldn't be taught. This led to a complete squirrel non-standard tech being spread all over the place, with no results. "I couldn't hold in tech, because I:

1. Didn't have control of it, and 2. Didn't have ethics." Until ethics was gotten in, in organizations, it was impossible to keep tech in and working fully, because there was no way to hold the line and no way to get the suppressives off tech lines. An auditor who doesn't recognize ethics-type cases, i.e. SP's and PTS's, is setting himself up for loses and for eventually quitting auditing.

There is such a thing as a case who doesn't have a wall there, only a picture of a wall. The universe for such a person is a very flimsy mockup, consisting of dub-in. You can run contact processes on such a person [CCH's] and he will come back into contact with the wall that you and I see. Occasionally, he will be startled, while doing objective processes, to see the wall getting shaky and disappearing. You may think that you are making him OT, but you aren't, because the wall is still there for you. If he were OT, it wouldn't be. He will realize that his mocked-up wall is not the wall that is there. This individual doesn't have to be an SP, to have mockups in place of walls. For the SP, people -- every one of us -- are mockups, too. We aren't there. God knows what is there, in the Place where we are standing. A paranoid is a mild version of this. An SP is not a paranoid. A paranoid just thinks people are against him. An SP is a person who is "surrounded by identities which others don't see." The paranoid may see purely imaginary people, who aren't there at all. The SP "creates" his enemies out of the real "whole cloth" of you and me. He doesn't see his enemies unless another real person is there to be turned into a pink alligator, a crazed Indian, or the priests of the Spanish Inquisition. What is really there in the SP's universe is something else, other than people, something very threatening and dangerous. Yet, mostly, this person looks totally sane. He doesn't hallucinate. [He is just delusional.] He is stuck on the track: really stuck. He has never moved beyond the stuck point on the track. An SP doesn't make case gain, because a person needs to have at least a concept of motion on the time track to get from one end of an engram to the other. The SP can't run an engram, because he is stuck in a past moment in time and can't move through through the successive moments of the engram. You or I might have had an incident there for a long time without noticing it. But the SP has had the world there for a long time and hasn't noticed it!

The anti-social personality has been looked at before, but it has never been fully described in earlier therapies. We call such a person a suppressive, because that is a more explicit and accurate term. These are the qualities of the suppressive:

1. We speaks only in generalities. He is always talking about "they" and "everybody". This effects PTS's, so they echo it. But somebody told the PTS. Newspapers speak of "850 Dead on Holiday", but they neglect to state that 85 million people were on holiday. That makes it all look sort of dangerous. Governments, likewise, govern "the people" or "the masses", not the individuals who are actually there. This is where the sweeping generality comes in.

2. He deals in bad news continually and exclusively. He is critically hostile. He never relays good news, but may twist good news to bad. Bad news will be relayed and worsened. A very SP person is so batty, that when he moves up in the world, he makes this the norm.

3. He alters any communication. He never duplicates. (Cf. the game of "Telephone".)

4. He doesn't respond to treatment, reform, or psychotherapy. The really bad SP won't come anywhere near an auditing chair. "The one thing this fellow can not do is confront his own mind." The SP feels that he would go totally insane if he had to take one tiny little look at his mind. That is why the SP goes mad at the idea of getting people to look at their own minds. An SP is afraid that if he deals with the mind even slightly, those spooks will move slightly. SP's cannot be reasoned with on the subject of the mind. Your crime is that you have almost made them confront something that they don't dare confront. And you have almost exposed them, because they are not under good control, and if they love control, they will be put away.

5. He is surrounded by others in one or another state of ruin and cave-in (PTS's). Around such a person we find associates who are cowed, ill, failing, or not succeeding, if not actually driven insane. When you try to treat these associates, they don't keep their gains.

6. He habitually selects the wrong target. This is not conscious. It is not just getting mad at the boss because somebody is mad at you. It is very reactive, in the SP. For instance psychiatrists wreck people and SP's in governments attack us. There is a complete dissociation. It is "Bill failed at college, so therefore we should go on a diet," not "Bill failed at college. Therefore we shouldn't send his brother, Pete." Because the SP attacks the wrong target, he doesn't succeed very will on a job. This is a saving grace.

7. He doesn't complete cycles of action. If he finds out that he has completed one, he has to redo it. He mustn't arrive, and he doesn't arrive, because his time sense is loused up. He doesn't have the idea of consecutive events.

8. He will often confess to alarming crimes, with no sense of guilt or personal responsibility whatsoever. He doesn't know that there is a difference between good and bad behavior.

9. He supports and approves of only destructive, downstat, and criminal groups and attacks constructive ones.

10. He approves of destructive actions and disapproves of good actions. He says, "It is probably a good thing that we had the war, because ... "

11. Helping others is an activity that drives him nearly berserk. However, activities that destroy in the name of help are closely supported. The idea is to get rid everybody or to make them all miserable.

12. He has a bad sense of property. He thinks that the idea that people own things is a pretense, made up to fool people. Nothing is ever really owned, to the SP.

"Delusions of grandeur" and desires to dominate have nothing to do with suppressiveness. The concept of one's own importance does not have any bearing, here. An SP may or may not have the feeling of being very important, as may a non-SP. There is nothing wrong with dominance. This is not the same as suppression. It is what a person does with dominance that counts.

An auditor's skill depends on his recognition of the situation in which he finds himself auditing. When you manage to isolate a series of characteristics that give you a certain expectancy, knowledge of

this data becomes valuable. If you can see several characteristics on an SP in a person, you can predict the rest and unload. This is an ethics case. An auditor should know that there could be more than one SP on the case. He should locate the other SP(s), if the first S and D doesn't get permanent results, even though it was well done. You could do a successful S and D and, at a much later date, the PC could find another SP and roller-coaster from that.

6609C01 SHSpec-79 Gradients and ARC

LRH coaches with the intention of making his student sound and look like an auditor. Coaching is a happy medium between so many flunks that the student quite and so few that he turns into a lousy auditor. Any coaching can be improved. It is easy to coach if you know what the TR you are working on is supposed to do.

The reason for security measures with upper-level materials is because you have to judge the ferocity of the material against the power of the individual that you are giving it to. The only thing wrong with 1950 dianetics was that people were thrown in over their heads. The clearing and OT materials look "So what?" when one has finished them, but not before. If you skip a half a page or glance ahead accidentally while running them, you will get sick. The gradient approach has been a primary and regulating factor in all of scientology. It is a new idea, as an overall idea. A thetan, in particular, responds very well to this approach. He responds better than a body does. You can do a gradient that is too shallow or too steep for your PC if you don't correctly judge his reality level confront, etc." just a little bit tough all the way" is best, but not so tough that you get failures. It should just be hard work. There are PCs to whom everything is automatic.

They have no "trouble" on some process, because they don't perceive the things in the process. They have no reality. In CCH's, there are people who will go through it with no change at all. They are aberrated as coots. There is no reality to it. They don't have to confront doing the process, because they aren't doing it. At person with no reality on lions or tigers can walk though a cage with lions and tigers in it. You must estimate the degree of a person's aberration to draw up an estimate of what gradient to apply to it. If you can't make, e.g., a Grade 0 Release, either:

1. The PC is already a Grade 0 Release.   or   2. Grade 0 is completely over his head.

It is obvious which of these two things is the case, if you know what you are looking for. You can undercut it, if you need to, by raising other corners of the ARC triangle. For instance, if the PC doesn't go release on Grade 0, you could audit the PC on various processes to raise A and R. For instance, dianetic auditing (e.g. lock scanning) words as an undercut . This works even on the insane. There doesn't have to be anybody else there but the auditor. [I.e. the auditor runs the bank.]. Usually it is R that you raise. Affinity occurs in the process of doing this. You still have to estimate correctly what the PC can run. If the PC is in a desperate condition, don't do something desperate. An early entrance point is mimicry. Doing mimicry on someone makes you real to them. It is a low level of communication, but it works very well, especially as a point to at ack, with someone who doesn't attain Grade 0 Release.

If you imitate a little kid, or if you communicate with him, he will like you. He will pick you out in a roomful of people, not because he knows you, but because you are real to him. Below Grade 0, i.e. if comm is really out or is very difficult, you approach with reality as the entry point on the ARC triangle. So you could use mimicry. However, if you validate insanity too long, you will stick the PC in a win for his insane behavior. But you can't invalidate him either. Say the guy complains of spiders all over the wall and himself. Don't invalidate him. Pick out the real reality in what he said ("wall" or "me". To Hell with the spiders.), and focus on that. And don't agree about the spiders. That is a lie, and basically he knows it, so he will know that you are crazy if you agree about the spiders. Ask, "What kind of a wall wouldn't spiders be on?" or "What kind of a wall do spiders like best?" or "Who would you have to be, not to have spiders on you?", and you will shift his reality.

You could get clever with raising reality. LRH did, in the late forties. Unfortunately, lots of therapies sprang from his ran various things. In 1949, "every time I audited anybody while [others were] watching, it became a school of psychotherapy, because they couldn't integrate it.... So it, ill by itself, became an approach, like Gestalt Therapy. They didn't have the basic data: gradient scales, ARC triangle, etc. They just copied one thing used in one case." The error was made, that because this was successful as an entrance point with one individual, the same gradient had to be used on all

individuals. For instance, if the PC has policemen on his front porch, he at least has a porch. Now, the chances are that he has all porches identified A=A=A. If you can introduce [differentiation] amongst porches, you get an increase in reality and an improved state of case. But the squirrels would be stuck in asking the PC about walls or -- worse -- spiders, not realizing that in this case, the proper entrance point would be "porch", a point of mutual reality. You would get the PC to differentiate between porches and drop the A=A=A. The squirrel never cognited on what LRH was doing. He thought that LRH had a "knack".

"Mathematics is in kindergarten on this planet." People on this planet don't understand symbolic mathematics. Symbolic math is not doing algebra with symbols. "It is solving a vast number of non-numerical variables by the use of comparisons, similarities, identities, and differences.... And ... you can't write it down." You mustn't follow the lead of math in applying "the suppressive generality of a number to the specific entity [e.g. an apple, a person, etc.] which is being calculated." Two plus two does not equal and never will equal four. You have to specify "Two what?" When you answer,"what" non-specifically, you have an insanity. Man's math is insane. "Zero" is a wild variable. You must specify "Zero of what?" "In what interesting universe is this zero of nothing?" So every time a formula involves zero, as in nuclear physics, it is a guess which, in fact, is based on experiment, and not on mathematical prediction. These guys really don't know what they are doing in higher math. Logic, ultimately, "depends on you and your concept of reality." Math is actually a low-grade expression of A, R, and C. A, R, and C add up to understanding. Mathematicians, along with others, in denying that you (a being) exist, has dropped out that which uses the math and understands it. "Mathematics cannot exist without live interpretation." It is always you who asks the question and you who receives the answer. If there are no live beings to understand, there is no mathematics.

Math could be defined as a method of memory, devised by a living being to make inanimate objects or other things appear to think or act. You will be able to be as much at cause over the whole thing as you are OT, because the more livingness you exert, the more logical you can be about it. You will be as good, logically, as you are clear. Eventually, you can run up to a point where you don't need mathematics.

One of the baffling things about dianetics and scientology is the question, "How did he figure it all out?" There are lots of formulas. But it is an old line, one LRH is very familiar with. "It's a simple matter of ARC, ... of potential understanding. You can't stand back and hate men and ... find out any R about them. You can't have a total unreality about men -- sitting in some ivory tower someplace ... -- [and hope to get understanding of or reality on Man]. And communication: You can't go about it being careful of what you say and [by being afraid to] hear. Anybody who is easily offended had better never go into the business of understanding, because it winds up only with prejudice.... This, of course, explains ... somebody who's terribly offended by scientology. He's so offended by what he hears [shut down communication], he can't understand anything in the first place." The first requisite on studying life is to be alive, not dead or disciplined or approved of. "In wogs, death really gets people together to approve something, as in, Don't speak ill of the dead." "Therefore, the basis of all scientologic and dianetic research has been understanding." There was no mystery involved, just ARC, plus no fear of saying things or looking at things. "Awareness depends on how alive you are. I'm not trying to say I'm more alive than others. I just am!"

Reality goes lower -- further South -- than communication, and affinity goes lower in reach than reality. This sounds odd, but it is observationally true. Insane people with a very low reality can yet feel enough affection to go sane because I asked them to. Education doesn't work in the absence of A, R, and C.

A, R, and C are the three pins on which you adjust any auditing session and how you select what you do. All auditing sessions go by gradients. There is no need to depart from what is laid out (in the grade chart) in auditing. But what about the zone between the org and the world around you? It is a problem in:

1. Gradients.

2. A, R, and C. For instance, there are two ways to handle intrafamilial relations:

1. Individual processing on a gradient. This is the best way. It is very senior to education. [When ethics is used to get tech in,] it is used to force (the family members to act in such a way that tech can go in]. It is not to give advice.

2. A, R, and C. This is limited if no one is present to understand. If they don't understand, they won't even start [the process of getting into better ARC].

This is the problem, here. We keep looking for some marvellous solution to any individual or organizational problem. Just realize that "there's no solution at any time superior to the ability of the person asking for it to understand. "There is no math that would help figure it out." Mathematics is as Good as it can be employed with understanding and as good as the understanding of who asks and who receives the answer.... The answer to becoming better at mathematics is [to] became clearer. The answer to any problem is to become more alive and more capable of understanding. That is the answer which pays off."

How do you do this? You Get processed, and you process people. You are not in a position in society to reform society educationally. You can't educationally inform the public. All you can say is that there is a way. The world's reality on communication is extremely faint. What they are using the communication media for is a total malicious waste. The newspaper is the modern gossip. A, R, and C in the world today is not good. Higher-level data from scientology is totally out-R. So what can a clear, 0T, or release do? He can remember A, R, and C in disseminating. And he can just be.

Don't let affinity overwhelm the reality. Get the affinity and the reality In. Don't kid yourself. You can feel on affinity and get a reality. Never allow others to cut you back from communication. Then you will understand. Understanding washes away everything. Understanding is a universal solvent.

"Communication ... is always within the reality of the person who can hear it." So your communication must be within the reality of the individual. You err when you tell people Any more than they need to know: namely, that there is a way out. If you tell them more, you bedazzle their understanding. An 0T could overwhelm a guy. He could put him in awe or in a religious frenzy. But the OT is actually putting the other person in a complete unreality is he does this. The more vulnerable a person is, the less capable of understanding he is, and vice versa. "At this particular time, our power exceeds our understanding," though not by much, and this won't continue to be true. So we get into a crisis situation: "Do we get so tired of them we just overwhump them, or do we stay true to our own beliefs and, continuing to suffer the slings and arrows that are thrown at us, still go along in a high state of ARC?" There is no real argument. The answer is the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics.

So the question is beginning to come up, "What are we going to do with this planet?" The only mathematics that will solve this question and the question of how to protect people at lower levels of awareness is the mathematics of ARC and the Axioms. We have to be gingerly, because those on the way up the bridge need protection. The power of scientology will inevitably be used for the greatest good of the greatest number of dynamics. The question is how to minimize the casualties along the way. But LRH doesn't have any canned answers about what we will do with the planet. He has a plan for keeping scientologists from being wiped out in a cataclysm. We are at a crossroads as our power increases. We have been very forbearing. We have to rely on good sense and on keeping our reality from degenerating to where it no longer matters what happens to the little guys. Every religious organization of the past has flunked this test. I hope we don't. Luckily ARC increases as one goes up the levels towards OT.

6609C08 SHSpec-80 States of Identity

Apparently, there is a boundary, beyond which you don't have thetans; you have endowment of a form with life: the little things that wiggle. For instance the amoeba or the cell is endowed. An OT comes along and says, "Let there be chicken!" He leaves a puddle of theta to animate it. this is the concept of how bodies are built. There is some truth in the idea that talking to flowers makes them grow better. 'Way back someplace, the thetan probably did something like this. The "green thumb" phenomenon is perhaps a lower-scale harmonic of this. There do seem to be people with a green thetan. Other natural abilities of thetans sometimes get preserved in or by individuals in an out-of-control state. So you get telekinesis, telepathy, child geniuses, etc. Jung had trouble with "poltergeists". Actually, he was subject to a form of below-awareness telekinesis. Some skills that are on automatic will temporarily vanish in the course of clearing. Suddenly you find that you can't do it anymore. But when it comes back, it is you doing it, instead of a machine or something.

Jung went into only one past life -- that of the English Druids.

Anything wrong with a thetan is a lower harmonic of that he can do, higher up on the scale. When that goes wrong, his ability on it goes into an inversion or goes out of his control and still happens in his vicinity, as with Jung, and puzzles him. It is just a little facet of his ability that has been brought down with him and not yet eaten up. Boy wonders tend to fold up because they don't know that they are doing it. It is not under their control. The musical child prodigy has probably been a good musician in the near past. As you go upscale, you tend to lose circuits.

If we exempt endowed states of wiggle, we can find out how far down [in the fifth dynamic] a thetan can go. The answer is: someplace in the insect or animal kingdom. Above that, you get thetans; below that, wiggle. Sometimes you run into a horse who is a thetan, and sometimes you run into one that isn't. Or a bee who was and a bee who wasn't. When nothing much is required of an animal or insect, you can get survival as just a piece of automatic machinery, unchanging in habit pattern, etc. It is a shadow of a thetan because a thetan made it. You occasionally find vegetables in the human race: [bodies without thetans]. Maybe sometimes some thetan picks up the body and it changes spectacularly.

A body can survive, although not well, without a thetan. When it has been totally guided by a thetan and the thetan leaves, the body isn't on any automatic functioning, and it won't do well. Also, if a thetan caves a body in, the body won't do well. A body will only get as good as you take away what is caving the body in.

Most mammalian bodies live six times as long as it takes them to grow up. Thus Man's lifespan should go to 110-120 years. The reason why it doesn't is that the human body is driven by a thetan. An aberrated thetan causes a sick body. A thetan with a service fac is quite capable of keeping a body from getting well. As a society becomes more aberrated, it becomes more sick.

One form of endowed life may destroy another form. So it shouldn't upset you that you can cure up the thetan and the body doesn't get well. There are a variety of illnesses that a body suffers from because it is being messed up by a thetan who, with his intention and aberration, is influencing his physical body. That body will get as well as you relieve the aberration of the thetan in those sectors where the thetan is causing the body to get sick. Therefore, don't assume that all that is wrong with the body is the mind. But, in addition to the effects of the thetan on the body, there is also a different seement of illness, caused by endowed life units that are designedly contrary to the body's life units, e.g. disease germs, [parasites, worms, etc.].

Then there is physical injury. If you hit a body with a battering ram, it doesn't matter what state the thetan is in. The body is going to go, "Splash!" If a body is badly Guided, it is smashed often. So you can reduce this category of bodily ills by fixing up the thetan so that he has fewer accidents. However, some accident is pretty inevitable in an uncleared environment. Another factor is the repairing ability of the being. If one were really upscale as a thetan, he could patch up or repair the body directly, or he could mock up a new one:

Lower Scale Manifestation: The thetan stops knocking the body about.

Upper Scale Manifestation: The thetan can put the body back together again.

So there are three sectors of attack on a body:

1. Endowed life attacking the endowed life of the body.

2. Aberration of the thetan influencing the body.

3. [Mechanical damage to the body. This would include chemical damage (poisons, lack of air, etc.).] And there are three basic means of cure:

1. The thetan can repair the body directly.

2. You can use beneficial endowed life units (as in antibiotics) to help the body.

3. You can repair the body mechanically, as with surgery. Here, you can repair damage [or misplaced parts -- e.g. from faulty construction of the body] or cut out endowed life forms [infected tissue or

cancerous tissue] that attack the endowed life of the body. [Chemical repair could be in this category also, e.g. antidotes, oxygen, water, etc.]

Therefore, to assume that you can cure everything with auditing is as silly as to assume that you can cure fear of spiders by means of neurosurgery. Beings do tend to an "allness", a cure-all propensity. "As long as you are not able to endow matter with life, you have to settle for what you've got." You have to live with the body you've got, or do without one. So you have to decade whether you are looking at:

1. Endowed life forms countering each other.

2. Pure mechanical injury.

3. Something the thetan is doing to the body.

You are better off in the last sphere. The first two need to be handled in an emergency, but the thetan is quite capable of preventing a body from recovering, e.g. with a service fac. So auditing can act as a before or after adjunct to the handling of (1) or (2), above. You could make a thetan less susceptible to (1) or (2), and you could come along after the fact and speed up healing, to the degree that the thetan was preventing it from happening. Your only mistake is to run the incident while it is still going on. Treat it first. And don't get into an allness about auditing and its healing effects.

The mechanism of miracles, using religious relics or tokens, e.g. a saint's knuckle bone, is a restimulation of the curative abilities of a thetan, if they existed. That is, the thetan's idea of his own power is restimulated by demonstrating that there is power somewhere. nut this is a mental Intervention. Faith healing restores, momentarily, a thetan's OT ability to do something with the body. It has drawbacks, since every now and then, when a body was endowed by thetan A, when thetan B comes along and puts some life into it, it will get sicker. Some faith healers have not lost the ability to endow life or change the life endowment of a body.

You can look around the eyes and get the stars that you can see surrounding them. These are little gold balls. Throw them away and put in your own, and you can get sicker. Bodies don't like having their anchor points messed around with or exchanged. To complete the experiment, throw your gold balls away and get the other ones back.

There are many things that Man didn't know about beingness or life. Therefore he made fantastic mistakes. Don't make these mistakes. Recognize Man's limitations relative to this. Recognize also that they are not your limitations, but that they are Man's. Therefore, you need an understanding of states of beingness. A caved-in thetan is on a reverse. He is totally the unknowing effect of his own cause. Anything he can do is being done, but he is not doing it. He has lost some of his ability to have even that happen. He is totally gone. So estimate how far down he can go. He can go down to being the effect of the effect of the effect, etc. of himself. But this is 'way beyond his reality, so don't expect him to got any reality on how he is doing it.

When you get a body animated by a thetan, as opposed to having a body that is merely endowed, you go into a fringe that is well below being oneself or being conscious. One is sort of automatically awake, automatically existing, with no responsibility for being alive, awake, or existing. Just below that, you get unconsciousness. Below where he has a clue that he is conscious, you are getting down to the lower dregs [of thetanhood] and the upper strata of the human race. The thetan conceives that he is a body: endowed life and no more. He is a removed something. He is an identity, a body. He can be picked up rapidly from there to the state of Grade 0 release: quite a distance. A Grade 0 release is less the effect of causes, but he is not up to causative alertness. He is awake or groggy on an effect basis. As he improves, he gets to be less the effect. both of his own cause and of others' cause.

A guy who is really low down on cause is the effect of anything that occurs anywhere. He worries about "train wrecks 8000 miles away." He could go downscale from that point, so that he doesn't worry anymore, because he doesn't exist and isn't worth anything, so it doesn't matter what he is the effect of. He can go down below that into faith: "I have an automatic regulator of my destiny, so I don't have to be alert or be concerned about anything, because something somewhere is taking care of me." This isn't necessarily connected with a religion. People will mock this state up for themselves, without even knowing that they are doing it. At this point, the thetan is totally irresponsible. Going downscale from there, he goes into a sort of numbness -- a further release from responsibility. Below

this, he is subject to any number of automaticities, which, if triggered, would produce a total, certifiable insanity. The majority of the human face is about a quarter of an inch above that.

That is why many people don't listen to you. Their state of beingness isn't up to it. You must keep the above in mind when asking a wog to look at responsibility. An individual, asked to look at his mind as a cause or an effect, can get into such anxiety, instead of looking into himself, that he goes frenziedly mad. Say that we were in an arena. Someone let in a tiger, and you said to Joe, "Jump over the railing and deal with the tiger." He would think that you were joking at first, but if you tried to force him over the railing, you would have a fighting, screaming person on your hands, who would be liable to say most anything. So it is with the SP, when you get him to look at his mind, e.g. to look at breakfast. SP's aren't trying to disprove scientology. There is no doubt in their minds that you could make them do things, and the thought terrifies them. The SP thinks that you are likely to drive him mad. SP's think that they are public benefactors who are discrediting scientology so that people won't have to look at their minds. An SP is below being able to be the effect of anything, even an automaticity. So when you bring him upscale, the first thing he has to confront, that he might possibly be the effect of, is the mind, and he goes, "Sting!" He goes a bit insane. SP's are below the level of Insanity. [So they have to come up through a band of insanity. Cf. R.D. Laing's idea that the path to sanity is through insanity.] They are below the level of being the effect of anything, good or bad. Any effect is bad, so they have to be an automatic thing [cause] that has an automatic effect. Actually, they are a and A'ing with an endowed self. Your presence, however, can bring them upscale. You can be up to the point where your ability to endow is on automatic, and you get guys twitching around you. When you get to OT, that comes under control.

There has [always] been a way up and a road out, but it hasn't been pursued, because philosophers are thoughtful types. They are noted for being reasonable and getting themselves martyred. But few stand up strongly when the firing squad marches down the street. Voltaire got reasonable. A breakthrough like this isn't a scholarly affair. It has to be done with a "Here goes nothing!" attitude. To follow up on scientology, a person would either have to be very reassured in a very quiet environment for a considerable period of time, if the person was pretty bad off, i.e." normal". He would have to be calmed down before he could confront something. The percent of people who can confront is the upper one percent of the planet. When you have the ability to confront, it is possible that you could exert enough influence on the environment ("possible" is a horrible understatement) to calm it down to a point where he could confront and disenturbulate it enough to make gains.

To handle the insane, you go down to what he can confront: being still in a still environment, with no one worrying him, with one solid, stable object. You could let him disenturbulate in this environment. The psychotic "doesn't have engrams that make him insane.... He is insane because his ability to confront the environment in his immediate vicinity is so low that he could never possibly take his mind off [his environment] long enough [to look at his mind. It is] too dangerous. Just as your super [SP] screams when you tell him to confront his mind, the psychotic screams when you tell him to confront the environment." Hence, a quiet environment is the only "cure" for insanity. "Insanity is a study of environments. It's not a study of the mind." There is no reason to audit the insane at all. When the environment is very safe and the individual is no longer actively insane, then, on a very light gradient, you could get him to confront the mind.

Scientology's problem is not the problem of making one OT. If clears have trouble communicating with wogs, OT's have even more trouble. You could endow a crippled boy's leg with life and heal it. This would be OK, unless you tried to explain what happened. Possibly, he would come upscale to faith, but he would be more likely to go into terror than into faith.

Your main line is the improvement of the being who is willing to be improved. Doing this, you will get enough improved beings to handle the problems in society that must be handled to snap the society out of being insane. You don't want to lift people up by faith, though, but by hope: the hope that maybe some day they could do something about it. First, you give him the hope that you can do something for him or about it, then that he can do something about himself and "it". Then the small hopes materialize.

States of beingness that Man will recognize do include saints, gods, miracle men, and messiahs -- all sorts of beings. Because Man is familiar with Superman, Batman, etc., he tends to attribute these characteristics to anything that is a step forward for Man. In the past, they would have attributed the characteristics of saints to scientologists. In Greek society, it would have been the characteristics of gods. Man is capable of conceiving of such beings, as long as they are unreal and exterior. They are

OK if looked at through a holy book or something. "What Man can conceive and what Man can confront are two different things." A Catholic priest professes a belief in supernatural phenomena, but what would he do it Christ's hand suddenly appeared, disembodied, and started turning the pages of his breviary? "Similarly, what a being can conceive he can become and what he can confront being" -- there is a gap between these two things.

We need further definition to distinguish clears and OT's. A clear has lost the matter, energy, space, and time connected with a thing called "the mind". He is not an all-knowing being. He moves up through becoming cause over the matter, energy, space, and time of his mind. An OT is a being who is knowing and willing cause over life, thought, matter, energy, space, and time. That definition doesn't say, "a mind". "Life" includes endowed cells, not only or necessarily other thetans. The OT may or may not be able to handle another thetan, but he can handle this commodity called "life". So there is a big gap between clear and OT. A clear makes a not-too-aberrated human being almost fly into pieces. This happens to a minority of people, but it does give an element of fear connected with clears. You are making people confront something that is somehow a little bit within their ken. You will not find them tracing the source of it. It isn't bad for them. If they sat around long enough, they would run out all the pictures. A clear puts "normal people at effect, without trying to do a thing. He just has a sufficient zone of beingness, that what falls into that zone ... is liable to be ... as-ised ... or go into some sort of action." Sometimes people fear clears a little and don't quite know why they feel that way. They don't necessarily associate the feeling with the clear.

Even a Grade IV release can be so much calmer and more at cause than the environment, that his presence can be therapeutic. So, as you come downscale to a Grade IV release, they stand out rather remarkably, and they are still a little bit out of reach. As you go downscale from there, you get [a person who is] more able to disseminate, because he more closely matches the reality level of the rest of the environment. As you go down the release stages, you get closer and closer to an ability to influence another without causing a mess, directly, immediately, understandably, and without restimulation. The bridge stays in, as a gradient for dissemination. Even the Book One clear was looked upon with considerable awe.

A Bodhi is probably below a dianetic release. It is stable for from two seconds to two years. But Buddhism's promise to make a Bodhi was enough to civilize three fourths of Asia. Having moved out of the reality of wogs, the scientologist tends to compare himself with other scientologists. He is unaware of his state of beingness until he is surrounded by wogs. That makes him somewhat unhappy in the company of wogs. As you go up towards clear, this is less true. If you go out in the wog world as a clear, they don't spot you as source. You tend to produce certain phenomena. You give the impression of being in command even when you don't do anything to command. People will say, "I have to concentrate to talk to you," or "You have such a command of the situation," when nothing is being commanded. You don't bother to use this. Mainly, life becomes easier.

The pity of these states of beingness is that there is a limit to what one being can do for another. You can do a lot, but you can't live another's life for him. What you can do is:

1. Provide a safe environment.

2. Show a way, a methodology.

3. Provide for the ethical application or administration of methodology.

4. Give advice.

5. Pervade the environment with calmness.

6. Mock up a new leg for a crippled boy.

But that is the limit. The rest is up to the other guy. Unless you lead the person to increase his own beingness, he will never arrive. This is the point that has been missed in all prior attempts to better Man. The only "miraculous intervention" there is or ever will be, comes from the person himself. He must overcome the terror of becoming the effect. He must be led upwards by an unenturbulated environment to destimulate enough so that he can put his own feet on the road out and walk. You can help him only with those first steps. Helping the individual is the only way to help humanity out.

6611C01 SHSpec-81 Government and Organization

A good government is in the realm of invention at this point. Man is so afraid of a bad turn in a benign monarchy that he can't have one. He is afraid of an SP getting into power. Also, a benign monarch can't wear all of his hats. What makes a government bad is that it gets an SP into it. One SP breeds others, as an SP wants other SP's around him. Generals that advocate wars of attrition are SP's. They are just trying to knock off as many troops as possible. The best military training is to do the most in the least time at the least expense, and to keep your own people from being banged up. The objective is to win. That is the proper conduct of war. You also want to inflict the least possible damage to the enemy, because you will have to put the enemy back together again if you win. This is a proper war. But the last four wars were wars of attrition.

All governments consist of a body of beings against the individual. The better a government is, the less against the individual and the more for the individual it is. Total suppression exists where the government is everything and the individual is nothing. The opposite extreme can be equally suppressive: Anarchy, where the individual is everything and the government is nothing. In an anarchy, any bum or suppressive is totally at liberty to knock anyone on the head.

There is no perfect government. The individual is as close as you will get to a perfect entity. Why do you need a government? Because any organization can win over individuals. We thetans got to where we are today because we didn't organize as a body of thetans. Instead, we let the bad guys organize into a body to get us. This is the only big omission on the track. OT's didn't handle it on their own feet. Any group of organized humanoids can defeat any OT. However, this requires that one know something about the laws of organization. Without an organization, the individual would have to maintain constant vigilance, because he only has to lose one battle to lose everything.

You want an org that is minimally restrictive and maximally effective. In a benign monarchy, the individual doesn't have to have much say, because everything is taken care of. When you turn over the government to a group, however, confidence in the government is shaken and the individual must have a say. Of course you don't let individuals make all the decisions. This would lead to a clown government. No individuals can all know enough to be meaningfully involved in every little thing. There never has been a democracy. The Greeks never had a democracy. Just fifty landowners formed a senate. The senators didn't even represent anyone. Therefore, it was not even a republic.

Republicanism is a mean between the extremes. If you make proper qualifications necessary for the holding of office, e.g. that a person not be below Grade IV, that person and other similar ones, forming a senate, being specialists in the issues at stake, could be sufficiently informed and have enough time to think about it to actually govern. So if scientology took over, you would have a republican government.

After you have chosen the governor, he is free to govern, without any "Yak! Yak!", unless some weighty issue comes up for a referendum, e.g. a change in the status quo or in the form of government.

England's failure to allow the American colonies representation in Parliament was an error in tech that caused a rift. When a group feels that it can't be heard, it ARC breaks. This is the sort of ARC break that always precedes a war. Hitler said something that wasn't acknowledged, and vice versa. So thirty million men were killed. In emergency situations, a benign monarch is the best system. There is no time to consult anyone anyway. But in time, a benign monarch gets tired and overworked, and he can't acknowledge everybody who speaks. So, unless he gets backed up by a representative body, you get a dissolution of the organization. The nominal head of the organization should be out of the way, except in an emergency, while the country is run by a representative body corporate. Such a body has great liabilities. There is a lack of total responsibility [to the constituents], so individuals in the group don't think fast enough. Therefore it is best not to have a generalized body corporate running the government. It must be specific in its representation, unlike the pattern of a board of directors. Each member of a board of directors nebulously represents "the stockholders". However, here, there is cross-representation. This generality goes into suppression. If "the people" are represented, then they could [logically] only be represented by one person. That is why a benign monarchy works. There is no cross-representation. But as soon as the monarch gets a body of advisors, that doesn't represent the people. More than one representative would have to represent exact segments of the population. When too many people are represented by one person, the distance becomes too great, and the people feel unrepresented. But if they can communicate with their

representative and get action, they feel that their governmental hat is well taken care of, so they can relax. The U.S. has two senators per state. This violates the above principle of representation. Electoral districts, however, do have direct representation. There is a further representation in state government, which can receive [certain] orders from the federal government. The U.S. government, however, has no representative in Colorado. It only has covert agencies there. The Colorado state assembly cannot address the U.S. Government. There is no direct line from the state assembly to the U.S. assembly or the Senate.

Before you can have a governmental system [that is any good], you have to have the tech of scientology to detect and improve abilities in people and ethics tech to detect suppressives. You also need the communication formula, ARC triangle, ARC break tech, etc.

If the people have a senator, why have a representative? The outcome is that the individual states and the U.S. government are in violent conflict. Hence the Civil War. When these comm lines don't exist, an individual goes into apathy. You get a dictatorship of "the people" vs. the individual. Or you get a situation where every man is the dictator. Representation can be pretty big, because not everyone appeals at once. But if everyone does appeal at once, then the representative had better do something fast. War is caused by incompetent government, which causes a breakdown in the comm line between a [constituent] group and the society that surrounds it. The society that surrounds it may be so incompetently governed that the inner group has to be nearly perfect to work its way forward. Scientology has this quality. We also keep trying to be better, at least whenever there is a down statistic.

In scientology, there are lots of built-in safeguards in the system, so there is no immediate need for elective representation In the future, elections will be required, when scientology gets bigger. Then exact representation will occur. No junior governing body may be given orders by any senior governing body, in which it is not represented. Conversely, very senior governing bodies should not give orders to junior governing bodies, from which they do not have a representative. That ensures a two-way communication situation.

The Advisory Council. The International Advisory Council would be made up of representatives of continental parts of the world and executives who represent types of divisions of orgs. It would have about fifteen members. Rule: No one may initiate a motion unless that motion has been formed into an issuable directive. If a person wants a policy letter framed, he must write it up. Rule: The chairman is given the power of absolute veto, unless three quarters of those present vote to continue discussion or voting. This will prevent endless hobby-horsing. A proposal could be referred for special study elsewhere, to be brought up later. This way, point of origin of policy letters is stated, since that person wrote up the policy letter before it was passed.

Members of the International Advisory Council represent the continental Advisory Councils, but they also represent all orgs on that continent. Therefore, someone from part of that continental area who feels that he is being done in, or something, could write to his representative in the international body. As the system expands out, the individual would find out that he had a representative in his local continental body.

A member of the ad council, on majority signatures, can get an urgent directive out on short notice, provided a B. of I. is convened later to determine if it was the right action. Unless a policy change occurs, an ad council directive is only in effect for a year, unless a policy letter is issued. The purpose of this rule is to prevent arbitrary laws from being arbitrarily introduced needlessly.

The advisory council has representatives from five continental areas plus one from St. Hill and a divisional organizer [for each division]. He represents every divisional secretary of that division in the whole world. His job is to compile all the materials and specifications. It is too much work for such a person to do this and hold another hat at the same time. So if a person can't get books, for instance, he would write the Div 2 divisional organizer. If the stat of the divisional organizer is down, he would get into being an authority. He can get militant in the ad council. The ad council can then issue what the divisional organizer has already written up in advance. It is issued on the flash color of that division, and it applies only to that division. The Divisional organizer is not operating those orgs, so he does not act as a bypass of the OES of those orgs.

Conversely, we will have the St. Hill or WW representative in continental ad councils. LRH comm can also serve this purpose. He has no authority, but he can be talked to, and he can explain what WW is doing.

Every divisional secretary in orgs becomes a member of the ad council [for that org]. The LRH comm is also on that org's ad council, to represent HCO. Thus we get an eight-man ad council.

Sooner or later, we will need a representative of the ad council in each of the divisions [of the org].

With a continental org that has three other orgs plus itself, you get four ad councils, composed of secretaries and exec secs. Thus, you get a ten-man ad council, [composed of the seven divisional heads, plus the LRH Comm, plus the OES plus the HAS.] Each junior org would have to have a representative in the senior org.

We are dealing with basic ethics and organizational tech.

It really helps to have all beings in the org cross-policed by stats. Stats don't ever "happen". They are always made, and you have got to find out what is making them. In a downstat situation, the errors are always gross. The greatest source of downstats is: no personnel on the-post at all.

If you get a stuck flow going on for too long, with no return flow, you get an apathy on the other end. [Cf. the S.O. 1 Line] People want to talk to LRH to find out if he is there. It is to get the back-flow going. The main problem is in the relationship between the individual and the corporate body. A corporate body that can't act swiftly will cause a lot of upset. A situation where any citizen can clobber the corporate body is equally suppressive, because that person will also clobber other individuals. The problem is to set up something that resolves the relationship between the corporate body and the individual.

1. The individual must be able to get justice from the corporate body.

2. He is entitled to bright management.

3. The corporate body can expect contribution and compliance from the individual. All it takes to make an organization is to avoid violating these. When you get the consent of the people and respect for the government, the thing will go on and on.

On other planets, Empire selection of governors was based on state of case.

When you put in a government, put in a review of that government. This happened to some extent in the U.S. with amendments to the constitution, but no one reported back to the original body that created the government.

A governed people who do not understand the theories or postulates of the government or the laws, can be pretty dismayed and confused. They are afraid that the relationship between the government and the individual will not be safeguarded. They may even be represented and don't know it.

6611C29 SHSpec-82 "OT" and "Clear" Defined

A majority of scientology's major executives are now clear. LRH noticed that the statistics of divisions were in roughly the same range as the case state of their heads.

We have tried to put together a scientology dictionary. It requires work from LRH to make sure that the definitions are complete. He will take students' requests on cards and define the words.

OT: Operating Thetan. "Operating" means "Manipulating, handling". You operate a car, etc. Also, oneself can operate; one is operative. "Thetan" is from the Greek letter, theta, traditionally used to mean thought. The letter "n" is added to "theta" to make the noun, "thetan". We mean by "thetan" "A life unit ... a being. An individual who is alive and who is capable of thinking [and being] -- a spirit inhabiting the body." In Greek times, theta was the thought in a person, as opposed to his body. The thetan inhabits the "clay" and moves it around. To that degree, anyone who can move is operating as a thetan. But "OT" means someone who "can operate without a body.... A being who is cause over

thought life, matter energy, space and time." Someone who is being cause is being "a source of action or impulse," as in cause-distance-effect. This state is quite different from the state of clear. It is someone who can operate without the encumbrances of the common clay. There are degrees of operation.

Wog. A "common, everyday garden-variety humanoid.... He 'is' a body. [He] doesn't know he's there," etc. He isn't there as a spirit at all. He is not operating as a thetan. The term comes from "Worthy Oriental Gentleman", from the days of the British in Egypt. A humanoid is one who has human characteristics, by which we do not mean that he is human in his treatment of things. He isn't. It is simply that he is a body. He isn't there as a spirit at all. He will develop a philosophy that says that everything is matter, including the self. Wog is not the bottom end of the scale, which would include psychotic, neurotic, catatonic, etc. This would be someone who didn't even know that he was MEST. OT isn't the top end of the scale, either. At the top, you would have a harmonic of the wog: "a thetan who didn't have to operate ... at all," in an almost unattainable absolute, outside of MEST altogether, so he would be serene, calm, and dissociated with the physical universe -- not in the time-stream. Someone at the bottom of the scale is the effect of everything. He has to cause everything and can cause nothing. Someone at the top would be potentially able to cause everything, but wouldn't have to. But this is a no-game condition, and thetans are idiotic enough to like to have a game going. A PTP exists when one has to do something about something. When audited thoroughly, a person is no longer affected by the problem. Similarly, in Serenity, one doesn't have to do anything about it. But one of the native characteristics of a thetan is messing around. He gets bored at Tone 40. So just below 40.0, you get OT.

At the beginning of the universe, the thetan was potentially omniscient and omnipotent, but he had no experience and knew nothing. He was pretty stupid. When you put someone back to the state of OT, you are putting somebody back who is different from anyone else on the track. He is operating with experience. When we say, "OT", we mean "clear OT". A released OT is someone who is exterior and feeling great; feeling powerful. For just plain OT, we can just call it "exterior". There has hitherto never been anything but a released OT. There are two parallel lines:.

1. How much is someone out of his bank?   and   2. How much less bank does he have?

Using techniques developed in 1952, you can bang nearly anyone out of his head. He then exhibits the characteristics of a being who is not influenced by a body. This state can last a third of a second, or it can last three hundred years. It will make someone sane who is insane, but since one has aberrations as a being, not just as a body, exteriorizing doesn't get rid of all his aberrations.

Gautama Siddhartha was exteriorizing people in 523 B, making a state called "Bodhi". We can make a Bodhi (a Buddha) in thirty seconds. The Lamas in Tibet developed practices to assist exteriorization. When the Lamas couldn't exteriorize people, they redefined "Bodhi" to mean someone who was calm, refined, serene and had benign conduct. It is the mental mass that prevents exteriorization. This mass is a composite of the thetan's own pictures and aberrations that pins him to the body. Some people are harder to exteriorize than others.

It is the mental mass called "the mind", with its pictures and masses, that prevents some people from exteriorizing. A thetan exterior is simply outside a body. This happens inevitably at death. It is only the worry about getting a body that makes a thetan unhappy. An operating thetan is a thetan exterior who can have, but doesn't have to have, a body, in order to control or operate thought, life, matter, energy, space, and time.

Nirvana was added to Buddhistic doctrine at a later date. The original idea was just to get away from the continual cycle of rebirth. There is no goal to operate in Buddhism, however.

Someone who is a thetan exterior but not clear or OT may be in very bad shape. He may barely be able to get to a maternity ward. He has no power of choice over what body he gets. Etc. And sometimes, a thetan suddenly regains his OT abilities, without knowing how he did it. This is quite rare. It frightens observers. Suleiman, in The Arabian Nights, produced a big scare about thetans. [LRH describes the embarrassment of the thetan in a battle, who hasn't noticed that his body has been killed, and who just keeps hewing away at the enemy on the battlements, until he notices that what he thinks is his sword goes through the enemy without touching them. Then he looks down in the mud and sees his old body.] A very aberrated OT could exist. He might accidentally discover that he can move MEST, make sound, etc. He is liable to do most anything, because he is operating

automatically. He is not able to control these manifestations. E.g. he may produce poltergeist phenomena. This would be a released OT. Those beings can be upset. This is a higher-scale wog amongst thetans.

It is also possible to be exterior, knowingly, but unable to move anything or cause things. One eventually gets tired of this and wants a new body. Previous released OT's had no one with whom to associate. A person who went thetan exterior had no hope of anything else. He had a shut track. Therefore the game of being a body became functional. Actually, an OT could mock up a body out of whole cloth. How else do you have a body? An OT like the above, with or without the ability to move objects, is not a clear OT. He is a released OT, since he doesn't understand his state or what he is doing. But the scientology definition of OT is clear OT. "A clear OT knows what [he has done and what he] is doing.... He is a clear who can operate like Billy-O." CLEAR

"A thetan without a bank," in or out of a body. The source of the bank, the being himself. He is making himself the unknowing and unwilling effect of his own bank. He is causing himself to receive, unwillingly and unknowingly, the effect of his own bank. The person compulsively makes up pictures. When he is bad off, all he's got is a blanked-out picture, a black mass that covers up the picture, or pressure that crowds the picture into oblivion. [The Black Five.] Below that, you get random pictures that flick by on automatic. The word, "bank" is taken from electronic computer terminology, meaning a card system, a file system. The machine pulls out certain data cards and puts them into operation or computation in the machine, so that the machine can solve problems. The bank-bound thetan is peculiarly affected by and operates on banks. "There is no such thing as a crazy thetan. There is a thetan who is mocking up craziness that he is the effect of." Otherwise, there would be no hope. You can ask a guy with a fixed picture or a chronic picture, "What part of that could you be responsible for?" This is a good process for the guy who doesn't know that he has a mind. Someone can be so not-ised that he isn't aware that he has a mind. The level of not believing in a mind is below the level of not being able to see the mind, or pictures. Above being able to see the mind is not having one. "All [mental] masses do is not furnish you with data as they seem to do but charge the area of the data up, so that you can't directly recall it, and you get hit ... by the picture [or mass], and you think the picture is giving you the data. So therefore you 'mustn't get rid of the picture,' because if you got rid of the picture, then you 'wouldn't have the data.' ... This is silly, because if you didn't have the picture, then you could recall it all," without consequences. A clear doesn't have a mind, in that he is not the effect of this picture mechanism. But the clear still has the MEST universe around, and he still uses a body that isn't very strong and is made of cells that aren't invulnerable. So the fact that a person is clear doesn't say that he won't get sick, because there are such things as bacteria and viruses, and the body has finite strength. It is idiotic to measure a clear by his health.

When a clear exteriorizes, he may be a clear exterior, unable to talk, etc., like a baby having to learn to walk. The state is stable, since he has no bank to snap him in again. When a person is clear, he can more easily become exterior.

[There are 140 clears as of this date, according to LRH.]

Getting someone from clear to OT is a job of proofing him up, so that even if he mocked up a bank, he wouldn't be the effect of it. A cleared OT is a proofed-up being who won't hit the banana peel. You could probably fix up a clear exterior so he would go exterior to the physical universe. You could use a command like, "Try not to be outside the physical universe." This would make him exterior from the universe, but that would be unstable until he was no longer at effect relatively to the physical universe. He would be unstable, since he is still the effect of MEST, life, and thought. But a person who can be at cause over something is not necessarily at total effect of it. That doesn't mean, however, that he has nothing to do with it. Because you can fix a car is no reason why you can't enjoy one.

Our adversary is the complexity of the "wisdom" of the ages, suppressed and combined to keep people from doing it. It takes a lot of blood, sweat, and tears to face this sort of thing. There is nothing mild about the way course supervisors continue [to do their job].

There is "probably a greater distance between clear and OT than between wog and clear."

A clear OT is "a walking miracle who ... comprehends the miracle." So knowing and willing cause is part of the definition of OT. It is not an accidental or automatic state. You get to a point where you can turn automaticities on and off. Doing it on an unknowing basis is far inferior.

"If this crosses up your own reality in any way, shape, or form, by all means don't [change] your own reality. Just run your auditing question!"

6612C06 SHSpec-83 Scientology Definitions [Part] II

For the first time in known history, there is ethics. You can't lie to do people in [and get away with it, in scientology]. People who protest ethics say, "Who determines who is suppressive?" That is easy. Suppressives have definite characteristics. This universe got formed and is going to pieces on suppression. "An organized minority is all that has been making this universe a mess." It could have been a good universe. But ethics would have had to go in early. And because thetans were acting as individuals and suppression was organized, all we have to do is reverse it, so that thetans, without forgoing independence, can organize the other side just a little bit. We are eventually going to become an organized majority. We already have numerical superiority. Also, they can't think straight. We have no overt intentions towards suppressives. We are just trying to go about our business. But "you yourself should not ... go out of your way to obtain amusement by the torturing of SP's simply because their valence is there to slip into. "The mocking up of suns is far more fun." But when you do it, do a good job!" ANALYTICAL MIND

This could be "anything that a thetan set up, which collected data and used it to resolve problems." The basic purpose of the "mind" is "the resolution of problems relating to survival. Now if a thetan does this, you could say he is a mind.... An analytical mind cannot exist independent of a thetan." Man has been so caved in, on the subject of the reactive mind, which he knew not wot of, of which he was not aware, that he now discredits the whole idea of a mind. He says, "I'll just do it all myself." REACTIVE MIND

A reactive mind is "an unwanted, unknowing series of computations which bring about an effect on the individual and those around him." It contains things like the computation, "All horses sleep in beds." It is an obsessive stratum of unknown, unseen, uninspected data that is forcing solutions, unknown and unsuspected, on the person. It is a sub-awareness activity. An analytical mind could be of use to an operating thetan. It could exist if it was a knowing and willing mechanism. For instance, much of dianetics and scientology was resolved by the construction of philosophical machines: something you would draw up which would give some data that you could then combine with some other data and get some answer. But you are setting down and lining up the data. You are just "doing a think which is recorded ... so that you can knowingly observe a relationship of data and get an answer.... So an analytical mind [is] a knowing and willing resolution of problems related to survival." This can get you in trouble, when it is of lasting duration, when it is set up to run forever without inspection and observation. An analytical mind cannot exist without inspection and observation. An astronomical computer being operated by a competent scientist could be likened to the analytical mind. But without inspection and observation, an analytical mind would become reactive. The reactive mind is like the opposite of the analytical mind. It is like a computer that, uninspected, picks up the data to resolve problems that had not been suspected, and turns out answers that, uninspected, then by law become a total effect upon a population. [I.e., to avoid reactivity, you must retain the option of total monitoring.] A total circuit, like an automatic elevator, may still be analytical if it can be inspected.

The human body falls into the class of machines that operate without understanding. Such a machine, where a thetan does not know how or why it operates, is reactive. The fellow who is there doesn't know when it is going to get sick or quit. The body line is running uninspected, and it is aberrative. It has reactions and effects upon the thetan that he cannot predict. It is an aberrative machine because it is running uninspected. It has no instruction book. This is a major omission. Beware of buying bodies without directions in them!

So willingness and inspection is what makes the difference between the analytical and the reactive minds. The difference between dianetics and scientology is that one [scientology] increases the awareness of the thetan and the other [dianetics] just erases the bank. The trouble you run into in disseminating comes from people's lack of awareness of the reactive mind. You have to show it to them. If you handle a person's reactive mind directly, you get the situation where the person was not aware that he had lumbosis and is not now aware that it is gone. The way you handle a reactive mind is to increase the thetan's awareness of it so he can control it. It ceases to be reactive. When you are talking about the analytical and the reactive mind, you are talking about the awareness level of the individual.

Only the reactive mind is opposed to the thetan. The analytical mind is "a mind that is temporarily set up, willingly and knowingly, to assist in the resolution of problems. Problems inevitably relate to survival. And anything he's set up to do this of which he was aware and which was inspected [would be included under the rubric of 'analytical mind']." A committee set up to get data and to coordinate the activities of another area or body -- of a factory or something like that -- would be the mind of that factory, even though they are thetans doing it. In fact, they would have to be thetans doing it, for it to be analytical.

One of the reasons why you should know policy is that otherwise the solutions and combinations, unknown to you, make it have an effect on you, because it is somewhat reactive. If policy isn't inspected and reformed to meet the condition of operation, it too would become a reactive mind, as with U.S. government law. From the point of view of the society, scientology is a somewhat reactive mind, to the degree that they are not aware of our existence or our effect. If scientology had evil intentions, it would be very easy to operate on a sub-rosa level. However, it would be bad for the planet, on the whole. It is hard anyway for society, at its low awareness level, to be aware of scientology. It is likewise hard for them to be aware of a thetan. A thetan should probably go by the rule, "Never explain." Don't feel that you need to explain your motives to others, when you don't intend to hide them. Their level of awareness of you is already so low that explaining won't help at all. After all, they can't tell your motives! Be as obvious, plain, and straightforward as you like, but "if the ordinary evidences which lie around them don't justify your actions, then there's no sense in explaining it to the person who's challenging them.... He wouldn't be able to understand them anyway." Any analytical mind can become a reactive mind. So setting up an analytical mind is always dangerous, to some degree.

POWER

The amount of force that can be applied in a unit of time. [Actually, the physical definition states that power is the amount of work that can be accomplished in a unit of time.] Power has the connotation of being potential, unlike force, which is actual. Power doesn't necessarily mean the use of force. Power is not exerted, whereas force tends to be. Therefore a person is powerful when he is able to use force, not when he is or isn't using force. But if he is forceful, he is using force right now. The smarter a person gets, the less he employs force to get others to change their opinions, etc.

IMPLANT

"Unwilling, unknowing receipt of a think." An implant is "an intentional wreck of somebody's ability to make pictures, perceive, and remember. It's intentional! ... An intentional installation of fixed ideas contra-survival to the thetan." In an implant, someone is intentionally giving the thetan perceptions and ideas. All hypnotism is, is a restimulation of past implants.

ENGRAM

"Those perceptions unknowingly contained in the force, duress, pain, and unconsciousness of an incident." This is not the same as an implant [because it is not necessarily intentional, for one thing]. Intent is the difference. The person makes a mental image picture by his reaction to an experience. He goes, "Out! Stop it!" In the process of doing this, "he's made a sort of a stuck wave," because he didn't prevent it. And just as you would make an embossed impression of something, he embosses the environment. If you were to press your hand against a brick for a split second, you would have a picture of the brick, and, a moment or so later, you would have the indentations of the brick, because you pushed something at the brick. Similarly, if you pull on a rope, you make an impression. [This would be analogous to a secondary.] The thetan pushes back against what is pushing him, or he pulls in against what is leaving him. It is at the point where he resisted the motion most that he gets stuck. A thetan can make and exert energy. When he tries to fend something off [or hold something in], he pushes [or pulls] back against something. He gets a picture of the moment when his resistance was great. That could be an engram, [secondary, lock,] or implant.

PROBLEM

Intention / counter-intention, goal / counter-goal, or purpose / counter-purpose.

GOALS PROBLEM MASS

The GPM is so named, because "when there are two intentions counter-opposed, [one] has a problem [and the opposed forces or goals] tend to produce mass. The Russians' statement of this is Dialectic Materialism -- that all ideas are born out of the meeting of two forces. [That is] backwards. When two ideas [oppose each other] they create force.... That shows you where they are on the [tone] scale: If you hit a guy hard enough, he'll think." [GPM's consist of pairs of opposing ideas.] Two opposing ideas produce a mass. "The thetan cannot as-is either side." Hence, the mass remains. The mass of a GPM is mental energy mass, but it can be in the physical universe, too.

PAN-DETERMINISM and SELF-DETERMINISM

Pan-determinism is the ability to see or as-is both sides [of a conflict or problem]. If "one is totally pan-determined, he has no mental mass, because he's seen both sides of everything. He can see two ideas at once, even though they are opposed." Self-determinism is laudable, because it is rare. But it is not as good as pan-determinism. If a guy justifies what he does, you know immediately that he is self-determined, not pan-determined. This is the quickest test there is. A wholly reactive person "will oppose any idea put to him."

A conservative or reactionary tends to be against everything you propose. So if you give him his own ideas, you give him a problem, because his first impulse is to be against them. [Cf. symptom prescription and the Interpersonalists.] This is such a horrible thing to do that it is normally looked upon as fightin' words, like, "You think you're pretty good, don't you?" You have made the guy resist his own ideas. The above type of person is on a lower-scale mockery of pan-determinism. He can carry out a raging argument with a second person that doesn't say a word the whole time, like, "Well, you're going to say.... And you think.... But ... !" There is no ability of a thetan that doesn't have a lower-scale mockery or exaggeration.

EMOTION

"A response by a wavelength affecting as individual or another, which produces a sensation and a state of mind."

INTENTION

Something which one wishes or intends to do. It is an impulse towards something. It is "an idea that one is going to accomplish something.... He means to do it."

AFFINITY

Affinity "has nothing to do with [emotion]. It's the ability to occupy the space of or be like or similar to, or to express a willingness to be something." "I like you," means "I would just as soon be you. I would just as soon occupy your space." When two individuals don't like each other, they won't occupy each other's space or viewpoint. They don't want to be like the other person, etc. A dissimilarity must exist. When this becomes sufficiently strong, a person "enforcedly becomes like the other fellow," which is an overwhelm.

HOME UNIVERSE

"The universe a thetan made for himself." Here we find the Rock, which we audited for and assessed out, meaning a shape of something on which we could then run a process. We had, in the past, a theory that it was the first object on the track that the fellow had made. We would run five-way help on it and make a fast, stable release of a very high order.

RELIGION

Religion "means, basically, the search for truth."

DED-DEDEX

A deduced something or other. "It means that the overt-motivator sequence went backwards. A ded-dedex is the overt-motivator sequence wrong-way to. So that you hit Joe, and then he hits you. That's a ded-dedex. The original connotation was [that] although it went this way, you had it figured out that he must have hit you first, so you invented something that he did to you to motivate your

hitting him. It's a phony overt-motivator sequence." It is what a guy does to justify an unmotivated overt. "It means, 'The overt act explained.'" The fact of having hit someone without provocation plus a means of explaining having hit him is the ded-dedex. After you commit the first action, you invent something to explain it. [Ded-dedex -- Deed-deed explained.]

SOMATIC MIND

This idea was "added to the First Book by Donald H. Rogers, [John W. Campbell, and the publisher]." I found it in the glossary, so there it is. It's "the mind that runs the body, independent of" [the body and the reactive mind.] It is a physical coordination switchboard system. In view of the fact that we don't know how it runs, we really have no business declaring the existence of a mind that we don't really know about.

(The early introduction to DMSMH -- with the part about the wheel and the arch -- describes the book. Its first line was written by Walter Winchell and the rest was written by the publisher.)

ANCHOR POINT

Something the thetan put out to make space.

BUTTERED ALL OVER THE UNIVERSE

"Very badly disoriented and dispersed." When someone in this case condition is asked to spot spots where he is (An improper process. The proper process is to have him spot spots where he is not.), he will point all over the universe. This is the reaction of this very dispersed case to this question, from which this term is taken. He will think that he is everywhere. It is an "I'm over there" case. Perhaps this condition comes from leaving anchor points all over the place and appearing in one or another of these points.

TIGER DRILL

"One of the drills ... that ... has been adequately discussed in bulletins." It uses "tiger" as a non-reactive word.

COMPUTATION

To figure out. 2 x 2 = 4.

COMPUTING PSYCHOSIS

"One who, from his psychosis, figure-figures. He's inconstant in his conduct. He's compulsive.... He's got ... crazy explanation.... He's obsessively solving a problem that doesn't exist."

DRAMATIZING PSYCHOTIC

"One patterned action which is insane [and which the person] runs over and over.... When he is] not doing that particular [action, the dramatizing psychotic is remarkably sane. [He is consistent in his conduct.]"

ARBITRARY

"Something introduced into the situation without regard to the data of the situation. 'Arbitrary' means 'stand alone'." Someone says, "X must be done," or "X is true." If that is introduced without observation, without any refutation [of what was there previously], into a formula, situation, admin action, of line, it will cause a ripple. This ripple then needs to be solved, so someone else will introduce an arbitrary solution to the introduced arbitrary. "It leads to further arbitraries being introduced to handle resultant outnesses." This is the "stuck five [held down five]" phenomenon. An urgent action may be an arbitrary, as in the tech of handling an urgent directive. This must be replaced by something based on observed fact. It is only in force until data can be gotten. An example of an arbitrary would be an education that a boy never understood, like an education without a purpose.

HARMONICS

Any wavelength action or scale has reverberations, up and down, by doubles or halves. "In the field of art, it means 'agreement with'.... In scientology, ... upper harmonics [refers to] well-off cases.' In scientology, it means a similarity or repetition of something at a higher or lower point on a scale. A lower harmonic is a lower similarity which is nutty, related to a higher harmonic. This is "based on the tendency of a wavelength to repeat itself.... The lower you go in terms of awareness, the more weird the repetition is.... In music, it means a co-action or similar action," like resonating strings. For instance, a lower harmonic of figuring out a math table is doodling. It is a similar action but less aware. Therefore harmonics apply to the awareness scale. The term "lower-scale mockery" expresses the idea of harmonics more usefully, for our purposes. Ridicule is based on this. You can feel that your ideas are crazy, even if they are not, if you hear them expressed or "mocked", by a nut or a "true believer". [Like a caricature.] I was trying to figure out what to do with the org. I was trying to figure out what England would do by trying to figure out what she should do to straighten things out politically. I was trying to figure out which way this was going to go, to figure out if I should expand the organization or whether to enter dollars into the country or hold them out. And I ran into a guy outside the door, who said that he was Disraeli and was going to help England.

6612C13 SHSpec-84 Scientology Definitions -- [Part] III

Scientology is an extension of the work of Gautama Siddhartha, 2500 years ago. Gautama sought to end the cycle of death and rebirth, by showing an individual that he was a spirit, not dependent on bodies. We accomplished his goal of exteriorizing people more successfully in 1952, but the wisdom of Buddhism was enough to civilize three-fourths of Asia. It is the oldest and biggest religion on this planet. It predates Christianity by 500 years. "Probably the shreds of [Buddhism came] into the Middle East with [the] silk and spice merchants, [who, following Alexander's ventures to India in about 333 B, discovered that there was a Europe and] made a trade contact with Europe. This sparked a religious revival. "Buddha predicted that in 2500 years, the entire job would be finished in the West. That's in the Pali Canons. Well, we finished it.... Buddha never pretended to be other than just a man," and his movement, the first international religious movement, was open to anyone. Buddhism "has moved, ... in its technology, not one inch further than it was pushed in Tibet, until 1952," when we started exteriorizing people. "The essence of religion [is the fact that] Man is a spiritual being." All religions hold this in common, but "only in Buddhism was this ever proven."

Any forward push like Buddhism runs into SP's who are afraid that if you got better, you might knock them off or at least stop their games. "The basic goal of psychiatry today is to wipe out religion. They say, 'Anyone who is religious is psychotic.'" If they succeed in knocking out our church, they will go after bigger ones. This is "really all that it's all about. As long as religion brings solace to Man, ... as long as churches stand, in any way, for the spiritual freedom of Man, psychiatry will not really be able to progress." Therefore, psychiatry should not be allowed to wipe out a small church, and then go on to a bigger church, and a bigger church, and so take it all over.

The government "has no right ... to comment upon religious beliefs or practice.... They are telling us that we must not do something we are not doing." We are not treating the sick and the insane. There is no law against increasing people's ability or intelligence, and that is all that we are doing. "Psychiatry is demanding its right to kill or maim any human being, after it states that he's crazy.... If they can do that, they can control the planet, politically." But they will fail, because they can't complete a cycle of action or choose a right target. There is no law against making people better or more intelligent. Also, when someone tries to cut a pure theta line, it tends to blow up against him.

"Our victory was the victory of the individual over 'Fate' and the universe.... If we win, everybody wins." Crushing the opposition on the way up is hardly worth doing.

INVERSION

"It should go one way, and it goes the other [way]. It inverts. It collapses in on itself downward.... When a person is introverted, ... he would look in on himself.... It's a reverse scale.... As one factor progresses, the other factor degresses.... It goes backwards."

EXTERIORIZATION

"An action which I have just described ... as the history of Buddhism." A thetan walks out of or exists out of a body. Exteriorization is "the action of moving out of a body." Psychiatrists boobytrap this by

claiming "that insane people can exteriorize." In fact, if they do exteriorize, they are sane while they are exterior.

INTERIORIZATION

People who are interiorized. "Interiorization is not the reverse of this. [It] means 'going into it too fixedly and becoming part of it', [not just 'going into your head']. You could interiorize into work [or into] most anything." Exteriorization means the spirit moving out of the body.

RESTIMULATION

"The reactivation of an existing incident.... Some approximation of the original incident causes it to go into play.... There is a point where it was restimulated.... The restimulation is usually unknown to the person. If it were known, ... he would immediately recover.... Unknown, ... it tends to have an effect upon the [person].... By picking up restimulations, you can knock out of action sn engram, without running it." It is as though the engram sat over in locker A, undisturbed and not troubling the person. Then one day, he passes a truck, and the engram drops out of locker A, and the person doesn't know what it is. So he becomes the effect of it. If you picked up the moment of its restimulation, it would drop back into locker A and cease to trouble the person. "It is upon this fact that the whole subject of releasing depends." The erasure that occurs is the erasure of these points of restimulation.

DESTIMULATION

"'Destimulate' means to take away the restimulation. [It] does not mean the erasure of the original incident." It is the knocking out of the point of restimulation.

GENETIC ENTITY

Cytology, the study of cells, conceives of an endless stream of protoplasm passing through time, with branch tracks that are bodies. Your current body is supposed to have originated from a sea of ammonia. By the process of reproduction, it is supposed to have dome down to PT. If that were the case, then somewhere along the line, a blueprint for a body would have had to enter the line. In the days of dianetics, a good way to account for past lives was to say that they were incidents on the GE line. [Cf. A History of Man.] The Darwinian theory is an explanation of this unending stream of protoplasm. We find that this theory doesn't actually hold good. Man is a spiritual being. You should be able to find the blueprint in the body. We used to think that it showed up on the E-meter. Actually it doesn't. Only you do.

FIRST OVERT

This "would be the first ... on a chain of overts." If a guy has an impulse to commit a given overt, you could trace back down the chain to the first one, and, theoretically, he would blow the impulse. [Cf. expanded dianetics.] But "you should not try to process a specific type of aberration.... It's quite fatal, ... because, in the first place, it's an eval for the case." Also, it is a condemnatory, negative-type process. It doesn't validate the person at all. You don't validate the person by finding his nasty habits and trying to process them." The percentiles of successes when specific aberrations are ... addressed ... is too low. [This procedure is-] not successful, because [you are not validating] what's right with the person.... You don't have to find out what's wrong with a person ... to make him right." You just get the guy to be able to communicate. Then you get him to look at his problems, and you find out that he has been resolving them by committing overts. You get him over doing this. Then you find that he is very ARC broken with life, and you get him over that. Then he gets to where he discovers that he has a great "solution" to everything, "and every time he has a bad break, he goes and lies down and is a horse, or something." But we are not interested in his solutions, and "we're not treating him for that reason.... All of these things are simply increasing the abilities of a spirit, not 'healing' what's wrong with it."

ENTRANCE POINT TO THIS UNIVERSE

Classified information. Many times on the time track, one has been told that he just entered this universe. It is a big swindle.

OT ACTIVITIES

"Those programs conducted by OT's to assist scientology."

ANCHOR POINTS (Gold Balls)

A body is constructed in a space framework. You can see these things. At least, some people can. When a person has dark hollows under his eyes, it is all the little gold balls grouped together under the eyes that have caved in and gone black. If you could shift the gold ball framework of the body, you could probably bend joints backwards, etc. Every once in awhile, somebody's face is out of shape, or something, and you get him to pick up the gold ball and put it back where it belongs, or something. Or you get him to put a bunch of balls out there to remedy his havingness of that particular ball. This is anchor point processing, from 'way back when. All of a sudden, instead of lying against his face, the gold ball goes back where it belongs, and the PC reasserts his sense of balance. His face will actually change shape. This has to do with the structure of bodies and what the space is, in which the body is formed. It is apparently one of the ways in which bodies are mocked up. "I wouldn't look for them, if I were you. It's rather fraught with disaster, in some cases." Gold balls are used in mocking up the body in space.

FIRST AND SECOND POSTULATE

If you find the first postulate that was made, relating to a certain situation, you can ignore the second postulate. About 1952, LRH tried to make an end-all of this. He looked for the first postulate that one ever made, on the track. We now find that "it's not necessary to have that."

ENERGY

"A potential of motion or power." The modern physics definition is that energy is small waves flowing. It is a force or a flow, or a potential force or flow from something to something, or ability to accomplish work, or to accomplish movement. A rather doubtful idea that we are taught to believe is that if something moves from point A to point B:

1. You need energy.

2. You develop energy. If you [really] know about the system of energy, you won't need huge amounts of energy to move particles. If a person really understands something, he can do remarkable things with it. Modern physics hasn't done that well with rocketry. It is not very efficient. So energy is potential or actual motion or force.

FLOW

Progress of particles, impulses, or waves from point A to point B, or in any direction. There is a direction to it, which rather outlaws the idea of a dispersal. A dispersal is not a flow. A flow has the connotation of being somewhat directional. If something flowing off a mountain is getting wider and wider, it can cease to be a flow and become a flood. Energy is a flow of particles, waves, etc., in some direction. A flow is a limited and directional progress of particles through space.

THOUGHT

Not to be confused with life and the spirit. A thought is a "spaceless, positionless product of a thetan, containing meaning." The Greeks confused it with life. The original mistake is in the word, "theta". For the Greeks, "theta" meant life or thought. Thought is not life and it is not a spirit.

LAMBDA

Life, in the dianetic axioms [Dianetic Axiom 11]. It is an unused symbol, today.

NOTHING

This "implies that the thing is, but is being 'not-ed'. You couldn't not-is something that wasn't, in the first place.... It's an assertion against fact."

COUNTER-EMOTION

"The emotion which greets the emotion." It is point A exerting an emotion against point B. Emotion is normally something that has flow, wavelength, and meaning mixed up with it. "Any emotion could counter any emotion." So counter-emotion means any emotion that is countering an existing emotion. When you take apart the emotion in a bank, you can pick out the emotion and counter-emotion. A counter-emotion is the emotion that is used to meet a situation and which does meet it. Counter-emotion is an interesting study. It is related to politics and control of humans. For instance, the counter-emotion to Hitler's rage, in Germany, was enthusiasm. The advertising field is also very interested in counter-emotion. The advertising exec comes up against it, because he tries to counter want with an emotion. But want isn't an emotion, so there is no counter-emotion. [So you have to know what emotion could create a desire for the product and counter that.]

MEMORY AND RECALL

There is "no difference between these two terms that's significant to the auditor.... Recall, however, implies that you bring it up to present and look at it. It has that connotation, whereas "memory" has the connotation that you simply knew it had happened. [So the two terms have] two different connotations." But they are very easily interchanged, because a person doesn't have to bring things up to PT when he is clear. He doesn't do this any longer. There are a lot of things that he doesn't bring up to PT to recall them. He can recall them in detail and tell you exactly where they are, without having them brought up into the present to review. To that extent, the modern clear is far in advance of the Book One definition of clear. "The reason one can't recall is totally contained in the fact that his memory is totally surrounded by mass which prevents him from recalling." If you got rid of all the mass of the mind, you wouldn't have anything to recall. Correct? Actually, it doesn't work that way at all. When you get the mass off, recall is easy. It is undue duress in the incident that prevents recall. So the individual gets a picture of the incident to read it, because he can't enter the incident where it is. The mental energy you used in bailing out of a lions' cage would prevent you from remembering that you had been in the lions' cage. Therefore, "amnesia" is the situation where a person is "protecting himself" from so many dangers on the track that the mass prevents penetration, because the part of the track for which he has amnesia is so heavily charged.

CONFIDENCE

"An expression of trust." Degree of trust. Inflation is an expression of no confidence in the government. Money is a symbolized idea that goes bad when confidence in the issuer drops. That is why they put pictures of kings and presidents, etc., on money. They try to associate [money and its issuer]. Trust (and distrust) is composed of past experience. "Total trust is looked on as total idiocy, but it is the only condition under which you can exist." We didn't arrive through suspicion!

CERTAINTY

"The degree of willingness to accept the awareness of an isness." It is a very conditional thing, since, in the first place, it is questionable whether any mass has mass. A scientologist does not start out from, "Where did the wall come from?", but just from, "Is the wall there?" And if it is there, the scientologist can have certainty on it. It is possible to generate uncertainty by asking, "What is?" Brainwashing is the trick of mixing up certainties. To unconfuse someone, it is only necessary to have him regain some certainties. A person ARC breaks if his certainties get shifted. An education can be made hypnotic by qualifying everything, so that it becomes a sort of generality, and definitely an uncertainty.

GENERALITY

"Any unspecific statement ... tends towards a generality. It's the substitution of a plural for a singular, or ... a greater for a lesser." This may or may not be intentional. Dispersed people talk in generalities. Classifying anything comes under this heading. For instance, it is not really "boys". It is "boy, boy, boy, etc." [Cf. Korzybski's General Semantics.] Classifying is necessary, but it is very dangerous. Classifications occur in the bank. "They" is always one person. You will always find out exactly who "they" is, on a meter. The generality is the primary tool of the SP. It is used to prevent reach, as in "Everything is all covered with germs, Johnny!"

SUPPRESS

To squash. To sit on. To make smaller. To refuse to let reach. To make uncertain about his reaching. To render (liquefy by heating) or lessen in any way possible, by any means possible, to the harm of the person and the fancied protection of the suppressor. The SP often expresses generalities to the suppressed person, thus surrounding him with generalities. The invention of "germs" was a bit suppressive. The suppressive uses tricks and mechanisms to prevent reach.

POSTULATE

To generate or think a concept. A concept is a think, a thought. To postulate implies a requirement that something goes, stops, turns white, goes blue, or remains blue. Or that it is something, or that it isn't something. Or that some action is going to take place, etc. A postulate implies conditions and actions, rather than just plain thinks. A postulate is associated more with intention than it is with a thought. It has a dynamic connotation.

HAVINGNESS

The feeling that one owns or possesses. It is possible to wear a coat without having a coat. Mere possession does not make havingness.

CONFRONTING

"Ability to front up to." "Confronting" is derived from "with-fronting". So there is a dim connotation that if you confront the door, the door is confronting you. Co-action is implied, but this does not actually exist, in our meaning of the word. Confront is the ability of the individual "to face up [to], look at, stand up to, stand in front of, be near, see, visualize, or otherwise perceive, something." By extension, if you can't confront something, you can't handle it. Thetans have been steam-rolled by confronting. Total confronting is not the total answer. There are times to stand up and glare, and there are times not to. When a person can selectively confront or not confront anything, then, of course, he has total power. These do go together. When a thetan doesn't want to confront something, he tends to mask it, to turn away from it, and it tends to make him an effect. If he can't make an effect on it, it can make an effect on him. However, in fact, to stand in front of an automobile going 60 MPH and to let it run over you, just to demonstrate that you are not afraid of confronting it is assininity.

If you ask a person whether he can confront an automobile going 60 MPH and he comm lags, you know that he is down into an obsessive confront and feels that there is some sense in your asking him to do it. He has the idea that there is something wrong with him if he won't go and do this. Willful and knowing confronting or willingness to conceive the idea of or to confront or not to confront -- these concepts are all contained in the single idea of confronting. If you felt that you had to be able to stand up to anything, that would be "to confess that you couldn't stop anything from occurring." I'm willing to confront putting my arm out to an automobile traveling 60 MPH and having it stop. To that extent, I am willing to confront.

This is not conditional confronting. "What are the conditions under which you would be willing to confront this?" is not a fair question. No one wants to lead a life of ruin, though some have made it into a virtue [e.g. the Stoics]. It is a philosophical booby trap. They persuade people that they should be willing to live a life as dope-addicts, bums, and in total ruin, in order to demonstrate that they can confront this kind of life. That is suppression. It has precious little to do with sanity. But it is a terrific process, in that the individual will come up to finding out what he is obsessively confronting, as well as what he is willing to confront and what he doesn't have to confront. One thing he might find out is that he doesn't have to go on confronting forever. In fact, he is quite tired of standing there. [So a desire to have a challenge concerning existence only relates to being willing to engage in a larger game.]

As the power to confront or not arises selectively, an individual's self-determinism arises accordingly. Very often, a thetan who never likes to be moving explains the fact that he got run over by X, by saying that he was perfectly willing to confront it. He is happy that he got run over by X, because now he has had such an experience. He says, "Well, it was a good experience, but I never want to do it again." When a person can control things, he can selectively confront. When he loses that ability, he says, "Well, at least I can confront it." The thought that you can't do anything about anything is very humanoid and deadly. There is suppression at work, if a person gets the idea that because he has the ability to confront anything, he must therefore confront everything. This is an invalidation of his ability to control and change undesirable aspects of the environment. This is SP talk. It is very

different from being willing to confront anything. It is only when you lose the ability to handle a situation that you justify your inability by the thought that you can confront the disaster that thereby ensues.

"We've run out of time. I leave you confronting your sins. Thank you."

<div style="text-align: center;">END OF SHSBC TAPE NOTES</div>