# LEVEL 2

## INTERNSHIP HIGH CRIME REFERENCES

# a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

# b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

# c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

Remimeo
Level II Check-
  sheet
Auditors Level II
  and above
Level VI Check-
  sheet

*Auditor Drills Series 4RA*

# LEVEL II

# PROCESS DRILLS

These drills match the order of processes set up for Level II in BTB 14 March 1974R Grade 2 Processes.

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

A.  Repetitive Process

B.  Alternate/Repetitive Process

C.  Bracket Process – with 3 or more commands run consecutively, in sequence.

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

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

1.  Study and understand the LRH data on the process.

2.  With this understanding, drill the action using the drill indicated.

3.  Drill each process with the auditing style that applies – see HCOB 6 Nov 64 STYLES OF AUDITING.

### Example on Level II:

**TR 200-41**    **Withhold Process Unbullbaited**

**TR 200-41**    **Withhold Process Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 14 July 60     CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP

*Commands:*

F1:    "What could you withhold?"

F2:    "What could another withhold?"

F3:    "What could others withhold?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

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

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

## FORMAT FOR UNBULLBAITED DRILLS

**Name:** Auditing on a doll unbullbaited.

**Command:** As for each separate process.

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

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

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

1.   Set up E-Meter as for E-Meter drills.

2.   Set up shield (to prevent TA and admin from being seen by pc (doll)).

3.   Have extra pens under the E-Meter.

4.   Have C/S face down between the bottom of the E-Meter and the table.

5.   Have W/S and Lists readily available in sequence required for the session.

Auditor starts the session and runs a standard session with the particular auditing action being taken up on the doll, keeping full session admin and using all standard procedures of the auditing action. Coach watches drill and points out any outnesses noted giving a "That's it" and a re-start. Outnesses should be handled one at a time until none exist.

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

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

## FORMAT FOR BULLBAITED DRILLS

**Name:** Auditing _____ Bullbaited.

**Commands:** As for each separate auditing action.

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

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

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

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

1.   Obnose the out of sessionness,

2.   Align this to the process run,

3.   Handle.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## SECTION I

### A.    Repetitive Process Drill

1.   Study and understand the LRH data referenced for the process you will be running.

2.   Tell the pc you are going to run (*name of process*).

3.   (The first time a pc runs this type of process, explain how a Repetitive Process is run.)

     R-Factor that this is a Repetitive Process.

4.   Clear the words of the process command in backwards sequence; then clear the command. (Ref: BTB 2 May 72R CLEARING COMMANDS)

5.   Say: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process.".

6.   Using full TRs 0-4:

     a.   Give the command to the "pc".

     b.   Get the "pc's" answer.

     c.   Acknowledge.

7.   Continue a, b, c to EP of the process.

8.   Indicate the F/N to the "pc".

### B.    Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill

1.   Study and understand the LRH data referenced for the process you will be running.

2.   Tell the pc you are going to run (*name of process*).

3.   (The first time a pc runs this type of process, explain how an Alternate/Repetitive Process is run.)

     R-Factor that this is an Alternate/Repetitive Process.

4.   Clear each command of the process. Clear the words of the command in backwards sequence, then clear the command itself. (Ref: BTB 2 May 72R CLEARING COMMANDS)

5.   Say: "Start of Process," or "This is the Process."

6.   Using full TRs 0-4, run the 2 commands alternately, 1,2, 1,2,1,2 to EP of the process.

7.   Indicate the F/N to the pc.

**C.  Bracket Drill**

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

1.  Study and understand the LRH data referenced for the process you will be running.

2.  Tell the "pc" you are going to run (*name of process*).

3.  (The first time a pc runs this type of process, explain how it is run.)

R-Factor that this process has several commands that will be run 1,2,3,4, 1,2,3,4 etc.

4   Clear each command in the series. Clear the words of the command in backwards sequence) then clear the command. (Ref: BTB 2 May 72R CLEARING COMMANDS)

5.  Say: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process.".

6.  Run the commands consecutively – 1,2,3,4 etc. to EP for the process.

7.  Indicate the F/N to the pc.

**D.  Dynamic Assessment Drill**

LRH Ref:

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

**Steps:**

1.  Clear the word "Dynamic" per the Scientology Dictionary.

2.  Clear the Dynamics 1-8 per the Scientology Dictionary. (Note any tone arm action while clearing each Dynamic.)

Clear the word "describe".

3.  Ask the pc to describe each Dynamic 1-8.

4.  Find "…where the tone arm is moved by one or another of the Dynamics.

5.  "If the tone arm (not the needle) is moved by a Dynamic, then using the needle motion, find the hottest terminal that represents that Dynamic…" LRH HCOB 2 Feb 60 THE CO-AUDIT TEAM.

Clear the command: "Tell me some terminals on the _____ Dynamic." (Or whatever terms will get the idea of that Dynamic across to the pc.)

Then give the command.

6.  Write down each terminal the pc gives – with its read. (If the pc gives a particular terminal like "Marge" – his wife, translate it into a general terminal such as "a wife" or "a woman". Get the reads on the general terminals.)

7.  All reading terminals are run in order of largest read. Use Suppress and Invalidate buttons, or add to the list as necessary.

8. Exhaust the list of terminals.

9. Repeat steps 5-8 on each Dynamic that gives tone arm motion. Handle in order of greatest TA.

10. If you haven't reached the EP of the action being done, do another Dynamic Assessment, steps 3-9.

The following processes on Level 2 require a Dynamic Assessment:

TR 200-5, 6        MELBOURNE 3

TR 200-23, 24    DYNAMIC STRAIGHT WIRE

TR 200-25, 26    O/W STRAIGHTWIRE    AND SELECTED PERSONS OVERT STRAIGHTWIRE

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

b. "Avoid adjectival commands.

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

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


## SECTION II

## LEVEL 2 DRILLS


**TR 200-1     Viewpoint SW and Viewpoint ARC SW Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-2     Viewpoint SW and Viewpoint ARC SW Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

Book – Creation of Human Ability R2-25 p. 65, 6

***Commands of Viewpoint Straightwire:***

F1:   "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for you to look at."
"Give me some emotions it would be all right for you to look at."
"Give me some efforts it would be all right for you to look at."

F2:   "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for another to look at."
"Give me some emotions it would be all right for another to look at."
"Give me some efforts it would be all right for another to look at."

F3:   "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for others to look at."

"Give me some emotions it would be all right for others to look at."

"Give me some efforts it would be all right for others to look at."

Drill per Creation of Human Ability R2-25, using the Repetitive Process Drill on each command of each flow.

### *Commands of Viewpoint ARC SW:*

F1:   "Who would it be all right to have like you."

"Who would it be all right to have agreed with you."

"Who would it be all right communicate with you?"

F2:   "Who would it be all right for you to like?"

"Who would it be all right for you to agree with?"

"Who would it be all right for you to communicate with?"

F3.   "Who would it be all right for others to have like them?"

"Who would it be all right for others to have agree with them?"

"Who would it be all right for others to have communicate with them?"

Drill per Creation of Human Ability R2-25, using the Repetitive Process Drill on each command of each flow.

### TR 200-3     Additional HAS Processes – HAS VII Unbullbaited
### TR 200-4     Additional HAS Processes – HAS VII Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 19 Jan 61 ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES

### *Commands:*

F1:   "Get the idea of people making you friendly."

"Get the idea of people making you unfriendly."

F2:   "Get the idea of making people friendly."

"Get the idea of making people unfriendly,"

F3:   "Get the idea of people making other people friendly,"

"Get the idea of people making other people unfriendly,"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-5    Melbourne 3 Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-6    Melbourne 3 Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 4 Dec 59        Allowed Processes 1st Melbourne ACC

Do a Dynamic Assessment per the Dynamic Assessment Drill given earlier in this bulletin.

*Commands:*

1.    "What part of a _____ could you confront?"

"What part of a _____ would you rather not confront?"

2.    "What part of a _____ could another confront?"

"What part of a _____ would another rather not confront?"

3.    "What part of a _____ could others confront?"

"What part of a _____ would others rather not confront?"

Drill each pair of commands using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-7    Repetitive Confront Process Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-8    Repetitive Confront Process Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 8 Mar 62        THE BAD AUDITOR

*Commands:*

1.     "What could you confront?"

2.     "What would you permit another to reveal?"

3.     "What might another confront?"

4.     "What might another permit you to reveal?"

5.     "What would you rather not confront?"

6.     "What would you rather not have another reveal?"

7.     "What might another hate to confront?"

8.     "What might another object to your revealing? "

9.     "What should be confronted?"

10.    "What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?"

Drill using the Bracket Drill.

**TR 200-9    Continuous Confront Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-10   Continuous Confront Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 14 July 60    CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP

*Commands:*

F1:    "What could you continue to confront?"

"What would you rather not continue to confront?

F2.    "What could another continue to confront?"

"What would another rather not continue to confront?"

F3:    "What could others continue to confront?"

"What would others rather not continue to confront?"

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

**TR 200-11   Viewpoint Straightwire Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-12   Viewpoint Straightwire Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

Book – THE PHOENIX LECTURES p. 260 (1971 edition)

*Commands:*

1.    "Tell me something you wouldn't mind knowing."

2.    "Tell me something you wouldn't mind looking at.".

3.    "Tell me an emotion you wouldn't mind observing."

4.    "Tell me some effort you wouldn't mind observing."

5.    "Tell me some thinking which you wouldn't mind observing."

6.    "Tell me some symbols which you wouldn't mind seeing."

7.    "Tell me some eating which you wouldn't mind inspecting."

8.    "Tell me some sex which you wouldn't mind looking at."

Drill using the Bracket Drill.

**TR 200-13  Worry Process Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-14  Worry Process Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 5 Jan 61    O-W A LIMITED THEORY

*Commands:*

F1:   "Get the idea of another worrying something."

"Get the idea of another not worrying something."

"Get the idea of something being worrisome to another."

F2:   "Get the idea of worrying something."

"Get the idea of not worrying something."

"Get the idea of something being worrisome."

F3:   "Get the idea of others worrying something."

"Get the idea of others not worrying something."

"Get the idea of something being worrisome to others."

Drill each flow using the Bracket Drill. (People, animals and things can be used in place of "something". Specific items must read.)

*also run:*

F1:   "Get the idea of another attacking something."

"Get the idea of another not attacking something."

F2:   "Get the idea of attacking something."

"Get the idea of not attacking something."

F3:   "Get the idea of others attacking something."

"Get the idea of others not attacking something."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-15   Criticism Straightwire Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-16   Criticism Straightwire Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 13 Oct 59      A USEFUL PROCESS

*Commands:*

F1:   "Recall another being critical of you."

"Recall another withholding criticism of you."

F2:   "Recall being critical."

"Recall withholding criticism."

F3.   "Recall another being critical of others."

"Recall another withholding criticism of others."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-17   Revelation Process – X2 Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-18   Revelation Process – X2 Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 15 Mar 62      SUPPRESSORS

*Commands:*

F1:   "What wouldn't you want another to present to you?"

"What has another presented to you?".

F2:   "What wouldn't another want you to present?"

"What have you presented to another?"

F3:   "What wouldn't another want another to present?"

"What has another presented to another?"

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

**TR 200-19   Recall a Secret Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-20   Recall a Secret Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

PAB 146        PROCEDURE CCH

*Command:*

"Recall a secret."

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

"The Auditor explains to the preclear that he is not looking for hidden data to evaluate it. He is only asking the preclear to look at the data. He then makes a list of valences, paying great attention to those the preclear considers 'unimportant' or is very slow to divulge." LRH PAB 146.

This is done as follows:

1.   Clear the word "valence".

2.   Clear first, then say "Tell me some valences."

3.   Write down the valences the "pc" gives, plus reads.

4.   In order of largest read, run all reading valences in the following commands:

F1:   "Think of something *(valence)* might withhold from you."

F2:   "Think of something you might withhold from *(valence)*."

F3:   "Think of Something *(valence)* might withhold from others,"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

5.   Exhaust the list of valences.

**TR 200-21   O/W Flows Process 8 Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-22   O/W Flows Process 8 Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 25 Jan 62       FLOW PROCESS

*Commands:*

F1:   "What had to be outflowed?"

"What had to be withheld?"

"What had to be inflowed?"

"What had to be held off?"

F2:   "What had to be outflowed by another?"

"What had to be withheld by another?"

"What had to be inflowed "by another?"

"What had to be held off by another?"

F3.   "What had to be outflowed by others?"

"What had to be withheld by others?"

"What had to be inflowed by others?"

"What had to be held off by others?"

Drill each flow using the Bracket Drill.

**TR 200-23   Dynamic Straightwire Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-24   Dynamic Straightwire Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 16 Feb 59       HGC PROCESSES FOR THOSE TRAINED IN ENGRAM RUN-
NING OR TRAINED IN THESE PROCESSES
STAFF AUDITOR'S CONFERENCE OF 16 FEB 59

PAB 155       PROCESSES USED IN 21ST ACC

1.   Do the Dynamic Assessment per the Dynamic Assessment Drill given earlier in this bulletin.

2.   Run reading terminals in order pf largest read – in the following commands:

*Commands:*

F1:   "Think of something _____ has done to you."

"Think of something _____ has withheld from you."

F2: "Think of something you have done to _____."

"Think of something you have withheld from _____."

F3. "Think of something _____ has done to others."

"Think of something _____ has withheld from others."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

## TR 200-25 O/W Straightwire And Selected Persons Overt Straightwire Unbullbaited
## TR 200-26 O/W Straightwire And Selected Persons Overt Straightwire Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 24 Feb 59 TECHNICAL BULLETIN

HCOB 3 Jul 39 GENERAL INFORMATION

HCOB 3 Feb 59 HGC CURRENT PROCEDURE

1. Do a Dynamic Assessment per the Dynamic Assessment Drill. Run reading terminals in order of largest read – using the following commands t

*Commands:*

F1: "Recall something _____ has done to you."

"Recall something _____ has withheld from you."

F2: "Recall something you have done to _____."

"Recall something you have withheld from _____."

F3: "Recall something _____ has done to others."

"Recall something _____ has withheld from others."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

## TR 200-27 Not-Is Straightwire Unbullbaited
## TR 200-28 Not-Is Straightwire Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 3 July 59 GENERAL INFORMATION

HCOB 3 Feb 59 HGC CURRENT PROCEDURE

HCOB 22 Jan 59 NOT-IS STRAIGHTWIRE STAFF AUDITOR'S CONFERENCE 16 FEB 59

PAB 155

*Commands:*

1. "Recall something that you implied was unimportant."

"Recall something somebody else thought was important."

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

> 2.    "Recall a time when you thought something bad was unimportant."
>
> "Recall a time somebody else thought something bad was important."

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

> 3.    "Find something unimportant about this room."

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

## TR 200-29   O/W Process Unbullbaited
## TR 200-30   O/W Process Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

> HCOB 12 July 64     SCIENTOLOGY I TO IV MORE ON O/Ws

*Commands:*

> F1:   "Tell me some things you think another should not have done to you."
>
> F2:   "Tell me some things you think you should not have done."
>
> F3:   "Tell me some things others think they should not have done to others."

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

*also*

> F1:   "Tell me what another has done to you that got him/her into trouble.
>
> F2:   "Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble."
>
> F3:   "Tell me what others have done to others that got them into trouble."

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill,

*also*

> "What wouldn't you do over again?"

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

*also*

> "What are some things a person shouldn't say?"

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

*also*

"What gets a person into trouble?"

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

*also*

F1:   "What has another done to you that he/she regrets?"

F2:   "What have you done that you regret?"

F3:   "What have others done to others that they regret?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

*also*

F1:   "What has another said to you he wishes he hadn't?"

F2:   "What have you said you wish you hadn't?"

F3.   "What have others said to others they wish they hadn't?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

*also*

F1:   "What has another advised you to do?"

F2:   "What have you advised another to do?"

F3:   "What have others advised others to do?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-31   Universe O/W Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-32   Universe O/W Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 5 Oct 59        UNIVERSE PROCESS

1.   Drill E-Meter Drill No. 24 Assessment by Instant Read.

2.   Assess: Thetan, Mind, Body, Physical Universe. (On bullbaited drill, use fruit words.)

3.   Run reading items in order of largest read – using the following commands:

*Commands:*

F1:   "Recall something _____ has done to you."

"Recall something _____ has withheld from you."

F2:   "Recall something you have done to _____."

"Recall something you have withheld from _____."

F3.    "Recall something _____ has done to others."

"Recall something _____ has withheld from others."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-33   Know To Mystery Straightwire Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-34   Know To Mystery Straightwire Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 17 Apr 59      KNOW TO MYSTERY STRAIGHTWIRE FOR EXTREME CASES
HCOB 25 Sep 71R Rev. 4 Apr 74 TONE SCALE IN FULL

1.   Clear the word terminal.

2.   Clear the question "Give me some terminals that could represent 'un-knowable'."

3.   Ask the question. Write down pc's answers exactly and the read on each answer. This is **not** Listing and Nulling.

4.   Run each reading terminal in order of largest read – using the following commands:

*Commands:*

F1:    "Recall something _____ has done to you."

"Recall something _____ has withheld from you."

F2:    "Recall something you have done to _____."

"Recall something you have withheld from _____."

F3.    "Recall something _____ has done to others."

"Recall something _____ has withheld from others.

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

5.   Repeat steps 1-4 on each line of the Know to Mystery Scale – moving-upwards.

Know to Mystery Scale (Ref. HCOB 21 Sept 71R THE TONE SCALE IN FULL)

Know

Not Know

Know About

Look

Plus Emotion

Minus Emotion

Effort

Think

Symbols

Eat

Sex

Mystery

Wait

Unconscious

Unknowable

**TR 200-35   Regimen 6 O/W Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-36   Regimen 6 O/W Straightwire Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 6 Sept 10R Rev, 8 May 74    36 NEW PRESESSIONS

1.   Clear the question "Give me some terminals that could represent the 6<sup>th</sup> Dynamic."

2.   Ask pc the question. Write down his answers exactly – plus read on each answer. This is not Listing and Nulling.

3.   Run the reading terminals in order of largest read – using the following commands:

*Commands:*

F1:   "Get the idea of *(terminal)* doing something to you."

"Get the idea of *(terminal)* withholding something from you."

F2:   "Get the idea of doing something to *(terminal.")*

"Get the idea of withholding something from *(terminal.")*

F3:   "Get the idea of others doing something to *(terminal).*"

"Get the idea of others withholding something from *(terminal.")*

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

*also*

F1:   "What has (terminal) done to you?"

"What has (terminal) withheld from you?"

F2:   "What have you done to (terminal)?"

"What have you withheld from (terminal)?"

F3:   "What have others done to (terminal)?"

"What have others withheld from (terminal)?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

*also*

F1.   "Get the idea of (terminal) having done something to you."

"Get the idea of (terminal) having withheld something from you."

F2.   "Get the idea of having done something to (terminal)."

"Get the idea of having withheld something from (terminal)."

F3.   "Get the idea of others having done something to (terminal)."

"Get the idea of others having withheld something from (terminal)."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-37   O/W Process On Problem Persons Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-38   O/W Process On Problem Persons Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 14 April 60    NEW PE DATA

1.   Clear the question "Tell me some persons you've had problems about."

2.   Ask the pc the question. Write down his answers exactly – plus the read on each answer.

3.   Run the reading terminals in order of largest read – in the following commands:

*Commands:*

F1:   "What has _____ done to you?"

"What has _____ withheld from you?"

F2:   "What have you done to _____?"

"What have you withheld from?"

F3.   "What has _____ done to others?"

"What has _____ withheld from others?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

*Command:*

"What part of your life have you been responsible for?"

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-39   Best Responsibility Process Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-40   Best Responsibility Process Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 4 Feb 60 THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING

HCOB 11 Feb 60 CREATE AND CONFRONT

1. Locate an area where the pc cannot do, is having troubles or cannot take responsibility.

   Clear first, then say: "Give me some areas where you have difficulty (or "cannot do" or "cannot take responsibility".). Write down the pc's answers plus reads. Handle all reading areas in order of largest read, as follows:

2. Find the charged terminals that represent that area by clearing and saying (for example): "Tell me some terminals that could represent (the area,)." Write down the pc's answers plus reads.

3. In order of largest read, run each reading terminal in the following commands:

*Commands:*

F1: "What has _____ done to you?"

"What has _____ withheld from you?"

F2: "What have you done to _____?"

"What have you withheld from _____?"

F3. "What has _____ done to others?"

"What has _____ withheld from others?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

4. Exhaust the list of terminals.

   Exhaust the list of areas by repeating the above steps.

**TR 200-41 Withhold Process Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-42 Withhold Process Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 14 July 60 CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP

Commands:

F1: "What could you withhold?"

F2: "What could another withhold?"

F3. "What could others withhold?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-43   Locational Responsibility Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-44   Locational Responsibility Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

Book – SCIENTOLOGY CLEAR PROCEDURE ISSUE I p.22

*Commands:*

"You look around here and find something you could be responsible for."

"You look around here and find something you don't have to be responsible for."

"You look around here and find something you would permit somebody else to be responsible for."

Drill each command using the Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-45   Level II Triple Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-46   Level II Triple Bullbaited**

Commands:

F1:   "What has another done to you?"

"What has another withheld from you?"

F2:   "What have you done to another?"

"What have you withheld from another?"

F3:   "What has another done to another?"

"What has another withheld from another?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

**TR 200-45   Havingness Unbullbaited**
**TR 200-46   Havingness Bullbaited**

Commands:

F1:   "Tell me a flow you could be interested in."

F2:   "Tell me a flow another would be interested in."

F3:   "Tell me a flow another could get others interested in."

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

Revised by Flag Mission 1234
2nd Molly Harlow

Approved by

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

and the Commodore's Staff Aides
and the Board of Issues

for the

BOARDS OP DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:CSA:BofI:MH:mh

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

# STYLES OF AUDITING

*Note 1: Most old-time auditors, particularly Saint Hill Graduates,
have been trained at one time or another in these auditing styles. Here
they are given names and assigned to Levels so that they can be taught
more easily and so that general auditing can be improved.*

*(Note 2: These have not been written before because I had not deter-
mined the results vital to each Level.)*

There is a Style of auditing for each class. By Style is meant a method or custom of performing actions.

A Style is not really determined by the process being run so much. A Style is how the auditor addresses his task.

Different processes carry different style requirements perhaps, but that is not the point. Clay Table Healing at Level III can be run with Level I style and still have some gains. But an auditor trained up to the style required at Level III would do a better job not only of CT Healing but of any repetitive process.

Style is how the auditor audits. The real expert can do them all, but only after he can do each one. Style is a mark of Class. It is not individual. In our meaning, it is a distinct way to handle the tools of auditing.

## LEVEL ZERO

## LISTEN STYLE

At *Level 0* the Style is Listen Style Auditing. Here the auditor is expected to listen to the pc. The only skill necessary is listening to another. As soon as it is ascertained that the auditor is listening (not just confronting or ignoring) the auditor can be checked out. The length of time an auditor can listen without tension or strain showing could be a factor. What the pc does is not a factor considered in judging this style. Pcs, however, talk to an auditor who is really listening.

Here we have the highest point that old-time mental therapies reached (when they did reach it), such as psychoanalysis, when they helped anyone. Mostly they were well below this, evaluating, invalidating, interrupting. These three things are what the instructor in this style should try to put across to the HAS student.

Listen Style should not be complicated by expecting more of the auditor than just this: Listen to the pc without evaluating, invalidating or interrupting.

Adding on higher skills like "Is the pc talking interestingly?" or even "Is the pc talking?" is no part of this style. When this auditor gets in trouble and the pc won't talk or isn't interested, a higher classed auditor is called in, a new question given by the supervisor, etc.

It really isn't "Itsa" to be *very* technical. Itsa is the action of the pc saying, "It's a this" or "It's a that." *Getting* the pc to Itsa is quite beyond Listen Style auditors where the pc won't. It's the supervisor or the question on the blackboard that gets the pc to Itsa.

The *ability* to listen, learned well, stays with the auditor up through the grades. One doesn't cease to use it even at Level VI. But one has to learn it somewhere and that's at Level Zero. So Listen Style Auditing is just listening. It *thereafter* adds into the other styles.

## LEVEL ONE

## MUZZLED AUDITING

This could also be called rote style auditing.

Muzzled Auditing has been with us many years. It is the stark total of TRs 0 to 4 and not anything else added.

It is called so because auditors too often added in comments, Qed and Aed, deviated, discussed and otherwise messed up a session. Muzzle meant a "muzzle was put on them", figuratively speaking, so they would *only* state the auditing command and ack.

Repetitive Command Auditing, using TRs 0 to 4, at Level One is done completely muzzled.

This could be called Muzzled Repetitive Auditing Style but will be called "Muzzled Style" for the sake of brevity.

It has been a matter of long experience that pcs who didn't make gains with the partially trained auditor permitted to two-way comm, did make gains the instant the auditor was muzzled: to wit, not permitted to do a thing but run the process, permitted to say nothing but the commands and acknowledge them and handle pc originations by simple acknowledgment without any other question or comment.

At Level One we don't expect the auditor to do anything but state the command (or ask the question) with no variation, acknowledge the pc's answer and handle the pc origins by understanding and acknowledging what the pc said.

Those processes used at Level One actually respond best to muzzled auditing and worst to misguided efforts to "Two-Way Comm".

Listen Style combines with Muzzled Style easily. But watch out that Level One sessions don't disintegrate to Level Zero.

Crisp, clean repetitive commands, muzzled, given and answered *often*, are the road out – not pc wanderings.

A pc at this Level is instructed in exactly what is expected of him, exactly what the auditor will do. The pc is even put through a few "do birds fly?" cycles until the pc gets the idea. Then the processing works.

An auditor trying to do Muzzled Repetitive Auditing on a pc who, through past "therapy experience", is rambling on and on is a sad sight. It means that control is out (or that the pc never got above Level Zero).

It's the number of commands given and answered in a unit of auditing time that gets gains. To that add the correctly chosen repetitive process and you have a release in short order, using the processes of this Level.

To follow limp Listen Style with crisp, controlled Muzzled Style may be a shock. But they are each the lowest of the two families of auditing styles – Totally Permissive and Totally Controlled. And they are so different each is easy to learn with no confusion. It's been the lack of difference amongst styles that confuses the student into slopping about. Well, these two are different enough – Listen Style and Muzzled Style – to set anybody straight.

## LEVEL TWO

## GUIDING STYLE AUDITING

An old-time auditor would have recognized this style under two separate names: (a) Two-Way Comm and (b) Formal Auditing.

We condense these two old styles under one new name: Guiding Style Auditing.

One first *guides* the pc by "two-way comm" into some subject that has to be handled or into revealing what should be handled and then the auditor handles it with formal repetitive commands.

Guiding Style Auditing becomes feasible only when a student can do Listen Style and Muzzled Style Auditing well.

Formerly the student who couldn't confront or duplicate a command took refuge in sloppy discussions with the pc and called it auditing or "Two-Way Comm".

The first thing to know about Guiding Style is that one lets the pc talk and Itsa without chop, but also gets the pc steered into the proper subject and gets the job done with repetitive commands.

We presuppose the auditor at this Level has had enough case gain to be able to occupy the viewpoint of the auditor and therefore to be able to observe the pc. We also presuppose at this Level that the auditor, being able to occupy a viewpoint, is therefore more self-determined, the two things being related. (One can only be self-determined when one can observe the actual situation before one: otherwise a being is delusion-determined or other-determined.)

Thus in Guiding Style Auditing, the auditor is there to find out what's what from the pc and then apply the needful remedy.

Most of the processes in the Book of Remedies are included in this Level (II). To use those, one has to observe the pc, discover what the pc is doing, and remedy the pc's case accordingly.

The result for the pc is a far-reaching re-orientation in Life.

Thus the essentials of Guiding Style Auditing consist of Two-Way Comm that steers the pc into revealing a difficulty followed by a repetitive process to handle what has been revealed.

One does expert TRs but one may discuss things with the pc, let the pc talk and in general one audits the pc before one, establishing what *that* pc needs and then doing it with crisp repetitive auditing, but all the while alert to changes in the pc.

One runs at this Level against Tone Arm Action, paying little or no heed to the needle except as a centering device for TA position. One even establishes what's to be done by the action of the Tone Arm. (The process of storing up things to run on the pc by seeing what fell when he was running what's being run, now belongs at this Level (II) and will be re-numbered accordingly.)

At II one expects to handle a lot of chronic PTPs, overts, ARC Breaks with Life (but not session ARC Breaks, that being a needle action, session ARC Breaks being sorted out by a higher classed auditor if they occur).

To get such things done (PTPs, overts and other remedies) in the session the auditor must have a pc "willing to talk to the auditor about his difficulties". That presupposes we have an auditor at this Level who can ask questions, not repetitive, that guide the pc into talking about the difficulty that needs to be handled.

*Great* command of TR 4 is the primary difference in TRs from Level I. One understands, when one doesn't, by asking more questions, and by really acknowledging only when one has really understood it.

Guided comm is the clue to control at this Level. One should *easily* guide the pc's comm in and out and around without chopping the pc or wasting session time. As soon as an auditor gets the idea of *finite result* or, that is to say, a specific and definite result expected, all this is easy. Pc has a PTP. Example: Auditor has to have the idea he is to locate and destimulate the PTP so pc is not bothered about it (and isn't being driven to do something about it) as the finite result.

The auditor at II is trained to audit the pc before him, get the pc into comm, guide the pc toward data needful to choose a process and then to run the process necessary to resolve that thing found, usually by repetitive command and always by TA.

The Book of Remedies is the key to this Level and this auditing style.

One listens but only to what one has guided the pc into. One runs repetitive commands with good TR 4. *And* one may search around for quite a while before one is satisfied he has the answer from the pc needful to resolve a certain aspect of the pc's case.

O/W can be run at Level I. But at Level II one may *guide* the pc into divulging what the pc considers a real overt act and, having that, then guide the pc through all the reasons it wasn't an overt and so eventually blow it.

Half-acknowledgment is also taught at Level II – the ways of keeping a pc talking by giving the pc the feeling he is being heard and yet not chopping with overdone TR 2.

Big or multiple acknowledgment is also taught to shut the pc off when the pc is going off the subject.

## LEVEL III

## ABRIDGED STYLE AUDITING

By Abridged is meant "abbreviated", shorn of extras. Any not actually needful auditing command is deleted.

For instance, at Level I the auditor *always* says, when the pc wanders off the subject, "I will repeat the auditing command" and does so. In Abridged Style the auditor omits this when it isn't necessary and just asks the command again if the pc has forgotten it.

In this style we have shifted from pure rote to a sensible use or omission as needful. We still use repetitive commands expertly, but we don't use rote that is unnecessary to the situation.

Two-Way Comm comes into its own at Level III. But with heavy use of repetitive commands.

At this Level we have as the primary process, Clay Table Healing. In this an auditor must *make sure* the commands are followed exactly. No auditing command is *ever* let go of until that actual command is answered by the pc.

*But* at the same time, one doesn't necessarily give every auditing command the process has in its rundown.

In Clay Table Healing one is supposed to make sure the pc is satisfied each time. This is done more often by observation than command. Yet it is done.

We suppose at III that we have an auditor who is in pretty fine shape and can observe. Thus we *see* the pc is satisfied and don't mention it. Thus we see when the pc is not certain and so we get something the pc is certain of in answering the question.

On the other hand, one gives *all* the necessary commands crisply and definitely and gets them executed.

Prepchecking and needle usage is taught at Level III as well as Clay Table Healing. Auditing by List is also taught. In Abridged Style Auditing one may find the pc (being cleaned up on a list question) giving half a dozen answers in a rush. One doesn't stop the pc from doing so, one half acknowledges, and lets the pc go on. One is in actual fact handling a bigger auditing comm cycle, that is all. The question elicits more than one answer which is really only one answer. And when that answer is given, it is acknowledged.

One sees when a needle is clean without some formula set of questions that invalidate all the pc's relief. And one sees it *isn't* clean by the continued puzzle on the pc's face.

There are tricks involved here. One asks a question of the pc with the key word in it and notes that the needle doesn't tremble, and so concludes the question about the word is flat. And so doesn't check it again. Example: "Has anything else been suppressed?" One eye on pc, one on needle, needle didn't quiver. Pc looks noncommittal. Auditor says, "All right, on " and goes on to next question, eliminating a pc's possible protest read that can be mistaken for another "suppress".

In Abridged Style Auditing one sticks to the essentials and drops rote where it impedes case advance. But that doesn't mean one wanders about. One is even more crisp and thorough with Abridged Style Auditing than in rote.

One is watching what happens and doing exactly enough to achieve the expected result.

By "Abridged" is meant getting the exact job done – the shortest way between two points – with no waste questions.

By now the student should know that he runs a process to achieve an exact result and he gets the process run in a way to achieve that result in the smallest amount of time.

The student is taught to guide rapidly, to have no time for wide excursions.

The processes at this Level are all rat-a-tat-tat processes – CT Healing, Prepchecking, Auditing by List.

Again it's the number of times the question is answered per unit of auditing time that makes for speed of result.

## LEVEL IV

## DIRECT STYLE AUDITING

By direct we mean straight, concentrated, intense, applied in a direct manner.

We do not mean direct in the sense of to direct somebody or to guide. We mean it is direct.

By direct, we don't mean frank or choppy. On the contrary, we put the pc's attention on his bank and anything we do is calculated only to make that attention more direct.

It could also mean that we are not auditing by vias. We are auditing straight at the things that need to be reached to make somebody clear.

Other than this the auditing attitude is *very* easy and relaxed.

At Level IV we have Clay Table Clearing and we have Assessment type processes.

These two types of process are both astonishingly *direct*. They are aimed directly at the Reactive Mind. They are done in a direct manner.

In CT Clearing we have almost total work and Itsa from pcs. From one end of a session to another, we may have only a few auditing commands. For a pc on CT Clearing does almost all the work if he is in session at all.

Thus we have another implication in the word "direct". The pc is talking directly to the auditor about what he is making and why in CT Clearing. The auditor hardly ever talks at all.

In assessment the auditor is aiming directly at the pc's bank and wants no pc in front of it thinking, speculating, maundering or Itsaing. Thus this assessment is a very *direct* action.

All this requires easy, smooth, steel-hand-in-a-velvet-glove control of the pc. It *looks* easy and relaxed as a style, it is straight as a Toledo blade.

The trick is to be direct in what's wanted and not deviate. The auditor settles what's to be done, gives the command and then the pc may work for a long time, the auditor alert, attentive, completely relaxed.

In assessment the auditor often pays no attention to the pc at all, as in ARC Breaks or assessing lists. Indeed, a pc at this level is trained to be quiet during the assessment of a list.

And in CT Clearing an auditor may be quiet for an hour at a stretch.

The tests are: Can the auditor keep the pc quiet while assessing without ARC Breaking the pc? Can the auditor order the pc to do something and then, the pc working on it, can the auditor remain quiet and attentive for an hour, understanding everything and interrupt alertly only when he doesn't understand and get the pc to make it clearer to him? Again without ARC Breaking the pc.

You could confuse this Direct Style with Listen Style if you merely glanced at a session of CT Clearing. But what a difference. In Listen Style the pc is blundering on and on and on. In Direct Style the pc wanders off the line an inch and starts to Itsa, let us say, with no clay work and after it was obvious to the auditor that this pc had forgotten the clay, you'd see the auditor, quick as a foil, look at the pc, very interestedly and say, "Let's see that in Clay." Or the pc doesn't really give an ability he wants to improve and you'd hear a quiet persuasive auditor voice, "Are you quite certain you want to improve that? Sounds like a goal to me. Just something, some ability you know, you'd like to improve."

You could call this style One-Way Auditing. When the pc is given his orders, after that it's all from the pc to the auditor, and all involved with carrying out that auditing instruction. When the auditor is assessing it is all from the auditor to the pc. Only when the assessment action hits a snag like a PTP is there any other auditing style used.

This is a very extreme auditing style. It is straightforward – direct.

But when needful, as in any Level, the styles learned below it are often also employed, but never in the actual actions of getting CT Clearing and Assessment done.

(Note: Level V would be the same style as VI below.)

<div align="center">

**LEVEL VI**

**ALL STYLE**

</div>

So far, we have dealt with simple actions.

Now we have an auditor handling a meter and a pc who Itsa's and Cognites and gets PTPs and ARC Breaks and Line Charges and Cognites and who finds Items and lists and who must be handled, handled, handled all the way.

As auditing TA for a 2½ hour session can go to 79 or 125 divisions (compared to 10 or 15 for the lowest level), the pace of the session is greater. It is this pace that makes perfect ability at each lower level vital when they combine into All Style. For each is now faster.

So, we learn All Style by learning each of the lower styles well, and then observe and apply the style needed every time it is needed, shifting styles as often as once every minute!

The best way to learn All Style is to become expert at each lower style so that one does the style correct for the situation each time the situation requiring that style occurs.

It is less rough than it looks. But it is also very demanding.

Use the wrong style on a situation and you've had it. ARC Break! No progress!

Example: Right in the middle of an assessment the needle gets dirty. The auditor can't continue – or shouldn't. The auditor, in Direct Style, looks up to see a-puzzled frown. The auditor has to shift to Guiding Style to find out what ails the pc (who probably doesn't really know), then to Listen Style while the pc cognites on a chronic PTP that just emerged and bothered the pc, then to Direct Style to finish the Assessment that was in progress.

The only way an auditor can get confused by All Style is by not being good at one of the lower level styles.

Careful inspection will show where the student using All Style is slipping. One then gets the student to review that style that was not well learned and practice it a bit.

So All Style, when poorly done, is very easy to remedy for it will be in error on one or more of the lower level styles. And as all these can be independently taught, the whole can be co-ordinated. All Style is hard to do only when one hasn't mastered one of the lower level styles.

## SUMMARY

These are the important Styles of Auditing. There have been others but they are only variations of those given in this HCO Bulletin. Tone 40 Style is the most notable one missing. It remains as a practice style at Level One to teach fearless body handling and to teach one to get his command obeyed. It is no longer used in practice.

As it was necessary to have every result and every process for each Level to finalize Styles of Auditing, I left this until last and here it is.

Please note that none of these Styles violate the auditing comm cycle or the TRs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

# R2-25: VIEWPOINT AND VIEWPOINT ARC STRAIGHTWIRE

Viewpoint and Viewpoint ARC Straightwire in a brief form has the following commands, 'Give me some things which it would be comfortable for you to look at'. And when the communication lag on this is flattened, 'Give me some emotions it would be all right for you to look at', 'Give me some efforts it would be all right for you to look at'. These are the chief concerns of the auditor in this process: The auditor must make sure that the preclear is absolutely certain he is comfortable in viewing such objects. The process fails when the auditor is incapable of pressing the preclear until this certainty is attained.

Viewpoint ARC Straightwire then follows, 'Who would it be all right for you to like?' And, as in any of these questions, when the communication lag has been fattened by repeated use of the first question, 'Who would it be all right for you to agree with?' 'Who would it be all right for you to communicate with?' 'Who would it be all right to have like, you?' 'Who would it be all right to have agree with you?' 'Who would it be all right to have communicate with you?' The basic formula and goal of this process is to increase the preclear's ability to tolerate views. The auditor is trying to do two things. He is trying to improve the tolerance and comfort of the preclear in viewing and experiencing knowingness, lookingness, emotingness, effortingness, thinkingness, symbolizingness, eatingness, sexingness, and mystery.

Franchise

# ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES

## HAS III

"Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" unlimited. Run in particular on any pc who has the goal of improving his memory. This process may also be used in the HGC where the pc has the chief goal of getting reality on the whole track or just improving memory.

## HAS IV

"Get the idea of changing."

"Get the idea of not changing."

The Instructor may add "something" (HAS IVa), "somebody" (HAS IVb) or a meter selected terminal (HAS IVc) to these commands at his discretion.

## HAS V

"Get the idea of solving a problem."

"Get the idea of not solving a problem."

The HAS Instructor may add a terminal if the pc complains about having lots of problems with that terminal.

## HAS VI

"Communicate with (body part)."

"Don't communicate with (body part)."

For persons who come into a co-audit chronically or temporarily ill. The person is asked by the Instructor what part of the body is ill. The Instructor takes whatever body *part* the pc names, not body condition, and uses it in above process.

## HAS VII

"Tell me something worse than a (body part)."

For more violent chronic or temporary illnesses assessed by Instructor exactly as above in HAS VI.

## HAS VIII

"Get the idea of making people friendly."

"Get the idea of making people unfriendly."

Instructor may use a specific person or the singular "a person" at discretion.

In all HAS Co-audits, the newcomer should fill out a goals sheet once a week and the Instructor should pay attention to it in choosing processes.

Further HAS Co-audit processes will be released when checked over.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jms.rd

ACC Instructors
ACC Students
Assoc Secs
HCO Secs

# ALLOWED PROCESSES 1st MELBOURNE ACC

The following processes are to be run in the last three weeks of the ACC at the option and discretion of the Instructors in consultation with individual auditors:

### Melbourne 1

Arduous Case Assessment by dynamics and other means: Overt-Withhold Straight Wire only on terminals having mass and no terminals of significance only. General terminals preferred.

### Melbourne 2

Preclear put in two-way comm with auditor by "Think of something you are willing to let me know." "Think of something you could withhold." And by other means if indicated by Instructor. Occasionally auditor asks, "How are you going?" "Is there anything you would like to tell me?" This is followed by "What would you like to confront?" alternated with "What would you rather not confront?"

Two-way comm is re-established frequently by above method where pc is in or near PT on process.

### Melbourne 3

Establish two-way comm with the pc and get tone arm down by getting off all overts and withholds on any dynamic.

Run dynamic assessment. Run small amounts of alternate create with large amounts of alternate confront on the same terminal create was run on.

Commands of Alternate Create: "What part of a….would you be willing to create?" "What part of a….would you rather not create?"

Commands of Alternate Confront: "What part of a (same terminal as used for create) could you confront?" "What part of a……would you rather not confront? "

Alternate means two questions run one after the other consecutively, one command positive followed by one negative.

### Melbourne 4

Two-way comm established and continued by auditor with pc during session. Get the stories, establish the overts, pinpoint incidents in time helpfully for pc.

### Melbourne 5

Assists on body to be run by Communication Processes. "From where could you communicate to a………(body part)?" Assists for PT location to be run with "To what could you communicate from this room?"

Any other ways of cracking cases now known will be run only by Instructors.


                                        L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-.rd

# THE BAD "AUDITOR"

It is time we spent time on improving auditing skill.

We have the technology. We can make clears and OTs with it as you will find out. Our only remaining problem is getting it applied skillfully.

This is why I started the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. The extremely high calibre of auditor we are turning out is causing gasps of amazement whenever these fine graduates return into an area. We are not trying for cases at Saint Hill. I can always make clears. We are trying for skilled auditors. But we are getting there on cases, too, faster than anywhere else on the average.

This training has been almost a year in progress. I have learned much about training that is of great benefit to all of us, without at the same time skimping the training of the Saint Hill student.

Looking over incoming students I find we have, roughly, two general categories of auditor, with many shades of grey between:

1. The natural auditor.

2. The dangerous auditor.

The natural auditor ties right into it and does a workmanlike job. He or she gets lots of bulletin and tape passes in ratio to flunks, absorbs data well and gets it into practice, does a passable job on a pc even at the start of training, and improves casewise rapidly under the skilled training and auditing at Saint Hill. This is true of the clears and releases that come on course as well as those who have had much less case gains prior to this training. These, the natural auditors, make up more than half the incoming students.

The other category we will call the "dangerous auditor". The severe examples of this category make up about 20% of the incoming students and are very detectable. In shades of grey the other 30% are also, at the start, to be placed in the category of "dangerous auditor unless tightly supervised".

At Saint Hill, with few exceptions, we only get the cream of auditors and so I would say that the overall percentage across the world is probably higher in the second category than at Saint Hill.

Thus it would seem we must cure this matter at the Academies and cure it broadly throughout Scientology, and if we do, our dissemination, just on this effort alone, should leap several thousand percent. If all pcs audited everywhere were expertly audited, well, think of what that would do. To accomplish this we need only move the dangerous auditor out of the danger class.

I have found out what makes a pc suffer a deterioration of profile (missed withholds) and have found out why a dangerous auditor is dangerous. Therefore, there are no barriers to our handling the matter as even the dangerous auditor, oddly enough, wants to be a good auditor but doesn't quite know how. Now we can fix it up.

The difference between a natural auditor and a dangerous auditor is *not* case level as we have supposed, but a *type* of case.

The earliest observation on this came in ACCs. About 1% of the students (say two students every ACC) could be counted on to be miserable if his or her pc made gains and happy if the pc was collapsing. This was an observation. What were these students trying to do? What did they think they should accomplish in a session? They are an extreme case of "dangerous auditor".

*This is* how to detect a "dangerous auditor" in any shade of grey:

Any auditor who (a) cannot achieve results on a pc, (b) who finds items slowly or not at all, (c) who gets low marks on tape tests, (d) who has a high flunk-to-pass ratio on taking tests for classification, (e) whose own case moves slowly, (f) who does not respond well to a "think" process, (g) who chops a pc's comm, (h) who prevents a pc from executing an auditing command, (i) who obsessively changes processes before one is flat, (j) who apologizes or explains why he or she got no results session after session, (k) who tries to make pcs guilty, (I) who blames Scientology for not working, (m) whose pcs are always ARC breaking, or (n) who will no longer audit at all, is *suffering not from withholds but from the reverse of the withhold flow, "Afraid to find out".*

The person with withholds is afraid he or she will *be* found out. The other type of case may have withholds *but* the dominant block is exactly the reverse. Instead of being afraid he or she will *be* found out, the opposite type of case is *afraid to find out* or afraid of what he or she may find out. Thus it is a *type* of case that makes a dangerous auditor. He or she is afraid of finding out something from the pc. Probably this case is the more usual in society, particularly those who never wish to audit.

A person with withholds is afraid to be found out. Such a person has auditing difficulties as an auditor, of course, because of restraint on their own comm line. These difficulties sum up to an inability to speak during a session, going silent on the pc, failures to ask how or what the pc is doing. But this is not the *dangerous* auditor. The only dangerous thing an auditor can do is miss withholds and refuse to permit the pc to execute auditing commands. This alone will spin a pc.

The *dangerous* auditor is not afraid to be found out (for who is questioning him or her while he or she is auditing?). The *dangerous* auditor is the auditor who is afraid to find out, afraid to be startled, afraid to discover something, afraid of what they will discover. This pho-

bia prevents the "auditor" from flattening anything. This makes missed withholds a certainty. And only missed withholds create ARC breaks.

All cases, of course, are somewhat leery of finding things out and so any old-time auditor could have his quota of ARC breaks on his or her pcs. But the *dangerous* auditor is neurotic on the subject and all his or her auditing is oriented around the necessity to avoid data for fear of discovering something unpleasant. As auditing is based on finding data, such an auditor retrogresses a case rather than improves it. Such an auditor's own case moves slowly also as they fear to discover something unpleasant or frightening in the bank.

Today, the increased power of auditing makes this factor far more important than it ever was before. Old processes could be done with minimal gain but without harm by such an auditor. Today, the factor of fear-of-discovery in an auditor makes that auditor extremely dangerous to a pc.

In Prepchecking, this becomes obvious when an auditor will not actually clean up a chain and skids over withholds, thus "completing" the case by leaving dozens of missed withholds and an accordingly miserable pc.

In Routine 3D Criss Cross this becomes obvious when the auditor takes days and weeks to find an item, then finds one that won't check out. An item every three sessions of two hours each is a low average for 3D Criss Cross. An item a week is suspect. An item a month is obviously the average of an auditor who will not find out and is dangerous. The auditor who uses out-rudiments always to avoid doing 3D Criss Cross is a flagrant example of a no-discovery-please auditor.

In the CCHs, the dangerous auditor is narrowed down to prevention of executing the auditing command. This, indeed, is the only way an auditor can make the CCHs fail. In any of the CCHs, the commands and drills are so obvious that only the prevention of execution can accomplish not-finding-out. The dangerous auditor is never satisfied the pc has executed the command. Such an auditor can be seen to move the pc's hand on the wall after the pc has in fact touched the wall. Or the pc is made to do a motion over and over which is already well done. Or the pc is run only on processes that are flat and is halted on processes that are still changing.

The pc is never permitted to reveal anything by the dangerous auditor. And so "auditing" fails.

The remedies for the dangerous auditor, by class of process, are:

*Class I – Repetitive Process, run in sequence*

**Revelation Process X1**

What could you confront?

What would you permit another to reveal?

What might another confront?

What might another permit you to reveal?

What would you rather not confront?

What would you rather not have another reveal?

What might another hate to confront?

What might another object to your revealing?

What should be confronted?

What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?

(Note: This process is subject to refinement and other processes on the same subject will be released.)

### Class II – Prepchecking Zero Question

Have you ever prevented another from perceiving something? (Other such Zero Questions are possible on the theme of fear-of-discovery.)

CCHs should be used if tone arm action during any Prepchecking is less than 3/4 of a division shift per hour.

### Class III – Routine 3D Criss Cross

Find Line Items as follows:

- Who or What would be afraid to find out? (then get oppterm of resulting item)
- Who or What would prevent a discovery? (then oppterm it)
- Who or What would startle someone? (then oppterm it)
- Who or What would be unsafe for you to reveal? (then oppterm it)
- Who or What would be dangerous for another to reveal? (then oppterm it)

Note: Well run CCHs, run according to the very earliest data on them, given again on two Saint Hill Briefing Course Tapes (R-10/6106C22SH/Spec 18, "Running CCHs" and R-12/6106C27SH/Spec 21, "CCHs – Circuits"), benefit any case and are not relegated to the psychotic by a long ways. The CCHs do a remarkable job in making a good auditor for various reasons. The first CCH (Op Pro by Dup) was invented exclusively to make good auditors. The CCHs 1 to 4 are run each one in turn, only so long as they produce change and no longer, before going on to the next. When is a CCH flat so that one can go on to the next CCH? When three complete cycles of the CCH have a uniform comm lag it can be left. My advice in straightening out or improving any auditor is to first flatten the CCHs 1 to 4, and then flattening all in one run Op Pro by Dup. This would be regardless of the length of time the auditor had been auditing in Dianetics and Scientology. Then I would do the Class II and Class III processes above, preferably doing the Class III items first, then the Class II so it could go whole track, or doing the Class II, then the Class III and then the Class II again.

———————————

## SUMMARY

Following out any part of this programme in any organization, in the field and on any training course will vastly improve the results of auditing and enormously diminish auditing failures.


L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

Fran Hldrs

# CURRENT RUNDOWN

# CONCEPT HELP

Concept processing is very old (1953). The original version of concepts goes:

"Get the idea of………."

The modern version of Concept Help O/W goes:

"Think of helping a………."

"Think of not helping a……."

Two-way Concept Help goes:

"Think of a…helping you"

"Think of you helping a………"

Five-way Concept Help would go:

(a) "Think of a…helping you"

(b) "Think of you helping a………"

(c) "Think of a…helping others"

(d) "Think of others helping a…"

(e) "Think of a…helping a…"

Concept Help has the value of being below, in its effect, the level of articulate thought which of course means that it bangs away at reactive thought.

Just exercising a pc in thinking at command is a sort of CCH on thinkingness, with which, of course, pcs have trouble. They have more trouble with creating than thinking and concepts are more in kind with confronting than with creating. Making a pc invent answers is, of course, right on his worst button. Therefore Concept Help goes a long ways on a case. It is quite unlimited, no matter what form is run, so long as some attention is paid to flow direction. (A flow run too long in one direction gives anaten – unconsciousness, remember?)

**ALTERNATE CONFRONT**

Concept Help, however, has the liability of making things "muggy" at times because of its indefiniteness.

Aside from create, the primary button that is awry (but which cannot be directly attacked without often overshooting the case or involving it in heavy bank reaction), the next things mechanically wrong with a pc would be unconsciousness and confusion. Help, of course, is the primary point of association and identification and is **why** things go wrong with a pc. But a scale of **what** is right with a pc in descending order of importance would be, as above:

> Creativeness
>
> Consciousness
>
> Order
>
> Control

and these would be flanked by the things wrong with these items which make them decline:

> Create – Irresponsibility
>
> Consciousness – Refusal to confront
>
> Order – Unwillingness to bring order
>
> Control – Lack of control.

Help fits in somewhat on this order. One creates to help (and fails). One goes unconscious to help or makes another unconscious to help him/her (and fails). One sees difficulty for others in too much order, seeing that two systems of order clash, and lets down his to help.

One conceives that control is bad and ceases to control and resists control to help others. These are all wrong helps, apparently, and when done, bring about aberration.

Aberration consists, evidently, of wrong-way assistance as follows:

> Optimum Condition ⟶ Response ⟶ Resulting Condition
>
> Creativeness ⟶ Irresponsibility ⟶ Disowned Creations
>
> Consciousness ⟶ Non-Confront ⟶ Unconsciousness
>
> Orderliness ⟶ Unwilling conflict ⟶ Confusion
>
> Ability to Control ⟶ Consequence of control ⟶ Mis-control.

Confront is a remedy for the consequences of the first three conditions and also communication. An auditing session itself by its TR mechanics, improves control and communication. Therefore Confront in one form or another is needed in routine sessions.

Havingness is an objective and somewhat obscure method of confronting and using it as we do objectively, it is a specialized form of confronting, possibly its best form, objective

or subjective, even though a series of subjective havingness in Washington in 1955 tended to show that profile gains were not made by subjective confront, a conclusion still subject to further checking.

Confront straightens out any "mugginess" churned up by Concept Help. No vast tone arm improvements should be expected from Alternate Confront, but even if it doesn't work well, like havingness, as a primary process, it has very good uses. Alternate Confront gives us a stabilizing tool. Pc feels weird = run Alternate Confront. He'll feel saner. Following this subjective process with the best objective process, havingness, we achieve stability for the gains reached by a help process.

As a comment, beingness is more involved with havingness than with confront.

Confront, on short test, can be run lop-sided, and does disturb the tone arm. "What would you rather not confront?" run all by itself in *one* pc (a BMA type test series!) did very well. "What can you confront?" of course did very well. Alternate Confront has enough wrong with it to be poor as a process for getting gains but wonderful as a process for stabilizing a case. I'll run some more tests on Negative Confront and let you know. But it is a fluke. By theory it is improbable as it is a cousin to the no-good "What could you go out of communication with?" But "What could you withhold?" is the greatest IQ raiser known! And it works. So perhaps Negative Confront, "What would you rather not confront?", will work too. Of course it's a fundamental button. All unconsciousness, stupidity, forgetfulness and enforced beingness result from problems in confronting.

## IDENTIFICATION

A=A=A=A is as true today as it ever was. The inability to differentiate is, of course, a decline in awareness. Identifying Joe with Bill or Rocks with Smoke is loony.

This is identification, a word that is amusing semantically, as its exact opposite, "Identify", is its cure, but is the same word!

Association of things or thoughts into classes is considered all right and may even be necessary to "learn" things. But this is the middle ground, already half way to lazy thinking.

*Help,* as assistance, is an identification of mutual interest in survival. Thus we have (1) possible confusion of beingness and (2) continuation. This makes *help* ripe for trouble. When one *fails* to help he keeps on helping! No matter how. He does keep on helping what he has failed to help. One of many mechanisms is to keep the scene in mock-up.

Help is a fundamental necessity, it appears, to every person. But it is dynamite when it goes wrong.

As a symptom of its continuance (survival factor – see Book ONE) pcs running help readily get the idea that help on some terminal "will never flatten" even though it is flattening nicely!

To handle this as a special item, one can run the confront part of a session with "Continuous Confront", the Alternate form of which is:

(a) "What could you continue to confront?"

(b) "What would you rather not continue to confront?"

The positive form (a) can be run alone for case gain. And I am going to test the negative form (b) as a single run to see if it can be "gotten away with". In theory, as all anaten is unwillingness to confront and as all help is continuous survival, form (b), Negative Continuous Confront, should do marvels for IQ and *may* become the proper companion for help processes if the session is *ended* with havingness.

At the present moment auditing routine is:

Pre-session

Model Session

Help Processes

Alternate Confront

Havingness

all in every session.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

# CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE
# VIEWPOINT STRAIGHTWIRE

This is a process which is very simple, very easy to use, and makes continuous advances. This process is not mixed with other processes, it is not part of any Standard Operating Procedure. It is not part of anything you would do ordinarily. It doesn't particularly apply to one case level or another case level. It is an independent process which in itself is very simple to administer.

The formula of this process is: All the definitions and Axioms, arrangements and scales of Scientology should be used in such a way as to bring about a greater tolerance of such viewpoints on the part of the preclear. That means that any scale there is, any arrangement of fundamentals in thinkingness, beingness, could be so given in a straightwire process that it would bring about a higher state of tolerance on the part of the preclear.

To make this more intelligible you should understand what a great many preclears are doing, and why an auditor occasionally has trouble with one preclear more than another. A great many preclears are being processed solely and entirely because they are unable to bring themselves to tolerate an enormous number of viewpoints, and being unable to tolerate these viewpoints they desire processing so that they can fall away from them and not have to observe them, and the auditor is auditing somebody who is in full retreat, and Scientology is being asked to aid and abet the retreat by, for instance, taking the charge off an engram. The auditor at the same time, if he does this, gives the preclear something in the way of a change of viewpoint in that he erases something so that the preclear doesn't have to view it any more.

Well, as you can see, this is a weak direction. What the auditor then is doing is to some degree holding in question the ability of the preclear to tolerate viewpoints. Time itself may very well be caused by an intolerance of past viewpoints – a person doesn't want viewpoints in the past, and so at a uniform rate he abandons past viewpoints, and when he no longer is following this uniform rate but is abandoning them faster than the uniform rate, he starts to jam up in terms of time, and becomes obsessed about time, becomes very hectic, begins to rush time, push hard against the events of the day, feels that he doesn't have enough time to accomplish everything he is supposed to accomplish, and this falls off on a very rapid curve to a point where an individual will simply sit around idle, fully cognizant of the fact that he doesn't have enough time to do anything. And so doesn't do anything, but knows he should be doing something but can't do anything because he doesn't have enough time. This is idiocy itself, but is the state in which you find a very great many people.

Time is the single arbitrary entered into life and is well worth investigating on the part of an auditor. An unwillingness to tolerate viewpoints will cause a jam in time. The fewer viewpoints which an individual will tolerate, the greater his occlusion and the worse his general state of beingness is. As I said, an auditor can remedy this in various ways. He can erase locks, secondaries and engrams (Lock, Secondary, Engram: A lock is a mental image picture of a non-painful but disturbing experience the person has experienced and which depends for its force on an earlier secondary and engram which the experience has restimulated. A secon-

dary is a mental image picture containing misemotion [encysted grief, anger, apathy, etc.] and a real or imagined loss. These contain no physical pain – they are moments of shock and stress and depending for their force on earlier engrams which have been restimulated by the circumstances of the secondary. An engram is a mental picture of an experience containing pain, unconsciousness, and a real or fancied threat to survival; it is a recording in the reactive mind of something which actually happened to an individual in the past and which contained pain and unconsciousness, both of which are recorded in the mental image picture called an engram). And by erasing these, he can make it possible for the individual to "tolerate the view", as he finds it in his own bank. Or, an individual can be so processed, as in exteriorization, that he can be caused to go around and look at various things and find out that they are not so bad.

Now, let's just take the mean between these two, and realize that a person who doesn't exteriorize is a person who does not want an exteriorized viewpoint. He does not feel he can tolerate an exteriorized viewpoint. He may have many reasons for this and one of the main reasons he will give is the consideration that someone may steal his body. In other words here you have a tremendously valuable viewpoint which he's likely to lose if he exteriorizes.

Viewpoints then must be scarce, viewpoints are all obviously too valuable to be used. And this comes about by viewpoints becoming intolerable.

Let's take somebody standing and watching his family being butchered by soldiers or something of this sort, Indians or other wild people. He would go along afterwards so intolerant of this viewpoint that he would fixate on it. It's the fact that he refuses to tolerate the viewpoint which makes him fixate on it. Now the reason for this lies in the various Agree – Disagree scales in the Philadelphia Doctorate Course lectures – the fact that if you want anything, in this universe, you can't have it, and that if you don't want it, you're going to get it. This is an inversion, and when this inversion comes about, an individual finds himself overwhelmed each time on whatever his own determinism is. If he starts to desire something he will find out immediately that he can't have it. Actually, he himself will take steps to make sure that he can't have it.

When he wants something to flow in, it flows out, when he wants something to flow out, it flows in. There is nothing more pathetic, for instance, than watching a psychotic try to give up any material object – trying to make them hand over or give up, or throw away one possession, such as an old Kleenex, almost anything – just try to make them give it up. No, no, they just won't do it. They clutch it to them and I swear that if you handed them an adder, wide-mouthed and fully fanged, they would clutch it to their bosom. Anything that comes in they immediately seize and that's that.

Now you as an auditor, every time you are trying to get someone to give up something, are asking them to give up a compulsive viewpoint. You will see that every time you ask someone to give up something he is likely to hold it closer.

Now there are many processes. There are a great many processes, there are all the Standard Operating Procedures, and in good hands they all work. There's Universe Processing, there's Advanced Course Procedure, there's Creative Processing, on and on and on and on, a tremendous number of techniques, which can be applied with good sense to preclears.

There are an enormous number of Straightwire processes, there's old-time Straightwire. The earliest Straightwire we had, which, by the way, was a marked advance on Freudian analysis, went like this: say we noticed that the preclear is afraid of cats. We would say: "Recall a time when you were afraid of cats", then: "Recall somebody who was afraid of cats", and then: "Find a time when somebody said you were like this person". That was approximately its formula – just Straightwire, and you sprung apart these valences very gently.

However, it required a great deal of good sense on the part of the auditor.

An auditor now and then would become a Straightwire expert, and by just asking searching questions and causing the individual to recall certain things he would bring about a great deal of relief on the case. Why did the relief take place? The individual has been going along in the full belief that he could not tolerate a certain viewpoint and the auditor has come along and demonstrated to him that that viewpoint was in the past and therefore is tolerable.

There, in essence, are the fundamentals of such Straightwire. You get key-outs (Key-out: Release or separation from one's reactive mind or some portion of it) on this – the individual comes up to present time so that he isn't looking in the past – assuming a past viewpoint. That is a goal of a great many processes, and is quite different from "wipe out the past so he won't have to look at it or experience it".

We have in Viewpoint Straightwire a very, very, new type of thinking. This is not to be confused with what we have been doing for all these many years. It hasn't any connection with it. It has an entirely different goal from that of any process you've ever done on a preclear. It takes the benefit of exteriorization, and reduces it to Straightwire. We get an individual to race around the universe to look at things observe things, experience things.

That's a Grand Tour (Grand Tour: The process R1-9, in The Creation of Human Ability by L. Ron Hubbard.) – that sort of drill – and here we reduce it right down to a Straightwire which is done interiorized or exteriorized.

One simply goes on the basis that the preclear is in the state he's in because he's not tolerating many viewpoints, and the entire goal of the process is to bring him to a point where he will tolerate viewpoints. That's all there is to the process.

The key wording of the process is "you wouldn't mind". Why do I announce this as something important, something new, something that is very useful to you? There are many varieties of viewpoint. If we were to take Full Knowingness, and squash it, we would find we were first getting into space, which would be perception. We have to perceive to know. This is the level of Lookingness. Now if we condense that we find out that we have to get Emote to know. A person has to emote. We squash perception, and we go into Emotion to know.

Now, if we squash down and condense even further, we get Effortingness, and if we condense Effort even further, we get Thinkingness, and if we condense and package Thinkingness, we get Symbols. As an example of this, what is a Word but a package of thought, and if we were to condense Symbols, we would get actually the wider definition of the symbol – we would get animals. You are probably thinking of it in terms of a viewpoint of a body, if you don't see that clearly, but the definition of a symbol is a mass with meaning, which is mobile. That is a symbol and of course that is an animal, too. An animal has certain form

which gives him certain meaning and he is mobile, and if you see that the Thinkingness condenses, then, into form, you will understand art. Just in so many words, a very simple thing.

We have Thinkingness condensing into Symbolizingness, ideas condensing into actually solid objects, and when these are mobile, we have symbols, and when these symbols are observed, they are found to wind themselves up with other symbols and take an associate, they associate with one and another, and take things from one and another, and you get Eatingness. That's a big, big band we're covering in there, that's the whole business of: "I have an idea about a form in this space and matter, and I'm going to get it all together, and I'm going to make this all mass together." Well, the second we've done that, something has been created. Now don't expect that thing which has been created to create anything. This is a thing which isn't creating, and therefore must subsist on an interchange of energy, and we get eating. Now we take eating and condense it down, that is to say, let's make food scarce, and let's make it very hard to get, and we get a condensation which completely escapes time itself, and you go outside of time and you get Sexingness.

That is to say that outside of present time, you get future time, which is sex.

An individual is right straight off the time track between Eating and Sex, and there's nothing will float on a time track like a sexual engram. They just float all over the time track.

They don't nail down at all. They are very mobile. The individual, in Eatingness, starts to slide out of present time by this token alone, and people are terribly worried about how are they going to eat tomorrow, and when they have reduced this down to the reductio ad gastronomy you get to a point where "I can't solve this problem of eating tomorrow, therefore I'd better just leave it all up to somebody else," and slide in on the genetic protoplasm line and go up the line a little bit, and get another form, and be that.

That's the best way to solve eating – just to live tomorrow and maybe tomorrow there will be more food.

A very readily available test will demonstrate this. Notice those countries of the world which breed faster and harder than other countries of the world. We find India and China doing this. And we find that these are two countries which have extreme, chronic food scarcity. Now we can say, well look, they have the greatest food scarcity because they keep breeding people, and that eats up all their food. No, it's the other way around. They eat up all their food, and so they breed like mad. This can be tested also with animals. If you starve an animal, an animal will procreate faster. If you were, for instance, to give any family of homo sapiens a carbohydrate diet with a very, very low protein content – by the way this would be, you'd say, terribly unconducive to the production of estrogen, androgen. It's proven to be very unproductive of it – but if you give them a high carbohydrate, very low protein diet, the next thing you know they'll start to get very anxious about breeding. That's because you're telling them in essence right where they can understand it in their stomachs that they are unable to obtain enough food today, and so must eat tomorrow. Therefore you get countries of the Western hemisphere, which are very heavily starch dieted, and you find out that these countries are the most anxious about breeding and about tomorrow. There is no reason to stand around and prove this for hours. It's just the Know-to-Sex scale. Condensed knowingness.

"I don't know how I'm going to get along today therefore I'd better breed like mad and appear tomorrow and maybe I'll know then," is about the last ditch. Well, if you notice this, death must come, in this band, above sex. A person presupposes his own death to indulge in the protoplasm line. And so we get people like Schopenhauer and The Will and the Idea closely associating sex and death, and we get certain animals and insects, which so closely associate sex and death that they have accomplished death when they have accomplished sex.

Fear Merchants (Fear Merchants: The aberrative personality. This was an early description of what is known as a Suppressive Person, or the Anti-Social Personality) like to tell you about the black widow spider. I don't know why the black widow spider is such an attractive beast to some people, but it is apparently so. I noticed that it exists mainly in California – Southern California. Lots of black widow spiders down there, and most California girls, if you get into any kind of discussion on the second dynamic at all, will sooner or later inform you that the female black widow spider eats its mate after consummation of the sexual act. Anyway, the main thing here is that actually when you go down this scale, although it doesn't belong on the scale, you'll find death just before sex. Know, Look, Emote, Effort, Think, Symbol, Eat, Death, Sex. Death doesn't belong there, but this shows you where this mechanism comes in.

Now, beingness might also be on this scale somewhere. Beingness might be on this scale, and if it were, you would have a tendency to look for it up toward the top, but the truth of the matter is, it's all up and down the scale, and there is no beingness like that beingness at Symbols. You find the human race having been made into a form – a mass, meaning, mobility. A mass with meaning which is mobile – that's a body, that's a word in a dictionary, that's a flag above a building, it can be moved around and it has meaning. You'll find that human beings indulge very, very heavily in being symbols. Well, you'll find people around being sexual objects too. So that this scale sort of interlocks on beingness. A fellow could be some effort – and actually we don't find beingness at the top of the scale at all, we find it down there pretty low on the scale, so when an individual has gotten to a point where he has to be something, he's practically at bottom. A further examination would have to put beingness at least at Symbols. A person becomes things at that level, and you will frequently find a preclear mainly being his name.

Looking further, we find that there are different kinds of viewpoints. There is something you might call a know-point. That would be senior to a viewpoint. An individual would not have dependency on space or mass or anything else. He'd simply know where he was. There would be a viewpoint, which is a perception point, which would consist of look, and smell, and talk, and hear, and all sorts of things could be thrown in under this category, viewpoint. Ordinarily we simply mean at that level of the scale, looking, but you can throw all the rest of the perceptions in at that level of the scale.

Going down a little bit from there we get something we could call an emotion-point. It would be that point from which a person emotes, and at which he emoted, and then there would be something else called an effort-point, and the effort-point would be that area from which a person exerted effort, and that area into which that person received effort. And as we went down a little bit from that, we'd find we had a thinking-point, and there of course we get the "figure-figure-figure". The person is thinking there, not looking. And if we go down a

little bit further than this from a thinking-point, we get a symbol-point, and there, really properly, we get words. And below that we get an eating-point, and below that we get a sex – point.

If you considered each one of these points below known as an effort to make space, a great deal of human behavior would make sense. Let's take an individual who is simply trying to make space with words. Words don't make good space. So an individual who tries to make space with words sooner or later gets into bad condition. Much lower than that would be a person who is trying to make space with eating. Of course that's inverted, isn't it? And then there's the person who is trying to make space with sex, and that is really inverted. That goes both ways from the middle. The lowest part of the eating scale is excreta and urine. People will try and make space with that. Dogs, for instance, are always trying to make space that way.

There are people who are trying to make space with effort. This is the use of force, this is Ghengis Khan riding out and slaughtering villages. He's trying to make space. You notice that the space had to exist before he could ride out any place.

And we go up a little higher, and maybe you've known somebody who's tried to make space with emotion. And we go up a little higher and we get to the way you do make space which is by looking. And actually you get to make space by knowing. If you just knew there was some space, there would be some space, and that would be all there was to that. Just that simple. That's an effective way to go about it, and looking is another effective way to go about it, and when we get down to emotion, that is getting ineffective. People who try to make space with emotion don't get very far. That's literally, actually, figuratively, or any other way you want to look at it. It's too condensed, and it kicks back. Yet that is above the individual who makes space by working hard or by pushing hard or by exerting force.

In other words we see that there is quite a little bit of band there, at effort, and you'll see that they get less far than people who try to make space with emotion. And now we get into the thinking band, and people who try to make space with thinking, which is about the most unworkable activity that anybody could engage in.

When we get down to making space with symbols, here is a nation trying to fly its flag over all the world, which doesn't make much space, and then we go into eating, and an individual trying to make space by offering things to be eaten. A cattleman, for instance, is doing this. He's making space with cattle. And a fat man is trying to make space with food, and so on. Now when we get down into sex, of course, if an individual could breed fast enough and far enough he would wind up with all sorts of space, he thinks. Of course, he winds up with no space. This is the most condensed activity you can get into: sex. You can see somebody's bank all short-circuited – jammed on sex. But remember, we are looking at a gradient scale that runs from Sexingness right on up through the levels to Knowingness.

And if anybody comes along and tells you that sex is the only aberration, please laugh.

You could answer, Yes, that was how we entered the problem, we found nut that people were loopy on the subject of sex. So then we examined the problem further, and having examined the problem for many years, it was discovered that sex was part of a gradient scale of human experience which is basically an activity of trying to make space, and people try to

make space in various ways. And when they get down too low on the scale they are abandoning present – time life and at that point they have sunk to the level of Sexingness. They are trying in this way to get some future up there on the track and it is a chaos. It is an attempt to derive experience from external sources, and to pull experience in.

Operation at the level of Sexingness is really a cave-in.

When you examine this band and its inversions up and down the scale you see that it gives us an enormous number of Straightwire questions.

The basic question would reduce this first from the stand-point of viewpoint of the whole scale, and that is where you catch your preclear most ably. You just take viewpoint of the scale, viewpoint of sex, viewpoint of effort, and so forth.

The systematic questions that go into this line would be as follows: you ask the preclear to give: "Something you wouldn't mind knowing." "Something you wouldn't mind looking at." "An emotion you wouldn't mind observing." "Some effort you wouldn't mind observing." "Some thinking which you wouldn't mind observing." "Some symbols which you wouldn't mind seeing." "Some eating which you wouldn't mind inspecting." "Some sex which you wouldn't mind looking at." Just as mildly and quietly as that. And that's Viewpoint Straightwire.

Franchise

# O-W A LIMITED THEORY

Before I would permit you to believe that the overt-withhold mechanism was a total way of life, I would point out that it applies only to a strata of existence and that it stems from failures to help.

The theory that what you do to others will then happen to you is a punishment control mechanism peculiar to this universe. It derives from a deteriorated willingness to duplicate. It *is* the law of physics of *Interaction* – for every action there is an equal and contrary reaction.

"Love thy neighbour", when it is no longer a willingness, is enforced by the theory of O-W. "Love thy neighbour" can exist only when help, control and communication are high. When all these go, then O-W comes into vogue as a method of enforcing peace.

O-W is a theory which sets in when aberration sets in. It is not a high natural law. It is junior to the various laws of Communication, Control and Help.

O-W can occur only when help has failed. Help is a co-joining of vectors of life. When two beings who have joined forces to help fail each other, only then does O-W come into existence.

The forces of two beings cannot come into dispute until after they have first joined. Thus there is no war like that seen between brothers or husband and wife.

The cycle is this:

**Independent Beings**
**Communication**
**Mis-Communication**
**Control**
**Mis-Control**
**Help**
**Failed Help**
**Overts and Withholds**
**Overts and Withholds by Transfer**
**Worrying Others**
**Worrying about Others**
**Being Critical**

### Being Critical of Self

Basically, O-W is an effort to regain the status of independent being without taking responsibility for any of the intervening steps.

The reason we run O-Ws is that most pcs are on O-W by Transfer, which is to say, when they kick George in the head they get a headache themselves. This makes them think they are George. We use O-W since it explains phenomena found at a low humanoid level. We do not use it because it is a senior governing law of the universe.

When Help comes up, O-W as a mechanism drops out. We *could* run a full case, it would appear, with Help. However, in practice it is better to run lots of O-W with failed help as they complement each other and move the case faster. By running O-W we disclose many new failed helps. Why? Look at the cycle above and see that O-W occurs only when Help has failed.

Similarly, on the same cycle we see that worry undercuts O-W. But if it is run, it should be worked with O-W. The worry cure has commands as follows:

Get the idea of worrying something.

Get the idea of not worrying something.

Get the idea of something being worrisome.

People, animals, things can be used in place of "something". The process, going rapidly up toward failed help, is a bit limited and should be run with another process of the type of "Get the idea of attacking something" "Get the idea of not attacking something" to keep it going. The worry process bogs if run too long just by itself. It is a very valuable process as it explains many reactions and undercuts many cases. Worrying something is close to the lowest level of overt. It is the lowest effort to individuate.

But just as worry is not a way of life nor an answer to all of life, neither is the O-W mechanism an end-all law.

Many cases are not up to recognizing their overts. They will also have trouble recognizing their failures to help. Usually, then, they can recognize being worried or worrying people and thinking unkind thoughts and even attacking things.

Failed help also lies as a harmonic below O-W and so runs on any case if assisted with O-W as in Formula 13 or assisted with the Worry Process as above.

Worrying people is almost a way of life for the juvenile, just as O-W is with a criminal. People who feel childish or act that way are stuck in the violent motion of childhood *and* worrying others. Many pcs use their processing just to worry the auditor. Worry is the most easily dramatized O-W.

O-W, whether as worry or being critical (unkind thoughts), *is* the result of failure to help. O-W is the reason one gets another's valence. O-W is why pcs have somatics. But O-W is not a high order law.

You will not always have to be careful not to bump Joe. It would be a horrible universe indeed if O-W was its senior law, for one could then never *do* anything.

Fortunately, it drops out, both as a governing law and a necessity in life.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: pe.cden

[This HCO B was later reissued from Saint Hill Manor on 5 January 1961 with the distribution "Franchise Holders".]

HCO Secs
D of Ps


# A USEFUL PROCESS


On your HGC process you have many who cannot seem to plumb an overt/motivator sequence. On any such and many more, you will find the following process works admirably:

"Recall being critical."

"Recall withholding criticism."

If the pc tends to become ill push on through. This is the lowest level of force and influences body form. Try it and tell me how it goes.


L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

Add HCO Bulletin 8 March 1962
*THE BAD "AUDITOR"*

# SUPPRESSORS

The discovery of the "other side of withholds" type of case, the person who is afraid to find out, brings to view the reason behind all slow gain cases.

My first release was directed at auditing because good auditing is, of course, my primary concern at the moment.

But let us not overlook the importance of this latest discovery. For here is our roughest case to audit, as well as our roughest auditor.

Every case has a little of "afraid to find out". So you may have taken HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962, more personally than you should have. BUT everyone's auditing can be improved, even mine, and adding a full willingness to find out to one's other auditing qualities will certainly improve one's auditing ability. Here probably is the only real case difference I have had. My own "afraid to find out" is minimal and so I had no reality on it as a broadly held difficulty. Where I ran into it was in trying to account for differences amongst students *and* in auditors who sought to audit me. Some could, some couldn't. And this was odd because my ability to as-is bank is great, therefore I should be easy to audit. But some could audit me and some couldn't. Two different auditors found me reacting as two different pcs. Therefore there must have been another factor. It was my study of this and my effort to understand "bad auditing" on myself as a pc that gave us the primary lead in. I made a very careful analysis of what the auditor was doing who couldn't or wouldn't audit me, an easy pc. The answer, after many tries and much study of students, finally came down, crash, to the "afraid to find out" phenomena. Thus my first paper on this (HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962) enters the problem as a problem of auditing skill.

## THE ROUGH PC

The characteristic of the rough pc is *not* a pc's tendency to ARC Break and scream, as we have tended to believe, but something much more subtle.

The first observation of this must be credited to John Sanborn, Phoenix, 1954, who remarked to me in an auditor's conference, "Well, I don't know. I don't think this pc is getting on (the one he was staff auditing). I keep waiting for him to say, 'Well, what do you know!' or

'Gosh!' or something like that and he just grinds on and on. I guess you'd call it 'No cognition' or something." John, with his slow, funny drawl, had put his finger on something hard.

The pc who makes no gain is the pc who will not *as-is.* Who will not confront. Who can be audited forever without cogniting on anything.

The fulminating or dramatizing pc may or may not be a tough pc. The animal psychologist has made this error. The agitated person is always to blame, never the quiet one. But the quiet one is quite often the much rougher case.

The person whose "thought has no effect on his or her bank" has been remarked on by me for years. And now we have that person. This person is so afraid to find out that he or she will not permit anything to appear and therefore nothing will as-is? therefore, no cognition!

The grind case, the audit forever case, is an afraid to find out case.

We need a new word. We have *withholds,* meaning an unwillingness to disclose past action. We should probably call the opposite of a *withhold,* a "suppressor". A *"suppressor" would be the impulse to forbid revelation in another.* This of course, being an overt, reacts on one's own case as an impulse to keep oneself from finding out anything from the bank, and of course suppresses as well the release of one's own withholds, so it is more fundamental than a withhold. A "suppressor" is often considered "social conduct" in so far as one prevents things from being revealed which might embarrass or frighten others.

In all cases a suppressor leads to suppression of memory and environment. It is *suppression* that is mainly overcome when you run havingness on a pc. The pc is willing to let things appear in the room (or to some degree becomes less unwilling to perceive them). The one-command insanity eradicator, "Look around here and find something that is really real to you" (that sometimes made an insane person sane on one command), brought the person to discharge all danger from one item and let it reveal itself. Now, for any case, the finding of the suppressor mechanism again opens wider doors for havingness processes. "Look around here and find something you would permit to appear" would be a basic havingness process using the suppressor mechanism.

Thus we have a new, broad tool, even more important in half the cases than withholds.

Half the cases will run most rapidly on withholds, the other half most rapidly on suppressors. All cases will run somewhat on withholds and somewhat on suppressors, for all cases have both withholds and suppressors.

Withholds have been known about since the year one, suppressors have been wholly missing as a pat mechanism. Thus we are on very new and virgin search ground.

————————————

Additionally adding to the data in HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962, another symptom of a dangerous auditor would be (o) one who Qs and As with a pc and never faces up to the basic question asked but slides off of it as the pc avoids it and also avoids it as an auditor. All dangerous Q and A is that action of the auditor which corresponds to the pc's avoidance of a hot subject or item. If the pc seeks to avoid by sliding off, the auditor, in his questions, also

slides off. Also, the auditor invites the pc to avoid by asking irrelevant questions that lead the pc off a hot subject.

Also add (p) who fails to direct the pc's attention. The pc wants to cut and run, the auditor lets the pc run.

Also add (q) who lets the pc end processes or sessions on the pc's own volition.

Also add (r) who will only run processes chosen by the pc.

Also add (s) who gets no somatics during processing.

Also add (t) who is a Black Five.

The common denominator of the dangerous auditor is "action which will forestall the revelation of any data".

Because the auditor is terrified of finding out anything, the whole concentration of the auditor is occupied with the suppression of anything a process may reveal.

Some auditors suppress only one type of person or case and audit others passably. Husbands as auditors tend more to fear what their wives may reveal to them and wives as auditors tend to suppress more what their husbands may reveal to them. Thus husband-wife teams would be more unlucky than other types of auditing teams as a general rule, but this is not invariable and is now curable if they exclusively run on each other only suppression type processes.

### *Add Class I*
### REVELATION PROCESS X2

What wouldn't you want another to present?

What wouldn't another want you to present?

What have you presented?

What has another presented?

### *Class II – Added Zero Question:*

Have you ever suppressed anything?

### *Class III – Add Lines:*

Who or What would suppress an identity? (oppterm it)

Who or What would make knowledge scarce? (oppterm it)

Who or What would not want a past? (oppterm it)

Who or What would be unconfrontable? (oppterm it)

Who or What would prevent others (another) from winning? (oppterm it)

Who or What should be disregarded when you're getting something done?

      (oppterm it)

Who or What would make another realize he or she hadn't won?

      (oppterm it)

(In choosing which one of the above to oppterm first, read each one of all such Class III Lines [including those of HCO Bulletin of March 8] once each to the pc watching the meter for the largest reaction. Then take that one first. Do this each time with remaining Lines. One does the same thing [an assessment of sorts] on Line Plot Items when found to discover the next one to oppterm.)


                          L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

**PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN**

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

**From L. RON HUBBARD**

Via Hubbard Communications Office

37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

_____

15 October 1958

# PROCEDURE CCH

*(This lecture is a final summing up of the previous CCH PABs [interrupted at PAB No. 138] and should be read after those have been digested. It was given by L. Ron Hubbard to the HGC staff auditors in Washington, D.C. on 23 August 1957.)*

Thinkingness in general should not be suspected to be under anybody's control. It is probably more under the auditor's control than it is under the preclear's.

When I say or ask "Is the preclear's thinkingness under control?" I want you to understand that it is less under the preclear's control at any time than under the auditor's. The auditor can certainly control the preclear's thinkingness better than the preclear can. But before you can do this you must first get the preclear's body and attention under control.

A condition to running Trio is: Is the person and attention under your control? To assume that the power of choice is also under the preclear's control – much less his thinkingness – is, of course, completely wrong.

This condition then moves Trio way up on the present scale of processes. In order to give the preclear some havingness after CCH 0 to 5 has been flattened, I have developed an undercut to Trio.

Trio is a directive process and should be prefaced by **"Get the idea of having that clock." "Get the idea of having that picture (indicated picture on the wall),"** etc. That's highly directive and would keep thinkingness of a rough case under control.

The second version is: **"Get the idea that it is all right to permit that (indicated object) to continue."** It is also just an indicating process.

The third section of this trio is the clincher: **"Get the idea of making that (indicated object) disappear."** One runs "disappear" instead of "dispense with" or "not-know."

Small objects are much easier for the preclear to make disappear than large ones. You have not told him to make it disappear but only to "get the idea of making it disappear." Pre-

clears usually literally interpret you and try like mad to make it disappear – and it usually does for a short time.

I have solved the enigma of exteriorization. Why doesn't a preclear exteriorize easily and stay exteriorized? We ask the accompanying question: Why does a preclear get sick when one asks him to conceive a static? Obviously we would have to get somebody to conceive a static before he could himself stay comfortably outside his body's head.

The answer to this problem is contained in the process **"Recall a moment of loss."** Loss prevents the preclear from conceiving a static. He associates a static with loss. He says, "All right, if there is nothing there I've lost it," or "I've lost something there, therefore I'd better not conceive a static."

Conceiving a static is therefore painful. The truth of the matter is whenever he lost anything, something disappeared. All right. The funny part of it is that he never noticed that he didn't lose totally every time. He still had other objects. He lost his tie pin, but he still has his tie. He's still got the floor, the room, this universe, space, etc., but he never realizes this in these instances and that is why we run this process "Recall a moment of loss" to accustom somebody to conceiving a static very directly on loss and to get him to exteriorize.

An individual cannot conceive a static if he associates static with loss – if the loss is painful. So we have to cure him of the painfulness of loss, consideration of, before we can exteriorize him easily.

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

The process "Recall a moment of loss" aimed at this, but the third command of Control Trio (as this series of processes had better be called), **"Get the idea of making that (indicated object) disappear,"** handles it very well. This gets the preclear to take over the automaticity of all of the losses which he has unwillingly experienced.

The universe has been taking the things away from him, and just spotting objects and getting the idea that they are going to disappear or are disappearing takes over the automaticity of losses, and he becomes accustomed to it after a while.

All of the invisible masses that preclears have around them are actually simply symptoms of mass – loss, mass – loss. When an individual has no visio the only thing that he is looking at is a "stuck" loss. He is looking at the nothingness of something that was there.

So one takes over that automaticity with the third command of Control Trio and one therefore has a very highly directional, workable set of processes.

Each part of that Trio would be run relatively flat and go on to the next part, and I would say that one would run each part certainly not a hundred commands each and the auditor should endeavor to stay in that order of magnitude and just run it round and round.

Take somebody with glasses, for example. His eyesight will do more tricks in less time on this third command of Control Trio than one can imagine. Things will go black. Well, why do things go black? Blackness makes things disappear and one takes over the automaticity of blackness to make things disappear. Night grabs, the way of the universe, once in every 24 hours on earth here. This is the process we have been looking for to turn on visio.

If you want to turn on sonic with this you would have to go down to a noisy part of town and just run Trio on sound, but you wouldn't dare run Control Trio on sound if the preclear did not already have it flat on objects. Visio turns on before sonic.

There are many things one could do with this process. People who have anaesthetized areas in their body – like they have no chest, etc. – do weird things during this process.

I wanted to tell you particularly about this particular process because it is a specific and will be found to be very useful to you. We had to find out if one version of this would run without killing a preclear and that is "Recall a moment of loss." Actually "Recall a moment of loss" should act as a havingness process because it as-ises all of the lost points on the track and it should be a havingness process all by itself; but we didn't want to be so bold as to run it with no havingness.

(Until I find out differently, this Control Trio and "Recall a moment of loss" are making a bid for our chief exteriorization processes.)

Now here is a process which is based on our old **"Recall a secret."** The version is entirely straight wire. The auditor explains to the preclear that he is not looking for hidden data to evaluate it. He is only asking the preclear to look at the data. He then makes a list of valences, paying great attention to those the preclear considers "unimportant" or is very slow to divulge. Then the auditor takes this list and runs repetitive straight wire (1951) as follows: **"Think of something you might withhold from (valence)."**

The auditor repeats this question over and over until no communication lag is present. He *never* says **"something else** you might withhold from valence" because the auditor wants the preclear to think of some of these many times.

Before selecting another valence the auditor runs a little Locational or Trio. He then takes the next valence the same way. The list is covered once and then the same list is covered again. The object is speed. Cover many people. Given time the auditor can do the same thing on all dynamics.

There is a variation. Instead of a valence, body parts may be used. **"Think of something you might withhold from that (body part)."** Leave sexual parts or obvious psychosomatic difficulties until *last.* Don't begin on a withered arm, for example.

It is amusing to realize that this process overlords all early psychotherapies, but they, using this effort to locate secrets, thought that divulgence and confession were the therapeutic agents. These have no bearing on workability. Further, early efforts naively thought there was one secret per case. Actually there are billions. It is easy to get into past lives on this. A basic secret is that one lived before.

Whenever you run "withhold" on a valence you finish up with "can't have" on the valence and "have" for the preclear. It flattens off better that way.

You will often find that it is more advantageous to run Locational Processing than Problems of Comparable or Incomparable Magnitude at times. A Problem of Comparable Magnitude is all right, but it is a thinkingness process and on a case that is having an awful lot of trouble with it, it gives them hell to run Locational Processing, but nevertheless it does run out the present time problem, which is most fascinating.

Any one of the Rudiments is an excellent process. Two-Way Communication is great and does not as-is havingness. You have to keep the reality of two-way comm very high, though, and be willing to interrupt obsessive outflows and silences of the preclear. It is establishing a high level of reality. It consists of the auditor feeding experimental data to the preclear to have him look it over and decide about it one way or the other. You don't let the preclear in Two-Way Comm as-is everything he knows, thinks, or wants to do.

The latest addition to the Rudiments is "Clearing the Auditor." Actually the crudest way known of clearing the auditor is **"Who do I remind you of?" "Tell me something you like about me."** The best way of clearing the auditor we know of is in Training 15, which is **"Could I help you?" "How?" "Could you help me?" "How?" "Could I help anybody else?" "How?" "Could you help anybody else?" "How?" "Do other people ever help other people?" "Do women ever help women?" "Do men ever help men?" "Do men ever help women?"** etc. You beat it to pieces on a big long bracket.

This goes so far that it becomes a fantastic process in itself. You take father and mother valences and they are usually quite hot. You can run this on "Help." This is usually quite necessary on a case that is going to hang up because the only reason he is sitting there is to waste help.

One has to understand that this case is trying to waste help, and it isn't a matter of "Find the Auditor" in the Rudiments today, but "Clear the Auditor" and the only point on which he is cleared is "Help" – "Can I help you? Can you help me?"

We use *Handbook for Preclears to* give the preclear some homework at the Hubbard Guidance Centers and it has been helping out just to the degree that it does some clarification on goals and gets the preclear stirred up. It simply stirs up the case so that it will run out.

I was running over a phrenological questionnaire, and it said people are never permitted to do anything they want to do and this is the best goal of discipline. I got this tangled out in one way or the other. I got thinking about it from the standpoint – this was about 20 years ago – of "I wonder if there is anybody around that could articulate with great conciseness what he would like to do?" And I have found on all hands a failure to articulate was the main difficulty. A person had the feeling that he wanted to do something and that it would be wonderful, but it was all in a sensory capacity. If he could have been made to articulate this it would really have been something. And I experimented on it a little bit and we see that today in the *Handbook for Preclears.*

If you can get a person to articulate in a session anything about the future you have won the subject of goals. But it must be in the alignment of this person's frame of reference. It must be aligned with his life – not aligned with something we think he ought to live.

So let's take a look at the clearance of goals. Goals would not be likely to run on a high generality. In other words, they are specific, personal and intimate. It is **"What do you think? What do you want? What is aligned to your life?"**

Let's look at Goals as a process. One could run Goals for 25 hours with the greatest of ease. One could run the Present Time Problem for 25 hours, and we just had a report of a terrific win here on a preclear who was run on Locational for 25 hours. So it looks as though the Rudiments could be the session.

We discover a preclear in the terrible condition of not wanting any auditing, not going any place and all of his goals being somebody else's goals. Two things can be done immediately: Clear the auditor and then run Goals.

Goals could be run with two-way comm in this manner. You ask the preclear what he is absolutely sure would happen in the next couple of minutes, the next hour, a day from now, a week from now, one month from now and one year from now. We want something that the preclear is absolutely sure would happen.

We are running right there the reverse process of atomic bombs which say "no future – no future – no future." That is basically what is wrong with a person. Why does he get jammed on the track? It is because of "no future." He had been denied to a point where his loss was so great that he dared not own.

I had a case, by the way, which was one of the roughest cases I have ever run into. He put on the total appearance of being sane – dramatized sanity – and yet the case would make odd remarks like "I really think people are crazy." "Well, why do you think people are crazy?" I would say. "Well, because people say they can tell right from wrong and you know there's no difference." It was fascinating. He would make odd remarks like this from time to time.

One day he made a remark on goals: "Well, it's really best to tell people that things cannot happen to them because otherwise they might hope they could and then they would be disappointed."

This person was stark, staring mad and had no future of any kind. Five hours just this one question, "Is there anything going to happen in the remainder of this afternoon?" "Will *anything* happen the rest of today?" "Is there anything going to occur any place in the world the rest of today?" was run on him and his confident answer, with great certainty was, "No. No. No."

Finally we broke through it and I finally got the person to admit that there was some slight possibility that there would be a room here for the rest of the day. That busted the case. It read from total no-future up.

This case was an isolated one as we have had occasionally. Now and then an inspirational sort of process cracked them through. Well, now we see this process of Goals on the

basis of futures and a person without futures cannot have a fancy future called a goal and all a goal is is a fancy future determined by the person. If he has no future at all determined by anybody, then he isn't going to go anywhere from that point and any goal he has is totally unreal.

The best way that I know of to clear up a goal is as follows (with two-way comm): **"Is there anything that is going to happen in the next couple of minutes?"** We get this thrashed out until he has got some great big certainty that there will be something a couple of minutes from now. Then we gradiently move it up and we get certainties at each one of these stages and levels – regardless of on what.

The person knows there is going to be a future there. Now let's have him put something in this future he has now created. He has created a future and has certainty on it. Now let's put some desire in the future and we get a goal.

**"Now what would you like to have happen in the next couple of minutes?" or "What would you like to do in the next couple of minutes, tomorrow, next week,** etc?" We will get weird things which have no desire in them; they will all be get-rid-of's, and if you finally plowed him down on it he would get down to the bottom of the ladder, which is "Knock this body off right now." And when he says, "I would like to get over my fear of darkness, I would like to get over feeling bad every time my mother screams at me," these aren't desires. These are run-aways, flinches. These are "Let's not confront it," "Let's get out of the universe; let's scram," and the final result is the basic postulate, "If I could just get rid of this body right this instant I would be all right."

So that process doesn't even vaguely get flat unless there is a real goal like "I'd like to have a stick of candy." *That is* a goal, a real goal.

Preclears will modify their goals in some way or another: "Of course, I can't because I have to work and I don't have any money," and "yak, yak, yak." They are modified goals, and as long as they modify them they don't have a goal because they are making a postulate and the MEST universe is kicking the postulate in on them. So we do this on a gradient scale of time so that goals become real to them.

L. RON HUBBARD

Franchise
Sthil

# FLOW PROCESS

### (A Class I or Class IIb Skill)

First mentioned at the June Congress 1952 at 1407 North Central, Phoenix, Arizona (the first Scientology Congress), compulsive outflow and obsessive withhold are alike aberrated.

With the advent of Security Checking as a *process* (as opposed to a prevention of subversion) and the 1960 work on overt-withhold and responsibility, still continuing, means of "cracking cases" now lie open to the skilled auditor which, if expertly done, are capable of cracking the most resistant case.

The main emphasis has been lately upon withholds. These, coming after the confusion of an overt, of course hang up on the track and tend to stop the pc in time. The overt is the forward motion, the withhold coming after it is the inward motion.

While not ranking with the power of the O/W mechanism, there are, however, some very important flows which could be released and which, if released from the bank, could assist Security Checking. These are "laudable outflows" and some others.

The most important flows can be listed as follows:

1. Outflow.
2. Restrained Outflow.
3. Inflow.
4. Restrained Inflow.

All ridges and masses develop around these flows.

You recognize in 1, Outflow, the overt act, as its most important item. In 2, Restrained Outflow, you recognize all withholds. In 3, Inflow, we have a less well studied flow and in 4, Restrained Inflow, we have a newcomer to Scientology.

In that we have heretofore considered Inflow as Other-Determined it has not seemed aberrative on the basis that all acts that influence a thetan are done by himself.

But Inflow and Restrained Inflow can be Self-Determined Actions, as well as Other-Determined and therefore merit study.

Thus all four principal flows can be Self-Determined or they can be Other Determined. Thus all four flows can be aberrative.

In an effort to speed up Security Checking as class of processes, I am now studying 3. Inflow and 4. Restrained Inflow.

An example of Inflow would be Eating. An example of Restrained Inflow would be Dieting.

A general process which covers all four of these flows in the most general form would be:

### *FLOW PROCESS*

**What had to be outflowed?**

**What had to be withheld?**

**What had to be inflowed?**

**What had to be held off?**

This process is a safe process for a Class IIb or an auditor in training to run on HGC pcs or others.

It is a cyclic process and is ended with the cyclic wording in Model Session.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:sf.rd

# HOW TO DO A DIAGNOSIS

# ON DYNAMIC STRAIGHTWIRE

You ask the person to describe the dynamics from one to eight. We don't care about them being sequitur; any way you want to break it up, we don't care.

Now you ask a person to describe each one of these dynamics. You are watching an E-Meter for a change in pattern. Therefore, you have to carefully isolate the change of pattern before you can tell whether or not the pattern's changed on the E-Meter needle reading. But more important than that, you are looking for a dynamic that he makes mistakes on while he is trying to describe it, a dynamic he cannot describe, a dynamic that he won't even approach, that he is very leary of, and his statement is confirmed by the E-Meter reading. In other words, you have got the statement of the pc in this particular analysis or diagnosis for Dynamic Straightwire.

All right, then, we go all the way through asking for a terminal on these dynamics and we finally get a repeat. We will ask him for terminals on these dynamics; we'll get the same dynamic to read again. Now the basic rule which sorts this out is – any dynamic which doesn't clear by two-way comm has to be run. Simple as that. Any dynamic which doesn't clear by two-way comm has to be run.

Don't run a terminal that is totally unreal to the preclear. Another stable datum which comes on top of it is: Never run a terminal that's sensible. *Never.* If a terminal belongs on the dynamic you can almost say you'll get nowhere running it. So, you are looking for terminals that they give you for a dynamic which don't belong on the dynamic at all.

Now, if that terminal is real to the pc you will get a tremendous change in the case. If that terminal is totally unreal to the pc and if it does belong on the dynamic, why you're not going to get any change on the case, why run it? Might as well run some other process. It is neither a long process nor an invariable process. Given enough skill you could undoubtedly find one of these on every case. Given enough skill. But it is limited by auditor skill. Furthermore, it gives auditors a chance to chop up pcs and it gives auditors a chance to write some script.

You do not let the pc choose. You have auditors who actually believe that a pc is permitted power of choice in an auditing session. That one's a blinker.

Where you find pcs out of session, it's because nobody has trailed down a nutty dynamic.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mg.rd

# STAFF AUDITORS' CONFERENCE OF FEBRUARY 16, 1959

REGARDING HCO BULLETIN OF FEBRUARY 16, 1959:

*HGC Processes for Those Trained in Engram Running*

*Or Trained in These Processes*

Nearly everyone here has been trained in these exact processes and, if anyone here hasn't been trained in these processes, then everything on this Bulletin applies except Engram Running. The whole bulletin applies except Engram Running.

There will be a staff Theta Clearing Course, and those auditors who are on staff who have not been trained by an ACC in Engram Running will have an opportunity to get that training; and not too many months will go by before they are up to this, too. So this will apply at that time. Maybe it will have shifted slightly by that time, but I don't think very much.

Now what you are looking at here is the aggregate know-how that was gained and assembled on the 21st American ACC.

## UNDERCUTTING CASES:

Now the undercuts of cases became a vital necessity. This whole ACC was devoted to the R factor plus Engram Running. It was discovered that the thing that keeps individuals from running engrams adequately was their R factor, and when their R factor was very poor they could not run an engram adequately. Now the funny part of it is that an engram can be contacted and run and, if done persistently and well without ARC breaks, can run the following Scale of Confront. Here is the Scale of Confront, just to refresh your minds:

**Dub-In:** Lowest scale. This scale could possibly invert, and down below that you might have a black dub-in. Once you had run blackness, you would find a dub-in case. But the scale we are mostly interested in, because that is the one we most commonly see, begins at the bottom with dub-in, runs up, turns

**Black.** Runs through blackness, turns

**Invisible.** Runs from invisible to

**Elsewhere** – a desire to be elsewhere. The way they solve things is elsewhereness. Runs up from elsewhereness to

**Ability to Confront.** Runs from confront to

**Experience** or **Participate**. And only then are you up to **Beingness**.

Now this is the Confront Scale, and it is the scale of disintegrating Reality. It is how a person handles terminals or a situation. A person handles terminals and situations above all this by not having to participate, by not having to confront, finding no necessity to do anything about it unless he chooses so on his own determination; and if he did so, could do so with no personal liability. He could experience or not as the case may be. Now you'll find a lower harmonic on this in some philosophic level of somebody saying, "Yap, yap, well, I could, or I couldn't, and that's my choice," etc, well, he hasn't got any power of choice. He's just using this as the final escape mechanism – a philosophic escape mechanism.

If I said "bottom" – the bottom mechanism – it would be the one most commonly contacted. But you are apt to get a mechanism which is philosophic, which is simply a figure-figure mechanism about a situation, and the individual feels that if he could just figure it out he would be all right. In other words, this is a thought-thinkingness figure-figure, and he notises by figure-figure. Such a case, not-ising by figure-figure, will turn into a dub-in case as soon as you start curing his figure-figure; would turn into a black case; would turn into an invisible case; would turn into a confront case; would turn into an experience case. Which is quite interesting.

Now it is true that an engram could be found, started, and, if the auditor were good and held the individual right on the time period and had the time period well spotted, and had the overt and motivator, no matter how crazy they seemed or sounded, contacted, he could theoretically, just by running that engram, run a person through the totality of this Reality Scale. See? So there's another approach here. You get a guy who is figure-figure, find the engram necessary to resolve the case. First he figure-figures about it, and he'll run it, and run it just with the auditing commands – the five auditing commands to run an engram – he figure-figures about it, then after a while he dubs-in about it, then after a while it all goes black; and then after a while it eases into an invisibility – it's just not there – somatics are, and discomfort and other things are, but it's not there – and its not-thereness suddenly turns into little flicks – little flicks of confront. And boy, he goes elsewhere. It just starts to turn on and he gets it for the least little Flick and he goes elsewhere. And then pretty soon he can confront the thing; then pretty soon he can participate – he can run it in valence, squarely in valence, right in its moment of time, at which time it becomes pretty damn real. And then he goes to being able to put it there or not put it there, and its importance-unimportance factor flattens out so that it's neither important nor unimportant. And that engram is licked.

Theoretically, this could happen. That is actually the way I run engrams. But you will find in auditing in the HGC that the public expects of you a different thing than is expected of you by students. And that's why I wanted to talk to you for a few minutes. They expect a different thing. They expect you to be interested in their case. And that is quite amusing – because it's your job to get *them* interested in their case. But they want you to be interested in their case. All right, any case is interesting, so that's a pretty easy one. But you can get so interested in their case that you do a lot of talking to them and burn up an awful lot of auditing time. So there is some point where your interest becomes an indulgence, and on the happier side of that, where the pc is pleased you're interested in his case, and that's enough. Then you get him interested in his case.

All right. Now, we have for a long time not used PT problems. I'll tell you why very bluntly. It was not unusual for an auditor to burn up twelve and a half hours on a PT problem. It was not unusual. He did this with two motives: one just yak, letting the pc go on and on, poor control, not controlling the pc's comm outflow, letting the pc get into non-essentials. And the other side of it: he was trying to run the whole case with the PT problem. Well, wonderful – you can run a whole case with a PT problem – but why? Since it's slow freight. That's a very slow way to go about it. So we take a PT problem now and handle the session in this fashion:

We establish the rudiments every time we establish a session. Find the auditor, find the pc, find the auditing room, establish a goal for the session. Do that rapidly. We don't care what goal it is, so long as he has some kind of a goal. And then we ask for a PT problem. And we take an E-Meter (up to that time we didn't care whether the pc was handling the cans or not) but we take an E-Meter, and we have this PT problem appear on the E-Meter, or we don't run it. Got it? And we run the PT problem that appears on the E-Meter. So we get him to state this problem, and we don't care how he states the problem, because all we want to know is "Did it drop?" That tells you at once you won't run a PT problem on a stage-4 needle. Didn't drop-see, that's all within the requirements – it didn't drop, so skip it. It isn't going to be real to the pc anyhow. You'll have to do something else with this case. He's probably got thousands of problems; probably all of life is a problem. Probably every time he walks in a room he installs an engram. You know, the furniture's there – that's an engram. Get the idea? So why worry about a problem?

But if you got a PT problem that drops, you should remove yourself at that moment from all temptation. As soon as the problem drops, and as soon as he states that it is a problem to him and is worrying him *in present time, you* take the cans away from him and put the thing aside. Just lay the E-Meter aside. You're not interested in an E-Meter from there on. The reason why is because you'll increase the drop, you'll increase more drop and more drop as you ask him about it. You're already running it. And the problem is going to change. You have seen this phenomenon. You're not interested in a problem changing. The fact of your laying aside the E-Meter will rather convince him that you have found it and that's it. And you only want to know this: the personnel associated with that problem. You don't want to know more about the problem. You just want to know the personnel associated with that problem. His wife, his mother, and his wife's boy friend, or something of that sort. And that's the personnel associated with the problem. You just check that off.

Now, I'm going to ask you to take a notebook and a ball-point into the auditing room, because you've got two or three things to do here that require a list. I want you to get accustomed to establishing a list and then flattening it, not trying to run the case all over new again every time the case changes. That's one of the ways to waste time. You run one terminal, and of course the case changes, the problems change, everything changes on the case. If you reassessed it at this time to find a new terminal, you'd for sure find new terminals. Well, the devil with it. Let's just flatten what we contact, and when we're contacting and scouting and using cans and the E-Meter, just write down what we find. Then put the E-Meter aside and run what we've found until we get rid of all of that. Now you're going to do something new – give him back the E-Meter cans. Got the idea?

Pcs don't much like to hold onto these E-Meter cans forever. Furthermore, they become restive, and they want to scratch their heads, and they want to do this, and they want to rassle around, and most pcs you get are slightly nervous in this direction. Why should you worry about it? Because the E-Meter is only going to give you a certain amount of the information that is quite valid. Now, you're going to write down the personnel connected with this PT problem. You're going to take **Selected Person Overt-Withhold** on each one of these people. And the commands for this are right here:

"Think of something you have done to (…)," and

"Think of something you have withheld from (…)."

And you are going to run one of those commands and the next command, and then the next command – first command again, then the second command, first command, second command. In that way, you'll never lay an egg on an unbalanced flow. No flow will unbalance on you. They'll always stay there more or less stable. The case won't suddenly turn black when it's not supposed to turn black, and so forth. You won't ever over-run a flow and the pc will never get upset.

Now, let's look at this again. You have written down "wife", "his mother", and "his wife's boy friend". Which one do you run first? You have to ask this question to establish that terminal: "Which one of these things do you think is the most real to you?" The individual says, "Oh, Mother, of course." Who cares? That's what he says. All right, so that's the first one you take. Then you take the two remaining ones: "Which one is most real?" That's the one you knock out. That leaves you one more person. Knock that one out.

Now, there is something that is not stated here. I just typed this up rapidly for you – I didn't have a backing sheet, so there are typographicals because I couldn't even see what I was typing. This has a criterion, and it is an old criterion of all PT problems – it is, they are *PT* problems. By definition, a PT problem must exist *right now* in the physical universe. By definition. So therefore, the personnel involved in a PT problem must exist right now in the physical universe. He will tell you halfway through the run, that "It was actually my mother who influenced me this way" – ah skip it. That's not a PT personnel in that problem. His mother isn't really *part of,* let us say – it was her mother that was part of the PT problem. In other words, the people have to be actually associated with the problem and existing *at this time in this pc's life* influencing that problem, for this to be a PT problem. So therefore, we don't dive in any direction to pick up any new personnel we don't care about.

We get this problem flat. It is only flat if it answers this question: "Now, what do you have to do about that problem now?" And the pc says, "Nothing." It's flat. For our purposes, it's flat. The only reason we're running it is we're trying to get rid of the obsession he has to jump out of the auditing room and go *do* something about this problem. If he doesn't have to do anything about it, it's flat. But if he says, "Oh, it's flat, because I could go and talk to my wife's boy friend now, and I could handle him." No. Start right back over from the beginning – the first person you wrote down – and run that person again for a short time – next person for a short time – next person for a short time – on these exact auditing questions. "Now, what do you have to do about the problem?" He'll tell you, "Well, I don't have to do anything about it just now." That's enough. You consider that flat. Got it?

All right. This will keep you out of all kinds of trouble. And it will keep the pc from being all hung up in trying to go elsewhere in an auditing session. So much for that.

This is done at the beginning of every session. That first section there – it says, **"Starting A Case: And Begin Every Session"**. Well, you not only start each intensive with this, but you start every session with this, and you do the same thing.

If it takes you two hours to flatten the PT problem, I will think something is hung up. This is a rapid one. This is not a slow one. If it takes a couple of hours, well, something's really haywire here. He didn't say the problem, or he didn't do something, or he's holding something back. But notice we have said, "Think of something you have done to" and "Think of something you have withheld from". This will also get the pc talking to you, because it gets rid of the withhold. Got that? All right. So much for that.

Now, **Dynamic Straight Wire** you were taught in the 21st American, but the commands for the general public were not given to you. And they are given to you here on this sheet, this HCO Bulletin. Now, the only thing you are looking for is a represented substitute. In other words, you're looking for substitutes. You ask him for a substitute for himself, and you ask him for a substitute on the basis of "Tell me something that would represent yourself." And he says, "Represent myself? Oh, that's very, very easy – a tree." Get your ball-point busy at that point and put down "tree". Got it? Now, if he even says "toothbrush", get your ball-point busy. The proper answer, of course, is "Myself". It's just as simple as that. But the more a case is daffy on this line, the more attention you're going to pay to it. So you just run this whole assessment right straight on through: Self, sex, family, children, groups, mankind, the animal kingdom, birds, beasts, fish, vegetables, trees, growing things, matter, energy, space, time, spirits, souls, gods, God. Just one question. Each time you say this you just take one of those: "Tell me something that would represent, for instance, souls." The individual says, "Running water." Get the ball-point busy. Write it down. When you have got this whole list assessed, take the list you have written and run:

"Think of something you have done to (a toothbrush)."

"Think of something you have withheld from (a toothbrush)."

You'll be amazed, but they have actually done something to a toothbrush, and they have actually withheld something from a toothbrush. This is pretty terrific. Quite amazing. But you are only looking for daffiness on this, and a sensible answer you don't pay much attention to. You say, "Tell me something that would represent trees." And the fellow says, "Leaves." Now, there's a matter of judgment involved here. What if he said, "Shadows"? Well, I don't know. That's a matter of judgment. Try to run it or not try to run it, as the case may be. If it looks daffy to you, run it. You're the judge. Got the idea?

Now don't let it look daffy to you when you say, "Tell me something that would represent spirits," and he says, "Souls." When you say "souls", he says "spirits". That's not daffy.

But how about this guy that gives you the perfect representation all the way down the line like a little wound-up doll? You already, in looking him over, find out he has a sticky needle, he's registering at 6 on your E-Meter when you first put the cans in his hands, and he gives you all the answers perfectly. That case is giving you an intellectual response which has

nothing to do with any reality under the sun, moon or stars. Something he read in a book and a machine is rattling it off. So you do the assessment again. The second time you go through you're liable to trip him on something. Got the idea? So, if you get a perfect assessment, run it again. I actually don't care how many times you run it, but you're apt to be wasting time, because by two-way comm and definition alone you may not get anywhere with a very badly machined case. Nevertheless, a couple of times through, he should trip somewhere. Machine case generally does.

The rule governing Dynamic Straight Wire is: That which doesn't fall out by two-way comm just on assessment. He says it, and then it looks funny to him, and he laughs, and he thinks this is for the birds, and he says, "Oh, no, that wouldn't be one-actually, a substitute for a tree would be a leaf, or a small tree," or something like this. That's fine. Nothing wrong with letting him correct himself, because you are actually auditing him just by asking him the question. People, when they straighten out things in their own categories, very often recover very, very easily.

All right. Let's take up this next one here. That's an easy way to run Dynamic Straight Wire, isn't it, huh? I would ask you to do this, however, in view of the fact that you are doing a professional job of auditing for the public mainly, and that is, I'd ask you to memorize that list – rather than hold a bulletin in your hand and read it.

Now, the next thing we're going to run into here is **Past and Future Experience**. This is a bid for two things: One, the lowest level case there is – because experience, to him, is a dub-in, usually. Or it's a figure-figure, or it's something, so it compares to the Reality Scale. His definition of experience compares with the Reality Scale.

His definition of experience is a direct index to the Reality Scale, by the way. What does experience mean? He'll say, "Experience – that's very easy. To consider." There you've got your figure-figure level. "What does experience mean?" Well, "To write about it or make something out of it – experience is that thing which you use to manufacture the future." He's dub. "Now, what is an experience?" "Well, experience is that which you try not to have." That's probably black or invisible. Or, "It's the thing you forget," would be blackness. "Experience is something you try to forget" – invisibility level. "Experience is something you have to cope with." Obsessive confront. "Experience is – ah – well, experience – that's pretty hard to define – experience. I guess it's to go through something." You're getting a fairly sane response – to go through something. To have an actual adventure, something of this sort. You're getting a fairly sane reaction to experience.

So don't think that Past and Future Experience is pegging up at the highest level of the Reality Scale. It isn't. This process was found, in the 21st American, to be the undercut process. This was the lowest undercut process. And this is a killer, and it is very trying to an auditor. A very trying process, because it offers so many wonderful temptations. And that's what's wrong with this process.

Now, you run these two questions, one after the other, with no assessment, no E-Meter, nothing. You just put the E-Meter down after you've done the Dynamic Straight Wire thing, because on Dynamic Straight Wire, when you said, "Children," the needle was going on a gradual shift over here, and a little theta bop now and then. You said, "Children," and it

fell a dial, or all of a sudden started doing a big theta bop in the middle. When you got off of children, it settled down to the other pattern. That told you that you had something to be run on the subject of children. That he will also, at the same time, give you a daffy reading, he will tell you some daffy terminal to represent – so you needed the E-Meter there. But you don't need the E-Meter on Past and Future Experience, not even vaguely. You can just put the E-Meter aside and turn it off, and just run these two commands. Just clear them with the pc very bluntly. Say, "We're going to run something about experience. Now, we're going to see how you get along with this little process, and here are the commands of it: What part of your life would you be willing to re-experience? And the other command is: What part of the future would you be willing to experience? Now, here's the first command: What part of your life would you be willing to re-experience?"

The answer actually called for is a time, isn't it? And this is a time process. But there are very few preclears that will find this out for a very long period. They won't give you anything but super-significances and ball-up, and the pc who is real bad off will give you a type of experience. You accept all these things. You say, "What part of your life would you be willing to re-experience?" He says, "Well, eating cake." That's an answer? That's an answer. And that's followed with this: "What part of the future would you be willing to experience?" He says, "Well, more cake." That's an answer. So you just accept any answer that he gives you on the line. It gradually will boil down to a time answer. And it will gradually go back-track. The longer you run it, the more track you're going to cover, the more future you're going to cover. And there will be periods when the individual is absolutely sure that he is totally predicting the future. He gets into implants, let us say, that tell him what the future is all about. He's stuck 8000 years ago, but he's telling you about the future. All kinds of odd phenomena show up. But engrams come up and slap you in the teeth, one right after the other.

You run this for a while, and the individual says, "Oooh, well, you know I really wouldn't be willing – well, I would be willing – I don't know – I would – oohh, well – I really don't know – dental operation there, I was a young boy – I don't know if I'd like to re-experience that – I guess I could re-experience sitting in the – no, no, no. I could re-experience – I could re-experience the next day after it." You say, "That's fine," and just mark it down with the ball-point: "Dental experience as a child." That one he can't confront. Now, you're never going to run it as an engram, but you're going to have some tag of it as an engram. See, it may show you something.

As you go along and he runs into hot experiences, real, real hot experiences one right after the other, it is about time you put the E-Meter back in his paws. Get the idea? You don't have to start it with the E-Meter, but if he starts running into hot experiences, or if he gets into an engram and he can't seem to get out of the thing, the thing to do is not run the engram but give him an E-Meter and spot it in time for him. Get it spotted in time. If he's running into them hot and heavy, one right after the other, just leave him with the E-Meter. But if there is only one you have to spot in time, and then in a little while he doesn't seem to be running any more, take the cans away from him again and put the E-Meter aside. But if he starts running into one that obsessively sticks with him, don't let him flounder in the thing for an hour. Don't let him wallow in this one. Because he will just wallow in it, and this is no process-this is *not a good process* to run an engram with. So you let him out, OK? And the way you let him out

is to locate it in time with an E-Meter. And you go on running the process. Now, as I say, it offers enormous temptations to the auditor – beautiful temptations to run the things contacted. As you sit this out, you actually are going to change the characteristic of the engram you will ultimately run on the case. But you keep listing engrams that he runs into. Keep listing engrams that he runs into, well knowing that he will favor motivators. For every one of those motivators there is an overt. Now an engram that he consistently and persistently keeps hitting and hitting and hitting, you are going to find in that engram probably the engram you will run, eventually. But not until he is in PT, out of the engram, it seems to have dropped out, and so forth, and he seems to be all smooth on this thing, are you going to reach for that one again. You are going to flatten the process and then go to the engram.

Here we go. **Engram Running.** Of course, that is run all the way through with an E-Meter. Give him the cans and start out on this engram that you more or less found with Past and Future Experience.

Now, this is going to undercut cases, and I don't care how long you run it. I don't care if you run it for two weeks, because this is a very productive process. But if you are going to run it over that period of time, it isn't noted here, but some **Third Rail** had better be brought in here some place. And he'd better be shifted up finally until havingness. And you put in **Past and Future Experience**, right after that line, **"Combine With Third Rail If Run More Than 8 Hours"**. If you run it eight hours, this guy's havingness is going to start dropping on him, and you are going to run into difficulties. You could get into difficulties. All right.

**Engram Running.** Well, Engram Running, when the case has been prepared this way, becomes very simple. A case will start running like a little typewriter, if you have got this Past and Future Experience pretty flat.

Once you have picked an engram, make sure you get its motivator not only its overt. If you have got an overt, get the motivator. If you have got the motivator, get the overt. And only when you have got that have you got an incident. Now, an engram that is having one side of the overt or motivator run will get sticky. You have got to find the other side, and you have got to get both of these things in date. Normally, this will start showing up on Past and Future Experience. Well, we are going to run this engram with an E-Meter, we are going to consider that we have an incident when we have got both a motivator and an overt that fit together. And if the thing is just awful sticky, and dubby, and shockingly poor, and a lot of other things, you just started running it too fast, that is all.

We have got several things you can do at this state of the case, and so forth. Probably the best of them is go back to running Past and Future Experience. You didn't flatten it.

Now, here is this Engram Running. If you notice here, it says you run all the commands that run an engram twice. Run them all twice. That's because "Find something unimportant in that incident" is going to stir up stuff that newly has to be confronted.

Once you have chosen an engram and you have begun to run it, you have had it. That's it. That's the engram you are going to run. So it has to be chosen with considerable care. Listen to me now: If you re-assess the case after you have started an engram, you will get almost any other incident that is hot to drop more than the engram you started, because most of the

charge is already dissipated. So if you keep re-assessing a case, thinking another engram would be better to run for the case, you are of course always going to find another engram. You will never find the one you started to run again dropping with as much velocity. You see? That's something you have to keep in mind. If you are going to run an engram, that's the engram you are going to run. It's got to have its overt or motivator; suppose you are running the overt side of it, you have got to have the motivator side of it. So you really haven't got an incident until you have got both of these things located. And once you have started to run that, you have had it. Because it will discharge its charge and won't register on a meter any more the way some other incident will.

You can get a case just stirred all up and run all backwards and upside down, and that's the biggest mistake an auditor can make. I have given you the reason for the mistake-because now almost anything will drop better than the one you partially flattened.

If in doubt, run the engram you were running. If you are not getting rapid recovery, go back to the first engram you ran and considered flat and run it again. Sometimes, it will only take you fifteen minutes to run all five commands. You do it very fast. But very often something happened that it re-charged in some fashion. Very peculiar.

If you leave about a third of an engram missing and unflat, the whole engram has a tendency to charge up again. It is kind of funny. But you have got to flatten the engram you contacted.

Now the rule of the Last Largest Object is the only one I want you to pay any attention to in questioning the pc. Pc apparently is getting out of it. Change your auditing command. You are running, "What part of that incident can you confront?" He says, "Well, I don't know, it's pretty unreal to me, I don't know whether this happened or not." What was the last largest object? If he said anything that was offbeat and showed an unwillingness to run any more of the engram, you want to find out at once what was the last largest object that you contacted in there. And he says, "A house." You are going to shift your auditing command now to: "What part of that house can you confront?" And you are going to run that simply until he is back in the incident, and then you are going to go off on to "What part of that incident can you confront?" Doesn't require any vast bridge. You just tell him you are going to shift.

In that way, using that rule, you can actually pick up an engram where he was running as Abraham Lincoln, and in the engram he was shot in Ford's Theatre – you know – and the date is obviously correct. Dropped and everything. And then he runs John Wilkes Booth – no, he wasn't Lincoln, he was John Wilkes Booth. And so help me God, you may find that he was the Secret Service Agent who had a couple of drinks that night and wasn't watching. You don't care whether he runs it dub or not. Don't give up because he's running it wrong, because it'll come out right.

There was a joke on us in the 21st American. We had our paws on Bowie. He was Jim Bowie. And of course everybody doubted this, because it is a famous historical figure. And they tried to do everything under the sun to shake him out of this engram, and they finally went back to running it, and it was the one that flattened out. The trouble was, he had dub on it, which made Bowie die the wrong kind of a death under wrong circumstances. But as he ran

it, the more he ran it, the more he ran it, the more right the circumstances got. And it finally all came out in the wash. He did run the death of Jim Bowie.

Historical figures, however, are usually the yo-yo point used. The guy went out of his own body at the death; there was some current historical figure; he said, "That is the identity necessary to resolve this incident. That identity could handle it. So I will just be Catherine the Great." And he goes and runs Catherine the Great. The only mistake is to let him escape out of the time period. Maybe he did yo-yo right into the palace, maybe he did go right through her skull. But the right engram will shake out, because the Reality Scale is run by running an engram.

Theoretically, you could clear a person just by running one engram well enough. So never get off onto quantitative engrams. An engram is merely something for him to get used to confronting, and creating, and mocking up, and so forth. It's just a playing field you are using. The significance, the amount of change he gets in his life, none of these things have anything to do with it at all. It is just how well he can handle a mental image picture, and you have chosen a honey for him to handle. That is about all it amounts to. And when he finds out he can handle this thing from A to Izzard and beginning to end, and he can do it well, then the next engram to resolve the case will run quite rapidly. And you will run on down and finally run his basic, earliest shift of identity, which is the rock. And formerly he said, "There is a beautiful, clear sphere – that's the rock. And that's all the rock." Oh, heck. When you get several engrams run and get the rock as one of the engrams, you find out this beautiful, clear sphere was something he customarily clamped around thetans as a trap, and they sometimes clamped it around him, and there were raiding parties, and there was all kinds of personnel and there is drama and there is strain, and there is scenery and everything else. When you contacted the rock first and ran the rock first, he was insufficiently able to contact things. The date when he was mocking up this thing, he was so capable of mocking up that later on this poor, little, weak ole thetan, years and years and centuries and so forth afterwards going back to mock up this rock – uh-uh – it's too beefy. That's too much engram for him to confront first off.

So you choose the engrams – it doesn't much matter what you choose. You will find that every sexual incident you contact is a bounce from a death. A little rule for you. So don't let me catch anybody in the HGC running prenatals, birth, conception, because that is a bounce. Those are all tied in with the death, and the death is the engram which is necessary to resolve the case. So you keep running Past and Future Experience until you get them down to that – OK? Leave the second dynamic incidents severely alone.

Now it can be that he died, and he died is followed by a conception sequence, and he goes back to the old body to see if it is still decently buried – you know – and then he can't find the person that he thought he was going to be, get the next body from, and he gets all confused. And mess-ups of this character can occur. But keep him on the incident. Is this part of the text? When you finish a death and go through the exteriorization sequence, right at the end of it there is a conception or a prenatal or a birth. They quite ordinarily bounce into it, and you don't want it. You want nothing to do with it. So you stop him when you have got all of the exteriorization run.

There is a lot to know about engrams. You have been taught all this, but I am just showing you what you can do to win in the HGC with Engram Running. This would be a good, clean job then.

Every time you run an engram, now is the time to use some Not-Is Straight Wire, with its ordinary commands which you know. They are:

"Recall something that you implied was unimportant." "Recall something somebody else thought was important."

Don't ever let a pc run it in reverse, because it discharges havingness in about five commands. That is real rough the other way, too.

All right. Now there we have a rundown that will get engrams run, that will get ordinary, run-of-the-mill cases squared around, and that will get a lot done. But what about people who were not through the American 21st? And during that period of time up until they start in with a Theta Clearing Course, to run actual engrams on pcs, how about these people? Well, you have Selected Person Overts, with the "withhold" command added, and you will have a new bulletin out on these things, and so forth. We want that auditing to be relatively muzzled. It will win and everything will go along just dandy. But if you have got some case (and this is more for D.O.P.s than anything else) – if you have got some case that was awfully hard to start, very low random profile, you'd better turn it over to a graduate of the 21st American. And if you have got some case that, after he ran along for a while and was getting up to a point where he'd just run engrams beautifully, and the whole track's opening up, everything is going along just dandy, and it is certain that the engram necessary to resolve the case is just waiting, give him an auditor that can run it.

In other words, you can run an HGC this way: You can get some auditors that set pcs up to run engrams. You got the idea? And then you can have some auditors that run engrams. This is not any real violation of the Auditor's Code, because that will still give him the best processes and the best treatment for the pc that can be given.

Now there is no reason why, particularly after a staff Theta Clearing Course, that everybody can't run a regimen of this sort. But running it in the HGC, with all the profiles being submitted to me and all the Case Analysis Reports – the Case Analysis Reports now are more vital than profiles, because R changed on a case does not necessarily change the profile at all. You should know about that. You can change the R of the case without changing the profile. The person answered the same questions, only he answered them with Reality. This is quite remarkable. We need a brand new test. That test is in development right at this moment. It is a confront test, and that test will be coming up, but there is no reason to rush it, particularly. Let's just do it by Case Analysis.

I will get out a Bulletin that will take care of auditors who were not trained to run engrams, what they will run. But you already have data and material on this, and it is just as before, what you have been running.

Now, to start a case out **With Not-Is Straight Wire** is adventurous. That's an adventurous thing to do. That's a rough thing to do. We learned a great many things in the 21st American ACC. Learned a great many things, and that was one of them. Selected Persons

Overt-Withhold is very, very superior in undercutting cases to Selected Persons Overts. The only main change we have got is that we run Selected Person Overt-Withhold commands, just as it is given here in PT problem. That is a wonderful thing to do with a case, as long as the terminal is real to the pc. And there is no real reason that running a Scientologist, who knows what the command is, why ARC Break Straight Wire cannot be run on a person by an auditor who has not been through an Engram Running Course. That's a beautiful process.

I want to tell you something else. Can I tell you something here? A lot of research was done in the 21st American ACC, and students didn't see me as much as they thought they should, I suppose, but I was around. And I never saw so many flips and changes and vagaries in my life as I saw in that particular unit. The reports which I got were very – very helpful to me – very, very helpful to Scientology at large. There was a great deal done in that course. I spent about three weeks of the course – did very rapid research just in catching up with some of these undercuts. Because, let me assure you, the R factor in most of the cases you approach is so low that it poses a problem of running greater than we had ever imagined. Therefore, these are the processes that we are handing out.

Now, these are a Not-Is type of process. Dynamic Straight Wire runs a straight identification, but the rest of these things are Not-Is types of processes. To cure somebody from not-ising. When a person can confront something, he no longer has to not-is it.

But there was a funny command came up along the line, that I don't fully understand yet, but it takes care of a theta body. Now this is part of the research that was never given to the 21st American. And this is a peculiar darned thing. You can write it down on the back of this Bulletin, if you want to.

It is:

"Recall a time when you thought something bad was unimportant."

And that is just about the wildest thing you ever saw. Now that runs all by itself but can be combined with:

"Recall a time somebody else thought something bad was important."

And you will run all the newspapers off the case. The second command there is really not essential, but you just run this first command repetitively, and if it seems to run down or something bad happens, flip over to the other command. But you will as-is a theta body.

This is the doggondest thing you ever saw. It is a perfectly wild pitch. I was just adding up all possible combinations and working in all possible directions, and this one fell out of the hamper, and it doesn't integrate too well with the rest of your data. But this is the goofy one.

Now, something else came up in the 21st American that I should tell you in the HGC, and that is: After nine years, we have found out WHY. We had nine years of HOW, and now in the ninth year we find out why. Why people are aberrated. Why they are sick. Why they act the way they do. Why individuation takes place. And that is all wrapped up with **Withhold**. I had withhold earlier, but didn't shake it all out of the hamper, because I didn't have the overts to go with it. We find out that an individual gets sick by having the overt impulse to make

somebody else sick and then withholds it, because it is less social to give people illnesses. So he gets them himself. This is Freudian transference, it is a whole number of things. So when you run these overts, run the withhold with it and the case will start finding out why.

The theta body thing, and the masses and ridges, why, they run out when you ask a person to recall a time when he thought something bad was unimportant, or recall – well, that is the best command – recall a time when he thought something bad was unimportant. When you run this, you evidently run the center pin of the withhold. But you will get his tolerance. And this is the first straight ethical process, evidently, we have. It raises a person's ethics. It as-ises a theta body. It takes demon bodies and things like that off cases. I tested it two or three times here, just monkeying around with this thing, and it is one of the wilder ones. This is a wild pitch, that particular process.

So you could say that when a field doesn't immediately disintegrate, when you can't get an individual easily in the engram, when the field stays persistently black or something like that, you have got another string to your bow, and I don't care if you use it. But if you do use it, know this: It runs as an automaticity on such a demon case. He runs br-r-r-r-t – the last two thousand years he has been not-ising and saying it was unimportant that something was bad. And he will start coming up with, "Well, I should do something – no, I shouldn't do something – well, what is this? I should do something about it. I shouldn't do something about it. I have been very neglectful, but that really isn't bad. Not really. Somebody dying from the bullet wound I gave 'em – that really isn't bad. But – " And he is stuck right with the consid- eration on all of his overts – consequences of overts. They all must be unimportant. And it reduces his ethical level. But I have now seen two demon bodies disintegrate just with that one command just disintegrate – and this is the first time we ever had something that would disintegrate the astral body. So we find out at once that the astral body was an aberration. It isn't a necessary thing to make a thetan stick in the head at all.

All right. Now I wanted to give you this rundown, because today you were having a little bit of a rough time doing a transition from student to pro auditor, and I wanted to talk to you, even though it burned up some of your valuable time and mine. And ask you to sic sem- per transit, huh?

Now are there any questions? Yes, Jean.

Q. I have two questions. In running of the engram, do you ignore what they were run- ning in the ACC, or do you just go back and run them? My preclear has had several engrams started.

A. Now, if we look over this carefully, we see in running an incident: Find the engram necessary to resolve the case. Once you have chosen it and have begun to run it, be sure you have the motivator and the overt and then do not, do not, do not, do not, depart from that inci- dent to run another that "drops better" or comes up. Now look here. The engrams that were run on them in the course are no longer going to fall. And an engram is not going to show on an E-Meter. And if there were several engrams run on somebody in the course, and the first one wasn't flattened, then whoever audited them ought to be hit in the head with a sledge- hammer. There's only one or two cases that got by with this, that I have checked up on so far, and it is about the most serious blunder that could be made. Now, what you do in a case that's

had an engram already started is get a lie reaction check – that's all you want – of some sort or another, concerning this particular thing. You can put him on the E-Meter and ask him if it was run, and so forth, and ask him which one was the first one run. You could possibly get an occlusion, but usually the pc will tell you. There's no particular reason to doubt the pc. Get the first one, and get that one flat, and then you have no choice but to pick up the next one and flatten that one.

This applies without regard to how many auditors were on the case. This also, you will find out, will sometimes apply to somebody who had an engram audited in 1950. The only trouble with a 1950 engram is that it is probably an operation in the current lifetime, or a pre-natal in the current lifetime, and it was the wrong engram necessary to resolve the case, and you won't get very far running the thing. And we have no data at this time, whether it's best to pick that one up and run it or not. But I would say for sure that an engram that should have been run to resolve the case, such as a past death, if that was ever entered in all of those years, including 1950 – it may no longer drop on the E-Meter, because some of its charge is gone. That is the engram necessary to resolve the case.

Yes, got another one?

Q. Yes. The Dynamic Straight Wire – do you keep running this until you have picked up all the daffy terminals, then go through it several times and get the daffy ones each time?

A. If you get a daffy one, if you get several daffy ones, you take those you got on the first run and run them. Don't bother to go through again, because it will have straightened out. Enough will have straightened out to admit progress of the case. But if you don't get any daffy ones through once, then run it again. Any other questions? Dale.

Dale: I just had a comment on that. One 1950 engram, in which the auditor blew session because it was whole track, was the engram necessary to resolve the case and finally showed up. The guy had been black since 1950.

A. Good. Picked it up and flattened it. Well, that's a good job. That tells you that a black case, then, doesn't necessarily require five or six weeks of preparation before you run an engram. You pick up an engram as early as you can on a case and charge through. But it doesn't get you around starting a case. You have always got to start a case or start a session. Yes?

Q. On this re-experience process, do I run it until I get 3-D pictures, and track?

A. Yes. Oh, 3-D pictures and back in PT. Back in PT. I'll give you an example of one of these. Here's the pc. He is sitting in a terror charge, in a total black freeze, at 1500 AD. One second later, everything went to hell. One second before, everything had gone to hell. And he's sitting in this split second, at a rest point. Got it? Well, now, what do you think happens when you start asking him about future and past, alternately? He'll move right off that rest point, won't he? So this is an explosive, doggoned process. Now, I say you run it until he gets to PT. Some time or other you might find it impossible to get him to PT on the process. You just might. But the experience that has been had with it so far is that it does eventually move him to PT. Now is the time to take him back, at the auditor's discretion, and have him run that incident in which he was stuck.

By the way, "What part of PT are you willing to experience?" has on several cases exposed the engram necessary to resolve the case. It is the engram he's sitting in, and it is the one necessary to resolve the case. Yes?

Q. If you leave a process very unflat one afternoon, and come back in the morning and start questioning the guy, and you pick up first of all present time problems. Now supposing that process is the basic of his present time problem of the morning. Are he and you the terminals, the preclear and auditor the two terminals?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you run it that way?

A. Oh, well, if he got a lot of ARC breaks, it would be a good thing to run it this way. That would clean up all the ARC breaks, wouldn't it?

Now I am going to give you that again on ARC breaks. This is the hottest one to run ARC breaks on. Just pick up the auditor and pick up the pc, as the two people involved in the present time problem. I am glad you brought that up, Joe.

This idea of throwing him back into session after you have ended a session the day before is another point of judgment. Just how do you smoothly get him into it? Usually he has piled up something on top of the engram. There is a process here, which is not really a very good process, but which kicks them out, and it was not given in this ACC. That is Problems of Comparable Magnitude to that Engram, or that Incident. It will actually de-intensify an engram. You should have that as a little panacea.

That is an interesting one to wind up an intensive on. About noon of the last day you all of a sudden realize, "Boy, this man isn't going to make it." And you could run a problem of comparable magnitude to that engram and get it keyed out. However, you are better than that, and you will have had it flat by the last day of the last intensive he has, that's for sure. Any other questions? Don?

Q. Is "recall something" preferred over "recall a time"? I have heard "Recall a time you did something to somebody," and also "Recall something you did to somebody," which is slightly different.

A. "Recall a time" is always a superior process, unless the individual is consistently not recalling a time, at which time he is not obeying the auditing command. So you should say, "Recall something you have done to" to somebody who can't spot something on a time track.

Q. What's the difference there?

A. You are running really two processes with "Recall a time you did something," and you are running only one process, "Recall something you have done."

Q. Can he continue to do that without recalling a time?

A. Yeah. Definitely. Anything else?

"Recall a time," all by itself – you just sit down and say to a pc, "Recall a time. Thank you. Recall a time. Thank you." Some interesting things would happen to a case. Time, you see, is the single aberration. Joe?

Q. In running an engram, when you are tagging the engram for the first time, is it possible to peg, say, a 2-ton motivator and a one-pound overt, and that's the incident?

A. Yes. Because until they get some of the overt flat, the motivator will come off. The right one to run there, by the way, is the overt. You get that overt damn real, and all of a sudden you'll find the 20-tons have departed down to about 1 0-tons on the motivator. Now they'll run on comparable lines. Yes.

Q. Couldn't you have, say, a 20-ton motivator, as he was saying, and twenty one-ton overts tied to the same motivator, rather than one large overt?

A. You could. You could. Nevertheless, you'll find somebody getting all loused up on this, and best remedy is just to play what overt you find against what motivator you find as the incident. And just keep playing them one against the other, back and forth, back and forth, and eventually the thing will come out right.

There are many remedies, and one is Selected Persons Overt-Withhold Straight Wire on the personnel of the incident. You could take any incident as a PT and run any PT process on the incident. That's a little rule. I don't advise you doing it, however, but you can do it. It's very interesting: "Find something unimportant about that executioner," is just about the same as, "Find something unimportant about this room." If you want to get a reality soaring on a pc, just run "Find something unimportant about this room." And he'll start this not-is machinery going, you know, and he'll run it out to some degree, and all of a sudden the room will brighten up. Very interesting.

"Think of something you did to an executioner" would be it, rather than, "Think of something you did to that executioner." And he will come up with the overt, and he will find out he was the executioner in the same castle for about three lifetimes before he suddenly came back there and got executed. That usually is the way these things compare.

Any other questions? There is a burning question that you should ask, is: "Are we supposed to run these things muzzled?" Now, let me just say this, to do this for me: Let's cut down the unnecessary yak. And if the pc seems to be ARC breaking at all, you voluntarily muzzle your auditing. You got it? Because what he's got is an engram of being talked to or being interrogated in some fashion, and everything that he doesn't consider exactly necessary to the auditing session he resents. So if you find a pc is ARC breaking, you muzzle your session. Any other questions before we break this up?

Thank you very much for your time, I appreciate very much your coming in. I know you had a hard day getting on to a new routine, and you have got auxiliary duties. Several people in the HGC have been split off of administration, and there are other things going on. Latch on to 'em, get wheeling, but let's start making theta clears in this HGC and just make nothing else but theta clears. I have given you a pattern here that was thoroughly tested out in the 21st American ACC, and you can make theta clears – there's no great difficulty to it. Thank you very much.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ng.rd.lh

# HGC PROCESSES FOR THOSE TRAINED IN
# ENGRAM RUNNING OR TRAINED IN THESE PROCESSES

**Starting a Case:**   **Begin every session as follows with these rudiments.
Use Rudiments. Find the auditor, find the pc, find the auditing room.
Establish a goal for the session. Ask for present time problem.**

## Present time problem:

If PTP exists then run it as follows and in no other way. Do not yak around about it. Just ask if there is one, see if one registers on the meter. On the **PT problem that registers on the meter** (not some other one) do the following.

Ask for and write down all the persons connected with this problem. That problem includes the preclear. On each of these persons, one after the other, beginning with the one most real to the pc, run this:

"Think of something you have done to (selected person)." "Think of something you have withheld from (selected person)."

These commands are run one after the other until the selected person chosen is somewhat flat. (Pc begins to repeat things he has recalled before.)

Do this to each person involved in the problem.

**PT Problems were cut out of HGC because auditors burned up half an intensive on them. A PT Problem never requires more than a couple of hours to flatten. No "when" is used with PT problem by Selected Persons.**

**Use Rudiments and check PT Problem each session and handle as above.**

## Dynamic Straight Wire:

Do a survey, one time on the pc, not every session, to discover any errors in their dynamics. This is done with an E-Meter. On pcs not familiar with Sci. terms use the following words: Self, sex, family, children, groups, mankind, the animal kingdom, birds, beasts, fish, vegetables, trees, growing things, matter, energy, space, time, spirits, souls, gods, God. Assess with this question only, "Tell me something that would represent (each of the above, one after

the other)." When one changes the pattern of the needle action or when it is definitely balmy, write it down. When list is completed, take those items written down and run:

"Think of something you have done to (selected terminal you wrote down)."

"Think of something you have withheld from (selected terminal, same one)."

Run these questions on each, one after the other, until pc seems flat.

**If no daffy terminals are found on survey, survey it all again. If none are found this second time, skip this process.**

**Do this only once per auditor per pc.**


### Past and Future Experience:

This process goes rapidly into engrams but can be continued even if engrams are contacted.

Run these two questions one after the other, one time per each.

"What part of your life would you be willing to re-experience?"

"What part of the future would you be willing to experience?"

**Keep an accurate record of any engrams contacted. When engrams persist in the pc's view, carefully spot them in time for him.**


### Engram running:

Find the engram necessary to resolve the case. **Once you have chosen it and have begun to run it, be sure you have the motivator and the overt and then do not do not do not do not depart from that incident to run another that "drops better" or comes up. In other words once you have found an incident stay on it until it is flat.**


### Not-is Straight Wire:

When you have flattened an engram thoroughly with all five commands gone over twice, run Not-Is Straight Wire between incidents. In other words, flatten an engram, then run Not-Is Straight Wire, get that a bit flat and locate and run the next incident.

Selected Person Overt Withhold, and General Overt and Withhold can be run on a pc only if they are biting. This is also true of Not-Is Straight Wire.


L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-.rd

_____

1 March 1959

# PROCESSES USED IN 21ST ACC

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

I want to take up here with great rapidity the processes from bottom to top that we have so far found and that have been effective, and some additional data in running them.

And first is the process Dynamic Straightwire. The way to do a survey on Dynamic Straightwire is this: you ask the person to describe the dynamics from one to eight. We don't care about them being sequitur – change them round if you wish.

Now, you ask a person to describe each one of these dynamics. You are watching an E-Meter for a change in pattern. Therefore you must carefully isolate the pattern, before you can tell whether or not the pattern has changed on the E-Meter needle reading. But, more important than that, you are looking for a dynamic the preclear makes mistakes about while he is trying to describe it, a dynamic he cannot describe, or a dynamic he won't even approach and is very leary of, and his statement is confirmed by the E-Meter reading. In other words, you've got the statement of the preclear in this particular analysis being stacked up against the E-Meter reading all the way through in an analysis or diagnosis for Dynamic Straightwire.

All right. We go all the way through, asking for a terminal on these dynamics and we finally get a repeat. We will ask him for terminals on these dynamics, and we will get the same dynamic to read again. Now the basic rule which sorts this out is: Any dynamic which doesn't clear by two-way comm has to be run. Simple as that. Any dynamic which doesn't clear by two-way comm has to be run.

So, if you have two or three dynamics jammed up, you can hope that two of them will clear up, leaving you with the remaining dynamic.

But this is not the complete criteria of what you run. There is another stable datum. Don't run a terminal that is totally unreal to the preclear. Another stable datum, which comes on top of it, is: never run a terminal that is sensible. Never. If a terminal belongs on the dy-

namic, you can almost say you'll get nowhere running it. So you're looking for terminals that the preclear gives you for a dynamic which don't belong on the dynamic at all.

Now, if that terminal is real to the preclear, you will get a tremendous change in the case. If that terminal is totally unreal to the preclear and if it does belong on the dynamic, why, you're not going to get any change on the case, so why run it? Might as well run some other process.

So, we have several conditions by which the diagnosis on Dynamic Straightwire works. I've done enough of these now and run enough of them, isolated enough of them and gotten conditions of change on enough of them, to realize that every time you changed a case you had (1) a person who couldn't describe the dynamic accurately, or who made mistakes while trying to describe it, (2) a person who gave you a non sequitur or erroneous terminal for that dynamic – the terminal was fairly real to the preclear, although it didn't belong there – and (3) you ran that, and it opened up track like mad.

What have you got here? You have a terrific identification. You are trying to undo identification that is lying right on the top. Well, this tells you, then, that it is neither a long process nor an invariable process. Given enough skill, you could undoubtedly find one of these on every case – given enough skill. But it is limited by auditor skill. Furthermore, it gives auditors a chance to "chop up" preclears and it gives auditors a chance to write some script, so this one has liability. And auditors have been writing script like mad. We had one particular case where the preclear couldn't say any terminal on the seventh dynamic, so promptly the auditor jumps in and takes the nearest related thing to the seventh dynamic, the thetan, he could get. This was A Head, and he ran A Head, and the preclear had nothing to do with it, and they wondered why the case didn't advance.

Now, you have auditors who are letting the preclear *choose*. In other words, there are auditors who actually believe that a preclear is permitted power of choice in an auditing session. And this is the biggest bug I have found existing at this instant on this ACC. That one's a blinker. They are probably not telling you this, that they think a preclear has power of choice. They don't know this: that it has to be nutty if you are going to run it – if it makes sense, why run it? They are looking for a wrongness in the preclear and they believe that the preclear knows all about his own case and could straighten it out all by himself. And that the auditor is an unnecessary adjunct. Now there are several people on this ACC who believe this and this is a great compliment to their faith in human nature, but it's certainly of no value in an auditor. The preclear has no power of choice at all. The one the preclear would never choose is the one you run.

An example: We had a preclear here who gave three terminals on the fifth dynamic. One of these was a mountain. So the preclear was given the power of choice as to which one to run and, of course, came up with a cat. So they sat there running cats. Well, a cat happens to be right for the fifth dynamic, so why straighten it out? The process is aimed at straightening out something. Obviously, the mountain was wrong. The preclear was totally stuck on the idea that there was a mountain in on this.

We found a mountain on the eighth dynamic in another case that hasn't been running. This case had been running metal on the sixth dynamic. So what? Metal belongs on the sixth

dynamic – why run it? Get the idea? But this auditor had found a mountain on the eighth dynamic and ignored it. Of course, everybody knows God is a mountain – that's obvious…

Now, this was the one to hit. And where you find these people out of session it is because nobody has trailed down a nutty dynamic. When they're out of session on Dynamic Straightwire, they're not interested in it at all, they are just not running an identification. They're running something reasonable, and at once the biggest liability of auditors is that they are reasonable and that they write script and write in reasonable reasons for it all. And they're trying to audit unreasonability out of people-and these two things just don't go together at all.

The next process up the line is Selected Person Overts. Select a terminal who is real to the preclear and, as you undercut the process, it comes closer and closer to present time. The person chosen has to be closer and closer to present time the more you try to go downscale on the process. But the person must be real, that's a criteria in there. And the next thing about it is, you must flatten off several of these people. And the basic reason for this is to prepare an individual to own up to some responsibility for his own actions. Unless he can assume some responsibility for his own actions, he won't do anything in an auditing session, so this is the one that cures.

The auditing command for Selected Person Overts is **"Recall a time you did something to _____ (the selected person's name)."** But that is undercut by the auditing command **"Think of something you did to _____."** or **"Think of something you have done to _____."** Now, the reason you say "Think" is because these people are very chary of owning up to anything or accepting any responsibility out in broad daylight in front of God and everybody, so you run "Think" and you've got a lot of people who are having a rougher time who won't own up to their own lives and who can't take responsibility for them on the third dynamic, but can take responsibility for them on the first dynamic. And this is the dynamic selection. So "Think" undercuts "Recall. "

The next one – General Overts – is much less effective when it has not already been undercut by Selected Person Overts. The individual just goes on and on with sweetness and light. The auditing command for General Overts is **"Recall a time when you did something to somebody."** Now there are other phrases and so forth which could be used for this sort of process, but here we are interested mainly in people. We are not very interested in MEST and the remaining four dynamics. They'd splatter all over the place. That's why it's "to *somebody."* If you said "something," you would get the remaining four, so there is an alternate command in here if you wanted to run the other four dynamics. You would say, **"Recall a time when you did something to something."**

Now, the next one up the line from this is Not-Is Straightwire: **"Recall a time when you implied something was unimportant."** And this, we find, is best run on an alternate basis with the next auditing command, **"Recall a time when somebody else thought something was important."** These two commands are alternated, one after the other, and you get these cases that are in a jam.

This is the direct cure of notisness; and where you have a case that is running a bad not-is, a process can evidently be invalidated or not-ised when the individual is out of session, or overnight. This is what Not-Is Straightwire cures. These are the people on whom a process

works once, and never works again. These people are not-ising so badly that they can't duplicate – and not-is, of course, is a mechanism to prevent duplication. So you cure, not duplicate. And the cure for it is Not-Is Straightwire.

[Continued in PAB 156]

# HGC CURRENT PROCEDURE

### *Selected Persons Overts Straightwire*

If you want an undercut on Selected Persons Overts Straightwire, run people close to present time and if you want to undercut it further, downscale its command to: "Think of something you have done to…" The preclear does not have to talk to run this process. He can just think of something.

Additional note: ARC Break Straightwire cannot be run on a case that is motivator hungry. Overt acts must *be* owned up to thoroughly on the lower processes before you can get ARC Break Straightwire to run properly. Bad auditing is much easier to do with ARC Break Straightwire than the other two processes. Bad auditing is the limitation of ARC Break Straightwire. It gives the auditor much more chance to make mistakes than either Selected Persons Overts or Not-Is Straightwire.

The two biggest single auditor crimes are:

1. Rough and choppy auditing.

2. Overestimating the level of case.

When either of these two crimes is committed you get reduced profile readings. If a profile reduces, the answer is in either one or two above.

The remedy for rough auditing is muzzled auditing. This gives the auditor wins, thus improving his judgement and gives the preclear wins.

Muzzled auditing is best run on:

1. Selected Person Overts Straightwire

2. General Overts Straightwire

3. Not-Is Straightwire.

ARC Break Straightwire belongs between General Overts Straightwire and Not-Is Straightwire in the scale of things, but is generally omitted because it requires smooth auditing; *however,* it produces the best results if case reality is up to it.

### *Gradual Scale Of Processes*

The lowest is:

1. Selected Person Overts Straightwire: "Recall a time you did something to ...."

2. General Overts Straightwire: "Recall a time you did something to somebody."

3. ARC Break Straightwire: "Recall an ARC Break." "When?"

4. Not-Is Straightwire: "Recall a time you implied something was unimportant" alternated with "Recall a time somebody thought something was important. "

5. Factual Havingness:

   - "Look around here and find something you would permit to vanish."

   - "Look around here and find something you would continue."

   - "Look around here and find something you have."

The results to be achieved by the above scale compare favourably to the CCHs and are faster.

When part of the profile gain lags on the OCA or APA, the person is found to have a dropped havingness, thus Factual Havingness (Third Rail – run 8-2-1) can be combined with the above, using the third command, VANISH, first. In any event, the fifth process in the above order is "Third Rail" (run 8-2-1) of Factual Havingness.

I would like to see this run extensively by HGCs. I would like to see this gradient scale run *in full* after every engram is flat, and before starting a new engram.

This will keep auditors from being fooled by dub-in. Dub-in can occur in a different lifetime, even when it was not present in the lifetime just run. Dub-in is a continuous characteristic of a person in a single lifetime and may not be present in the ensuing lifetime.


L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-.rd

*Technical Bulletin*

# SELECTED PERSONS OVERT
# WITHHOLD STRAIGHTWIRE

It is not only unreasonable but impossible to run engrams or higher processes than Selected Persons Overt Withhold on people who have low reality and low responsibility. Selected Persons Overt Withhold raises both reality and responsibility and some of the cases around will only start to respond after four to five weeks of Selected Persons Overt Withhold Straightwire. But the main point is that they do – repeat, *do* respond.

We have got it made in Selected Persons Overt Withhold Straightwire. Let's not lose it.

### *Selected Persons Overt Withhold Straightwire*

Select a person (terminal) that is real to the preclear.

Run "Recall something you have done to \_\_\_\_\_" (that terminal) and

"Recall something you have withheld from (that terminal)" alternately.

(one question after the other)

Wherever the person has a misidentification or a fixated terminal on any dynamic, that terminal should be selected out and flattened by Selected Persons Overt Withhold Straightwire. We will be rid of these unresponsible cases.

Do not graduate into General Overts until Selected Person Overt Withhold Straightwire is flat. When is Selected Persons Overt Withhold Straightwire flat? It is flat when the preclear has come up tone through shame, blame, regret, and a recognition of his own failures and preferably 4.0 on the tone scale as per "Science of Survival".

Minimize the two-way communication, clean up present time problems with the same process, using the terminals involved in the present time problem, and *if in doubt* **muzzle** the auditor.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mc.msp.rd

# GENERAL INFORMATION

## PURPOSE OF THIS WORK:

To modify the data and material taught and demonstrated in the HCA/HPA Theory and Practice course and to bring uniformity of stable data to students and instructors.

There are six basic process types. One or more processes of each type is included in the Theory and Practice course. Listed here are the six basic types, the characteristic, purpose and stable datum of each. These are the general data for each basic type. Specific data are given with the processes themselves.

### Type 1. Starting and ending sessions.

Characteristic: Two-way communication. Two-way communication is how it is done.

Purpose: To compose preclear into and release him from the auditing session.

Stable Datum: Agreement. Each thing done in starting and ending sessions is the establishment of an agreement.

### Type 2. Control processes.

Characteristic: Control by action. Preclear's physical actions are controlled in order to do the processes.

Purpose: To place preclear's body and actions under the auditor's control to invite control of them by the preclear.

Stable Datum: Never let the preclear get out of doing what he is told.

### Type 3. Duplication.

Characteristic: Mimicry by action. Physical actions are duplicated.

Purpose: To establish communication.

Stable Datum: Each command in its own unit of time separate from every other command.

### Type 4. Subjective.

Characteristic:  Thinkingness. The preclear must think something to do the process.

Purpose:          To recover automaticities of thought and as-is unwanted thinkingness.

Stable Datum:  Body control comes before control of thinkingness.

### Type 5. Objective.

Characteristic:  Spotting and finding. Preclear must spot or find something exterior to himself to carry out the auditing command.

Purpose:          To orient preclear in present time, drop out past and improve havingness.

Stable Datum:  Attention of preclear must be under auditor's control.

### Type 6. Straight Wire.

Characteristic:  Remembering and forgetting. Preclear must do these things to carry out auditing command or question.

Purpose:          To re-control remembering and forgetting and relate past to present.

Stable Datum:  Specific things, not generalities.

### Definitions Of Thetan, Mind And Body – the three parts of Man

**Thetan:**       The awareness of awareness unit which has all potentialities but no mass, no wavelength and no location.

**Mind:**         The accumulation of recorded knowns and unknowns and their interaction.

**Body:**         An identifying form or non-identifiable form to facilitate the control of, the communication of and with and the havingness for the thetan in his existence in the MEST universe.

                  A thetan himself without the body is capable of performing all the functions he assigns to the body.

* * *

## THE CCH PROCESSES – TONE 40 AUDITING

*Definition of Tone 40 auditing:* Positive, knowing, predictable control toward the preclear's willingness to be at cause concerning his body and his attention.

## CCH 1 – A Type 2 – Control Process

**Name:** Give me that hand, Tone 40.

**Commands:** "Give me that hand." Physical action of taking hand when not given and then replacing it in preclear's lap. And "Thank you" ending cycle. All Tone 40 with clear intention, one command in one unit of time, no originations of preclear acknowledged in any way verbally or physically. May be run on right hand, left hand, both hands ("Give me those hands") or "Don't give me that hand", each one flattened in turn, never switching to a different hand or command before flattening the one already started.

**Position:** Auditor and preclear seated in chairs without arms, close together. Outside of auditor's right thigh against outside of preclear's right thigh. This position reversed for left hand. In both hands preclear's knees are between auditor's knees.

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

**Training Stress:** Never stop process until a flat place is reached. To process with good Tone 40. Auditor taught to pick up preclear's hand by wrist with auditor's thumb nearest auditor's body, to have an exact and invariable place to carry preclear's hand to before clasping, clasping hand with exactly correct pressure (enough to be real to preclear, not enough to bruise his hand over a long run), replacing hand (with auditor's left hand still holding preclear's wrist) in preclear's lap. Making every command and cycle separate. Maintaining Tone 40. Stress on intention from auditor to preclear with each command. To leave an instant for preclear to do it by his own will before auditor does it. Stress Tone 40 precision – this process puts order into preclear's case, thus precision must be stressed.

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


## CCH 2 – A Type 2 – Control Process

**Name:** Tone 40 8-C.

**COMMANDS:** "With that body's eyes look at that wall." "Thank you." "Walk that body over to that wall." "Thank you." "With that right hand touch that wall." "Thank you." "Turn that body around." "Thank you." Run without acknowledging in any way any origin by preclear, acknowledging only preclear's execution of the command. Commands smoothly enforced physically. Tone 40, full intention.

**Position:** Auditor and preclear ambulant, auditor in physical contact with preclear as needed.

**Purpose:** To demonstrate to preclear that his body can be directly controlled and thus inviting him to control it. Finding present time. Havingness. Other effects not fully explained.

**Training Stress:** Absolute auditor precision. No drops from Tone 40. No flubs. Total present time auditing. Auditor turns preclear counter-clockwise then steps always on preclear's right side. Auditor's body acts as block to forward motion when preclear turns. Auditor gives command, gives preclear a moment to obey, then enforces command with physical contact of

exactly correct force to get command executed. Auditor does not check preclear from executing commands.

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


## CCH 3 – A Type 3 – Duplication Process

**Name:** Hand Space Mimicry.

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

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

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

**Training Stress:** That auditor be gentle and accurate in his motions, giving preclear Wins. To be free in two-way comm. That the essential part of the auditing command is the motion, not the verbal patter. When it is necessary to physically assist preclear to do commands, use one-hand commands, putting preclear's hand through the command with auditor's free hand holding preclear's hand by the wrist. Accept preclear's answer to the question, "Did you contribute to the motion?" – his answers are accepted, whatever they may be. Auditor always places his hands up before telling preclear to do so. Auditor tells preclear to put his hands in his lap and keeps his own up until preclear does so, allowing preclear to break the solid comm line.

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


## CCH 4 – A Type 3 – Duplication Process

**Name:** Book Mimicry.

**Commands:** Auditor makes a simple or complex motion with a book. Hands book to preclear. Preclear makes motion, duplicating auditor's mirror image-wise. Auditor asks preclear, "Are you satisfied that you duplicated my motion?" If preclear is and auditor is also fairly satisfied, auditor takes book back, acknowledges, "Thank you", and goes to next command. If preclear says he is and auditor fairly sure he isn't, auditor takes book back and repeats command and gives book to preclear again for another try. If preclear is not sure he duplicated

any command, auditor repeats it for him and gives him back the book. Tone 40 only in motions. Verbal two-way comm quite free.

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

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

**Training Stress:** Stress giving preclear wins. Stress auditor's necessity to duplicate his own motions. Circular motions are more complex than straight lines. The basic rule on complexity in duplication processes is: Make the motions as complex as is necessary to get the preclear's interest and attention and no more.

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

## METHOD OF RUNNING CCH 1, 2, 3, 4.

CCH 1 is run first and run to a flat spot. Then CCH 2 is run. If CCH 2 produces change, it is flattened and followed by CCH 1. Then CCH 2 and if it again produces change it is followed by CCH 1. This rule is followed throughout – when either CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4 produces change the process is flattened and followed by CCH 1. This series of four processes is left when they can be run, one after the other (1, 2, 3, 4) in the same session without producing change.

The four CCH processes are to be run on the following cases:

**Insane:** That is, a person who is extremely and obsessively unwilling to control his body, his attention and his thoughts.

**Unconscious:** Any person who is unaware, to a great degree.

**Hostile:** Person who has appeared for processing but who demonstrates a complete unwillingness to accept order and to carry out an auditing command.

**CCH 1 "Don't Give Me That Hand"** version, is a specific process for a case who is dramatizing a heavy compulsive withhold condition.

\* \* \*

*ARC Straight Wire – A Type 6 – Straight Wire Process*

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

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

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

**Note:** It should be thoroughly understood that this is a valuable process and an excellent step in preparation for running the heavier recall processes.

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

 If this process is "policed" the auditor asks the preclear "when" before giving the acknowledgement, as often as is necessary to maintain control of the preclear – or as often as is necessary for the auditor to maintain his own confidence that the preclear is under control and doing the process. This process can be run "muzzled" and should be, where muzzling is indicated.

**Assessment Definition:** An inventory and evaluation of a preclear, his body and his case to establish processing level and procedure.

1.   Determine processing level.

2.   Determine process to be used.

3.   Always undercut reality level of the case when assessing processing level.

4.   Establish reality level of case by two-way communication using understanding and affinity as guides. Understanding: What can the preclear say and talk about that is easily understandable to the auditor? What can the auditor say and talk about that is easily understandable by the preclear? Affinity: What does the preclear like or dislike? What does he detest or ignore? What is he anxious or otherwise mis-emotional about?

5.   Never overlook an obvious physical defect or communication difficulty when making an assessment of any kind.

6.   Be alert to preclear's comm lags and what produces them.

7.   Observe the preclear's response to control.

8.   Find out what the preclear assigns cause to – what he blames what he feels he can do nothing about.

## TERMINAL ASSESSMENT – FOR OVERT-WITHHOLD PROCESS

In the HCA/HPA course this is done by two-way communication. The student should learn it by observance of the instructor. Terminal Assessment is made to locate the terminals in the case which, when run, will produce an increase in the responsibility and reality level of the preclear.

## A VERY BRIEF COVERAGE OF DYNAMIC
## AND KNOW TO MYSTERY SCOUTING

1.  Discover the terminals the preclear states to represent each part of the expanded Know to Mystery Scale. Any terminal which is obviously aberrated and won't clear by two-way comm should be run.

2.  Discover what terminals the preclear has identified with the wrong Dynamic. Any terminal wrongly placed that won't blow by two-way comm should be run.

**Note:** Two-way comm here does not mean invalidative or evaluative questions or comments by auditor.

## SELECTED PERSONS SCOUT

This is the assessment most used. It is applied to the persons in the preclear's present life. There are several loaded questions which can be used and there are several observations to be made by the auditor.

**Questions:**

"Who is to blame for the condition you are in?"

"Who do you know or have known that you'd really hate to be?"

"Who really had it in for you?"

"Who do you know or have known that you dislike thinking about?"

To be observed by auditor:

Comm lag: Willingness or unwillingness to communicate about a specific person. Physical and emotional effect produced by discussion of specific person: agitation, voice change, blushing, dopiness, etc.

**Note:** Auditor must realize that preclear has no power of choice in the selection of terminals. The terminal is chosen by the auditor.

In a case where the preclear does not answer up to questions or shows no useful (to the assessment) effects from questions, simply select the person who is realest to the preclear and proceed with the process. Continue running the persons in preclear's present life on basis of

who is realest until preclear is able to answer up to assessment questions. Realest person at start may turn out to be the auditor. If so, run it.

### *Overt-Withhold Selected Persons Straight Wire – A Type 6 – Straight Wire Process*

**Commands:**

"Think of something you have done to _____." "Thank you."

"Think of something you have withheld from _____." "Thank you." Or

"Recall something you have done to _____." "Thank you."

"Recall something you have withheld from _____." "Thank you."

The use of the "think of" command rather than the "recall" allows the preclear to plow through where his track is jammed and incidents are not easily separated, to the point where he can recall. In either case commands are run alternately, one for one.

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

**Purpose:** To put the preclear at knowing cause toward the people in his current life so that those people can no longer restimulate the preclear in livingness.

**Training Stress:** Any terminal run with this process is flat when that terminal can no longer restimulate the preclear's reactive bank. When the preclear can find no new incidents to recall and must repeat old incidents to continue process, a given terminal can be considered flat. Make sure he is repeating *incidents* and not recalling *similar* incidents before ending the run on that terminal. Also, the first few repeats may be just the preclear's way of filling in a comm lag. Student should observe and understand phenomena occurring with this process. Where assessment has been properly made, the preclear will manifest various mis-emotions ranging from below 0.0 on the tone scale up to 2.0 and emotions up to 4.0. The NOT-ISNESS on the case will show up as attempts to not-is the auditor, process or anything preclear's attention touches. The preclear, at first, will not correctly assign the reasons for his mis-emotions and discomforts and will blame them on the auditor, etc. This is an example of **Corollary No. 3 of Axiom 58** in action. This process is run "muzzled" by the student in training. Muzzled auditing is done as follows: At the beginning of session, instructor makes an assessment of the preclear's case and chooses the terminal to be run. He gets the preclear's agreement to run the process and does a very brief clearing of the command with the preclear. Then, the student auditor says, "Start of session," and gives the first command. When preclear has answered the auditor acknowledges and goes on to the next command. If the preclear originates anything, either as a statement, comment or question the auditor nods his head as an acknowledgement. If the preclear asks to have the command repeated, the auditor nods his head and repeats it. This is continued until end of session or until process is flat on that terminal. If student has any question or thinks terminal is flat, he puts his hand behind his chair and wig-wags to get instructor's attention. He does not leave his chair. Near end of session instructor gives the team notice that the session will end in two minutes. At the end of that time, when preclear has answered the last command and has been acknowledged, the student auditor says, "End of session." This is all there is to muzzled auditing done by students. The student auditor uses

only TR 0, TR2, TR3 (duplicative command) and handles originations with a nod of his head, *only.* No rudiments or two-way comm beyond "Start of session" and "End of session". Student should understand that when he runs this process (and some others) on preclears in the field, he should use muzzled auditing whenever he finds himself with any tendency to over-communicate or with any preclear who ARC breaks easily. Student should also understand that Overt-Withhold Selected Persons, Third Rail, ARC Break Straight Wire and Not-is Straight Wire can all restimulate so much automatic **not-isness** that the preclear will at times apparently lose his bank, his memory, and even the auditing command and its meaning. The only action indicated when this occurs is to persist with the process.

**History:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in the 21st ACC, in Washington, D.C., in 1959, as a means of ensuring wider and more predictable case gains by more auditors, even unskilled ones.

### *Factual Havingness – A Type 5 – Objective Process*

**Commands:** "Look around here and find something you have." "Thank you." " Look around here and find something you would continue. " "Thank you." "Look around here and find something you would permit to vanish." "Thank you." Commands are each flattened in turn before going on to next command. Process can be begun on any of the three commands, but the above order should be followed. If process is begun on "vanish" the next command to be run is "have".

**Position:** Auditor and preclear seated facing each other at a comfortable distance and with preclear facing majority of auditing room.

**Purpose:** To remedy havingness objectively. To bring about the preclear's ability to have, or not have, his present time environment and to permit him to alter his considerations of what he has, what he would continue and what he would permit to vanish.

**Training Stress:** To be run smoothly without invalidative questions. One of the most effective processes known when thinkingness can be controlled somewhat. The student should thoroughly understand that when a preclear is set on wasting, the vanish command will at first occupy the majority of auditing time spent on this process. Student should understand that the three commands can be each flattened in order any number of times and that running one of the commands is quite apt to unflatten the other two. Process should be continued until this no longer occurs.

**Third Rail** is a special form of **Factual Havingness**

**Commands & Position:** are the same as in Factual Havingness. However the commands are run in a special ratio of:

 8 commands of "vanish"

2 commands of "continue" and

1 command of "have".

**Purpose:** To remedy extreme conditions of **not-isness**. To remedy obsessive waste. To permit use of the process without bogging preclear in any one of the commands.

**Training Stress:** Student should realize that there is very seldom any reason for altering this ratio and should never Q and A with the preclear's complaints about doing the "continue" or "vanish" commands. Student should understand that Third Rail should be run where auditor is uncertain where to begin with Factual Havingness.

**History:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., in 1958, as the best form of objective havingness. Originally developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in 1955 as "Terrible Trio". Third Rail developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London for the 5th London ACC.

### *Rudiments – A Type 1 Process – Opening And Closing Sessions*

**Commands:** None as such. Rudiments is the establishment of the agreements basic to an auditing session, and the termination of them, at end of session. Students must understand what the rudiments are and be able to use them with any preclear who is capable of agreeing to them, by two-way communication. They are:

1. Auditor
2. Preclear
3. Auditing room
4. Start of session
5. Preclear's goal for session.

Auditor, by two-way comm, gets preclear's agreement to each of these, allowing preclear to state his own goals. The above order is not necessarily the order in which they are established. There should be enough two-way comm to get the preclear's agreement and no more. The auditor should determine for himself, but not tell the preclear, what he (the auditor) intends to do with the session. At the end of session auditor makes sure the preclear is released from agreements. Auditor does not argue with the preclear about the preclear's goals.

**Note:** If a preclear cannot communicate about the rudiments or be brought to agree with them fairly easily, CCH 1, 2, 3, 4 should be run with only "Start of session" spoken by the auditor as total rudiments. Rudiments are not used otherwise with any preclear who needs to be run on CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. Alternatively, for more accessible cases, do "muzzled" auditing as described above.

### *Mock Up A Picture For Which You Can Be Totally Responsible – A Type 4 – Subjective Process*

**Command:** "Mock up a picture for which you can be totally responsible." "Thank you."

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

**Purpose:** To put preclear at cause with regard to mental image pictures to the degree that engrams are under his control.

**Training Stress:** That preclear not be run on this process before he is willing to carry out a subjective process command exactly as given. Earlier processes should be well flattened before this is attempted. Otherwise the preclear will be given loses. The command means exactly what it says and the preclear's thinkingness must be well enough under control for him to view the command that way. This process should not be run for ever without an occasional flattening of **not-is** Straight Wire.

**History:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., in 1958.

### *Re-Experience And Experience Process – A Type 4 – Subjective Process*

**Commands:** "What part of your life would you be willing to re-experience?" "Thank you." "What part of the future would you be willing to experience?" "Thank you." Commands run alternately, one for one.

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

**Purpose:** To bring about the preclear's ability to re-experience his past without enduring consequence and to confront the future without restimulation.

**Training Stress:** That student understand that the process is run until flat and that student be aware of what "flat" is. When the preclear can easily get out of any incident he gets into and when he can re-experience those things without enduring consequence. Where engrams are encountered with the process the auditor should attempt to find out the year of its occurrence by two-way comm and flash answers and should record the dates found. The auditor must not go into general two-way comm with the preclear about the incidents preclear contacts. Never end the process while preclear is sticking in an incident.

**History:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., in 1959.

### *Present Time Problems – Part Of Rudiments – Type I Processes*

**Commands:** Auditor, by two-way comm, discovers the preclear's present time problem and discusses it with him. If it blows on this basis, fine. If not, we move out of Type 1 Processes. To handle the present time problem other than by two-way comm, discuss it with the preclear and get the names of the terminals involved. Ask the preclear which of these is realest. Run the one he names with Selected Persons Overt-Withhold Straight Wire. Discuss the problem. Find which of the remaining terminals is most real to the preclear. Run it with S.P.O.W.S.W. Discuss the problem and so on until the problem is run out, which is when the preclear does not need to do anything about it.

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

**Purpose:** To remove the surface difficulty that is the present time problem so that the auditing session can progress.

**Training Stress:** Student should know definition of a problem and should know very well what happens to auditing sessions where present time problem is unflat. A problem is "The conflict arising from two opposing intentions". A present time problem is one that exists in present time, in a real universe. It is any set of circumstances that so engages the attention of the preclear that he feels he should be doing something about it instead of being audited. Auditor uses questions based on definition of present time problem to find present time problems. Never leave a present time problem half run. Preclears with whom the rudiments cannot be readily established should not be run on present time problems but should be run on CCH 1, 2, 3, 4.

**History:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in 1952.

### Arc Break Straight Wire – A Type 6 Process

**Command:** "Recall an ARC break." "When?" "Thank you."

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

**Purpose:** To as-is ARC breaks. To bring about the preclear's ability to confront and as-is ARC breaks. To straighten out the preclear's time track which has become collapsed by ARC breaks in restimulation. To key out and take out of restimulation the "Rock" chain.

**Training Stress:** To not acknowledge the preclear's execution of the command until the time of the ARC break has been established and to acknowledge with good TR 2 when the time is established. To accept preclear's reality as to "when". If he says, "It occurred the year I graduated from high school," accept it and go on to next command. Assist him with two-way comm when he has difficulty locating time. Flash answers may also be used for this. Do not leave process until preclear can easily get out of incidents he gets into on the process. Process is flat when recalling ARC breaks no longer produces undue amounts of mis-emotion. Student should understand that the process has the limitation of being somewhat hard to clear command with person unfamiliar with the term "ARC".

**History:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., in 1958.

**Note:** In handling ARC breaks with the auditor, the auditor should use Selected Persons Overt-Withhold with the auditor as the terminal when the break is severe. Otherwise, use TR 5N.

### Not-Is Straight Wire – A Type 6 – Straight Wire Process

**Commands:** "Recall a time you implied something was unimportant." "Thank you." "Recall a time somebody else thought something was important." "Thank you." Commands run alternately, one for one.

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

**Purpose:** To bring **not-isness** (Axiom 11) under preclear's knowing control and to reduce the **not-isness** in the preclear's bank. To improve recall and increase reality. To generally increase

preclear's willingness to confront his past. To as-is the times when preclear not-ised others. To bring about the ability to evaluate importances.

**Training Stress:** To be certain preclear can recall overt acts to some fair degree before attempting this process. To make certain the preclear is not running the process on the effect side (i.e. recalling times he thought things were important and times others implied things were unimportant). To persist when preclear's restimulated **not-isness** threatens to destroy the session. To run the process to a flat spot where the preclear easily gets out of the incidents he gets into and can recall incidents without immediately restimulating **not-isness**, which is manifested by a sudden worsening of his recalls.

**History:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., in 1959.

### SCALE OF PROCESSES TAUGHT IN HCA/HPA

This is a scale of processes as they fit with the **Confrontingness Scale**, from the bottom up.

1. CCH 1, 2, 3, 4.

2. Rudiments.

3. PT Problems by Overt-Withhold Straight Wire.

4. ARC Straight Wire.

5. Selected Persons Overt-Withhold Straight Wire.

6. Factual Having-
   ness                                 } These two processes can be interchanged.

7. Third Rail

8. ARC Break Straight Wire.

9. Not-Is Straight Wire.

10. Past and Future Experience.

11. Mock up a picture for which you can be totally responsible.


                                               L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-jh.rd

Full distribution

# NOT-IS STRAIGHT WIRE

Those persons on whom a process works once and those who have either dub-in or occlusion, process easily, if dramatically, on Not-Is Straight Wire. (See Axioms 11D, 18 and 22.)

Pcs divide into three general classes:

1. Those who have 3D pictures and good time sense.

2. Those who are occluded with black, colored or invisible fields and poor time sense.

3. Those who dub-in and have no time sense.

The scale of deterioration of a case is as above. First there are 3D copies of the real universe, then there is the action of not-ising these pictures (while they're still there) and finally, while not-ising, substituting false pictures.

This process is aimed at case types 2 and 3 above. (ARC Break Straight Wire also handles type 2 but not so well as type 3.)

Types 2 and 3 press into invisibility pictures by making them "unimportant". This is the clue word to unreality, stupidity, occlusion and dub-in. (See the Logics.)

The cycle which occurs is that the person gets overwhelmed with other people's declared importance. They counter by not-ising the importance of others. The reverse cycle of others reducing the pc's own importances is not run in Not-Is Straight Wire as it reduces havingness.

The commands of Not-Is Straight Wire are only these and no other:

"Recall a time you implied something was unimportant." Pc does. "When?" Pc says or auditor assists him by pegging it on an E-Meter.

This is run for about an hour. Then a second command only is run.

"Recall a time when somebody *else* thought something was important' Pc does. "When?" Pc says or auditor assists him by locating on E-Meter.

Acknowledgement is used. TR 4 is reduced to a nod.

An hour of one is followed by an hour of the other.

There's dynamite in this process. It is good, clean and unlimited. But *don't* chicken on it and pull out and don't quit because the pc gets uncomfortable.

Here may be the QED for all occlusion and dub-in cases.

L. RON HUBBARD

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

*SCIENTOLOGY I to IV*

# MORE ON O/WS

The Itsa processes for O/W are almost unlimited.

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

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

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

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

Here are some varied Level I Processes:

- "Tell me some things you think you should not have done."

- "Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble."

- "What wouldn't you do over again?"

- "What are some things a person shouldn't say?"

- "What gets a person into trouble?"

- "What have you done that you regret?"

- "What have you said you wish you hadn't?"

- "What have you advised others to do?"

There are many more.

These at Level II all convert to repetitive processes.

At Level III such processes convert to lists.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

# UNIVERSE PROCESSES

Now that HCO WW at Saint Hill Manor is settling down for the long run, thanks to the co-operation of all Central Organizations and Franchise Holders with very few exceptions, I have been able to do some co-ordination work on processes I have been developing and would like to give you a rapid rundown on some of this work.

The first modern development of any importance since Comm Processes is called "Universe Processes".

This is based on some work which started with the 1959 HPA/BScn Course. The most gross breakdown of parts of life is: 1. The Thetan 2. The Mind 3. The Body and 4. The Physical Universe. This division is a sort of shorthand of the eight dynamics and gives us the stuck points of the majority. As this division is refined it becomes the eight dynamics as used in the old Dynamic Straight Wire.

Almost anything which applied to or was used in Dynamic Straight Wire can also be used in Universe Processes.

The most elementary form of Universe Processes is called "Universe O/W". This consists of doing an E-Meter assessment of the person on the four points above, taking the most different needle reaction from the rest (Thetan, Mind, Body and Physical Universe) and running what was found with Overt-Withhold Straight Wire.

Example: Let us say that we found Physical Universe to be the thing which fell the hardest or looked the most different on the E-Meter. One would then run as an alternate question: "Recall something you have done to the Physical Universe" alternated with "Recall something you have withheld from the Physical Universe". When the E-Meter was reading Clear on the tone arm for the sex of the pc, one would then reassess and use the one of the three remaining terminals (Thetan, Mind or Body) which now fell differently or more than the other two. Thus all four would eventually be run.

Universe O/W is based upon the observable fact that a thetan is trapped in a thetan, a mind, a body and the physical universe. If he weren't, he or she wouldn't be sitting in a chair. Thus we process the extremely obvious, scouting out with an E-Meter only what obviousness is more troublesome to the pc than the other obviousnesses. Of course it seems strange that a thetan could think of himself being trapped in another thetan but you see this all the time in valences. Ghosts become ghosts by being overwhelmed by thetans they think are ghosts and so on. That a thetan is trapped in a mind and that it is not his own mind that he is trapped in is

also obvious. If it were his own mind he would soon as-is it and you see what a hard time he has trying to erase it: that hard time comes about because he is misowning the mind in which he is trapped. And this is true of all traps. A thetan is usually quite sure that there is something wrong with the ownership of his own body and sure enough there is. And of course he's in the universe without much understanding of it.

It is far more obscure that a thetan gets trapped in the remaining dynamics even though this is equally true. He isn't really trapped in an animal if he is sitting there in a human body and so forth. So Universe O/W processes the obvious that is the most obvious.

All four of these terminals are run.

Now there is another way of attacking this problem and it is very successful. This is the "Universe Comm Process". One assesses the pc in exactly the same way but runs the terminal on "From where could you communicate to a… (one of the four universes as above)".

It is very notable that Comm Processes work best on obvious and visible terminals and work much less well on things that are not present and worst on things that are merely ideas or significances. You can make great headway with a pc with "From where could you communicate to a body" when with the same pc you might get very, very slow results with "From where could you communicate to a brother". Therefore the easiest to run and make progress with a Comm Process is using an obvious terminal and this of course would be one of the four universes, thetan, mind, body and physical universe.

However, when one runs a very obvious terminal with a Comm Process, one must carefully avoid pinning the process in present time. One cannot successfully run a Comm Process with "From where could you communicate to this room". This is too specific. The pc is balked by the fact that the Comm Process strongly calls up every room like "this room" and if he answers anything about these other rooms he is not doing the exact auditing command and so goes rapidly out of session. Specific terminals that permit no large breadth of time span won't run on a Comm Process because the process escapes the time limit imposed all too easily. One would have to run "From where could you communicate to a room" in order to wipe out the bad effects of "this room" on the case.

Universe Comm Processes are evidently the best version of all Comm Processes.

The assessment of the proper terminal can be a little tricky. The semantics of the terminal get in an auditor's way. And yet the auditor may be led astray into using a version of the terminal that is not really an obvious terminal. Example: The pc does not understand what a thetan is and the meter does react to it so the auditor sorts out "soul" and "spirit", etc, but gets a large drop on "astral body" and decides to run it only to discover that he is running an engram of recent origin in which the words appear. "Spirit" dropped less but would have run because it was more general.

You are probably wondering how we can get away with running "conceive a static", forbidden in the book *The Creation of Human Ability.* We can just barely get away with it because of the nature and power of the Comm Process. By damping out excessive individuation the Comm Process increases havingness. A total individual can't have much of anything – you can't even have a car really unless you can be, besides self, a "car driver" or a "car pas-

senger". A totally individuated person cannot be anybody but himself, cares for nobody but himself and can share in no activity of any other person. Hence as we flatten out this obsessive individuation we gain in the pc usually enough havingness to run a massless identity such as a thetan. However this terminal usually runs less well than the other three employed in Universe Processes.

There are other developments which will be discussed in later bulletins, such as "Think of a creation you could make unknown" but these in general are not as important to us as the above.

If you are having trouble keeping your people on a Co-audit it's because the things you are running on them are not real to them. I think you will find that by using a Universe Assessment on a Co-audit as above, you will have much more constant attendance. Try it anyway.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.rd

# KNOW TO MYSTERY STRAIGHT WIRE

# FOR EXTREME CASES

(Cancels Bull. of March 31, 1959)

The Know to Mystery Scale expanded

- Not know

- Know

- Look

- Emotion

- Effort

- Think

- Symbols

- Sex

- Eat

- Mystery

- Wait

- Unconsciousness

To assess a case on the lower rungs of processing, ask pc, against an E-Meter, what terminal could represent each of above, select that terminal (object or person, never a condition) which changes needle action most and run Overt-Withhold Straight Wire on it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mp.rd

Remimeo
PR Hats
D of P Hats
Auditors

# TONE SCALE IN FULL

| TONE SCALE EXPANDED | | KNOW TO MYSTERY SCALE |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SERENITY OF BEINGNESS | 40.0 | KNOW |
| POSTULATES | 30.0 | NOT KNOW |
| GAMES | 22.0 | KNOW ABOUT |
| ACTION | 20.0 | LOOK |
| EXHILARATION | 8.0 | PLUS EMOTION |
| AESTHETIC | 6.0 | |
| ENTHUSIASM | 4.0 | |
| CHEERFULNESS | 3.5 | |
| STRONG INTEREST | 3.3 | |
| CONSERVATISM | 3.0 | |
| MILD INTEREST | 2.9 | |
| CONTENTED | 2.8 | |
| DISINTERESTED | 2.6 | |
| BOREDOM | 2.5 | |
| MONOTONY | 2.4 | |
| ANTAGONISM | 2.0 | MINUS EMOTION |
| HOSTILITY | 1.9 | |
| PAIN | 1.8 | |
| ANGER | 1.5 | |
| HATE | 1.4 | |
| RESENTMENT | 1.3 | |
| NO SYMPATHY | 1.2 | |
| UNEXPRESSED RESENTMENT | 1.15 | |
| COVERT HOSTILITY | 1.1 | |
| ANXIETY | 1.02 | |
| FEAR | 1.0 | |
| DESPAIR | .98 | |
| TERROR | .96 | |
| NUMB | .94 | |

SYMPATHY                                                      .9

PROPITIATION – (HIGHER TONED – SELECTIVELY GIVES)            .8

GRIEF                                                        .5

MAKING AMENDS – (PROPITIATION – CAN'T W/H ANYTHING)          .375

UNDESERVING                                                  .3

SELF-ABASEMENT                                               .2

VICTIM                                                       .1

HOPELESS                                                     .07

APATHY                                                       .05

USELESS                                                      .03

DYING                                                        .01

BODY DEATH                                                   0.0

FAILURE                                                      -0.01

PITY                                                         -0.1

SHAME – (BEING OTHER BODIES)                                 -0.2

ACCOUNTABLE                                                  -0.7

BLAME – (PUNISHING OTHER BODIES)                             -1.0

REGRET – (RESPONSIBILITY AS BLAME)                           -1.3

CONTROLLING BODIES                                           -1.5

EFFORT PROTECTING BODIES                                     -2.2

OWNING BODIES                                                -3.0        THINK

APPROVAL FROM BODIES                                         -3.5

NEEDING BODIES                                               -4.0        SYMBOLS

WORSHIPPING BODIES                                           -5.0        EAT

SACRIFICE                                                    -6.0        SEX

HIDING                                                       -8.0        MYSTERY

BEING OBJECTS                                                -10.0       WAIT

BEING NOTHING                                                -20.0       UNCONSCIOUS

CAN'T HIDE                                                   -30.0

TOTAL FAILURE                                                -40.0       UNKNOWABLE


                                        L. RON HUBBARD


LRH:ams.rd

Remimeo

# THIRTY-SIX NEW PRESESSIONS

The following material was developed for the 1st Saint Hill ACC. All cases of this ACC were well started toward clear, 25 of them started for the first time. These new presessions were employed. Two of the cases started with two-way comm on failed help only after which some of the presessions following worked.

NOTE: These presessions are subject to revision after my further study. Their numbers will not be changed. I will probably change some of the processes and commands. They are given here exactly as developed and in the order of development, not workability.

NOTE: The assistance of Dick and Jan Halpern, ACC Instructors, is gratefully acknowledged for the discussion and testing of these presessions.

NOTE: Presession I is to be found in HCO Bulletin of 25 August 1960 and is not actually part of this series, not being a havingness confront presession.

*PRESESSION II:*

Havingness:      "Look around here and find something you could have."

Confront:        "What could you confront?"
                 "What would you rather not confront?"

*PRESESSION III:*

Havingness:      "Point out something in this room you could confront."
                 "Point out something in this room you would rather not confront."

Confront:        "What unconfrontable thing could you present?"

*PRESESSION IV:*

Havingness:      "What part of a beingness around here could you have?"

Confront:        "What beingness could others not confront?"

*PRESESSION V:*

Havingness:      "Point out something in this room you could confront."
                 "Point out something in this room you would rather not confront."

Confront:        "Point out a place where you are not being confronted."

*PRESESSION VI:*

Havingness:      "Look around here and point out an effect you could prevent."

Confront:        "What would deter another?" "Where would you put it?"

*PRESESSION VII:*

Havingness:      "Point out something."

Confront:        "Tell me something I am not doing to you."

*PRESESSION VIII:*

Havingness:      "Where is the (room object)?"

Confront:        "Recall something really real to you."
                 "Recall a time you liked something."
                 "Recall a time you communicated with something."

*PRESESSION IX:*

Havingness:      "Look around here and find an object you are not in."

Confront:        "Recall somebody who was real to you."
                 "Recall somebody you really liked."
                 "Recall somebody you could really communicate with."

*PRESESSION X:*

Havingness:      "Look around here and find something you could have."

Confront:        "What beingness could you confront?"
                 "What beingness would you rather not confront?"

*PRESESSION XI:*

Have:            "Notice that (indicated object)." (No acknowledgement.)
                 "What aren't you putting into it?"

Confront:        "Tell me something you might not be confronting."

*PRESESSION XII:*

Have:            "Look around here and find something you can agree with."

Confront:        "What is understandable?"
                 "What is understanding?"

*PRESESSION XIII:*

Have:            "Look around here and find something you could have."
                 "Look around here and find something you could withhold."

Confront:        "What have you done?"
                 "What have you withheld?"

*PRESESSION XIV:*

Have:           "Notice that (room object). Get the idea of making it connect with you. "

Confront:       (First ask: "Is there anything around here that is absolutely still?" If the answer is yes, continue. If no, use another presession.) "Look around here and find something you could stop," (to change of needle pattern or tone arm) then: "Look around here and find something you could start," (to change of needle pattern or tone arm) then, when neither command unsettles needle pattern or tone arm any more, use 5 or 6 commands of "Look around here and find something you could change." Then return to "stop".

*PRESESSION XV:*

Have:           "Look around here and find something you could withhold."

Confront:       "What would you rather not duplicate?"

*PRESESSION XVI:*

Have:           "Point out something around here that is like something else."

Confront:       "What is something?"
                "What makes sense?"

*PRESESSION XVII:*

Have:           "Where isn't that (indicated object)?"

Confront:       "What unkind thought have you withheld?"

*PRESESSION XVIII:*

Have:           "What else is that (indicated object)?"

Confront:       "What would make everything the same?"

*PRESESSION XIX:*

Have:           "What is the emotion of that (indicated object)?"

Confront:       "What intention failed?"

*PRESESSION XX:*

Have:           "What is that (indicated object) not duplicating?"

Confront:       "What two thoughts aren't the same?"

*PRESESSION XXI:*

Have:           "What scene could that (indicated object) be part of?"

Confront:       "What past beingness would best suit you?"
                "What past thing would best suit you?"

*PRESESSION XXII:*

Have:            "Duplicate something."

Confront:        "What would be a betrayal?"

*PRESESSION XXIII:*

Have:            "What is the condition of that (indicated object)?"

Confront:        "Describe a bad case."

*PRESESSION XXIV:*

Have:            "What is the condition of that person?"

Confront:        "What is a bad object?"

*PRESESSION XXV:*

Have:            "What aren't you putting into that body?"

Confront:        "What beingness would it be all right to confront?"

*PRESESSION XXVI:*

Have:            "What bad activity is that (indicated object) not part of?"

Confront:        "How would you not duplicate a bad person?"
                 "How would you not duplicate a bad thing?"

*PRESESSION XXVII:*

Have:            "Where would that wall have to be located so you wouldn't have to restrain
                 it?"

Confront:        "Describe an unpleasant environment."

*PRESESSION XX VIII:*

Have:  (a)       "What around here would you permit to be duplicated?" or,
       (b)       "What is the safest thing in this room?"

Confront:        "Describe a removal."

*PRESESSION XXIX:*

Have:            "Who would that (indicated object) be a good example to?"

Confront:        "What would that person be a good example to?"

*PRESESSION XXX:*

Have:            "What would you have to do to that (indicated object) in order to have it?"

Confront:        "Spot a change in your life."

*PRESESSION XXXI:*

Have:          (Auditor holds two *small* objects, one in each hand. Exposes them alternately to pc, with as little motion of arms and hands as possible.) "Look at this." (No acknowledgement.) "What around here isn't this duplicating?"

*PRESESSION XXXII:*

Have:          "How could you deter a ......?" "What have you not given a ......?"

Confront:      "What could you own?"
"What have you denied owning?"

(To clean up Scientology auditing or instruction run on "auditor", "pc", "instructors", "student", as indicated.

"What would a.....own?"
"What would a .....not own?")

*PRESESSION XXXIII:* (This is used as a "post-session" to clear up an intensive at the end.)

Have:          Whatever havingness runs best on pc, as havingness command.

Confront:      "What have you done in this room?"
"What have you withheld in this room?"
(To clean up all auditing, use "an auditing room".)

*PRESESSION XXXIV:*

Have:          Whatever pc runs best, as havingness command.

Confront:      "Who have you overwhelmed?"
"Who have you not overwhelmed?"

*PRESESSION XXXV:*

Have:          "Notice that (indicated room object)."
"How could you get it to help you?"

Confront:      "Whom have you failed to help?"
(This will fish up a case who is out the bottom with ARC Breaks. Corrects alter-isness.)

*PRESESSION XXXVI:*

Have:          "Notice that (room object)."
"How could you fail to help it?"

Confront:      "Think of a victim."

Replace Havingness of Presession XXV with:

Have:          "Notice that body." "What aren't you putting into it?"

*3 Versions of – Regimen 6 O/W Commands:*

1.      "Get the idea of doing something to ......"*
             "Get the idea of withholding something from ......"*

2.      "What have you done to ........ ?"*
             "What have you withheld from .......?"*

3.      "Get the idea of having done something to ........"*
             "Get the idea of having withheld something from ......"*

      * Assessed *6th* Dynamic terminal. (Number 3 runs regret.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.esc.ntm.jh

Assn Secs
HCO Secs
PE Director Hat
Franchise Holders

# NEW PE DATA

## SUPERVISING PE CO-AUDIT

The best way to run a PE course was given in the London 1959 HPA/BScn tapes and the 6th London ACC tapes.

This consisted of supervising the PE as though you were the only auditor present, all the co-auditing auditors to be used only as your mouthpiece. The "Instructor" audits each case through the co-auditor.

All pcs present can be put on one meter at the instructor's desk by means of leads and a multiple switch. This is of considerable use and is authorized for all Central Orgs, PE Foundations.

## ASSESSMENT

An assessment is a necessity on each case. At the course's start, assess rapidly with a meter and then when the majority are running on terminals go back and do a longer assessment on the hard one. Keep a record of your assessment. But don't spend all your time favouring hard cases. It makes other cases tend to toughen to get your attention.

If a case isn't getting meter fluctuation on the meter at the instructor's desk, check into it. A running case gets a changing needle and a changing tone arm.

Keeping a record of tone arm position and needle state for each case helps you keep track. It's done by making a three column roster, the same one you used for assessment.

## PROCESSES

You have three processes you may now use.

1. O/W on a selected terminal "What have you done to _____?" "What have you with-held from?" A good assessment for this is: "What person do you have problems about?" Run that person.

2. Comm process on a body part. "From where could you communicate to a _____?" on an E-Meter, assess for a body part that falls not what the pc says. The part that falls will be real to the pc. An obviously ill part may not be real. When the chosen part is flat or reasonably so, assess for a new body part. Body parts are safer to run on co-audit than indefinite terminals. But "friend" or "car" can still be used. Use the paper trick on all co-audit comm processes.

3. Responsibility process "What part of your life have you been responsible for?" This requires no assessment but it is rather rougher than the first two above.

## PROCUREMENT

Your best procurement comes from word of mouth and happy cases.

If you supervise well and make sure the co-audit pc gets gains, you will have good word of mouth.

Free co-audit weeks given for one reason or another (such as highest scores of PE course quiz) is good procurement.

Well advertised free PE and a good comm course are the best procurements. A good info package mailed to everyone on your list and all callers is a necessity.

Being on time, handling bodies in an orderly way are good procurement.

## HAS CERTIFICATES

HAS certificate requirements have changed.

A passing grade on an examination of materials covered is all it takes at this time.

Later we may require that they pass a comm course too. But not now.

So examine your past students on essentials they've been taught and as they pass send their names and addresses to your central organization and the student will receive a nice HAS certificate.

Your student having a certificate will help procurement.

## SUMMARY

PE co-audit is running well where auditors are doing it by the book, running badly where the handling of processes, students and paper work is sloppy. Good total 8-C = good course. Courses where regular charges are made and collected get better graphs.

Here and there a PE co-audit set up is running poorly because the auditor instructor does not have info packages and does not even try to handle bodies walking in.

Most everywhere PE co-audit is doing well. I am very proud of the way most auditors are trying and winning. Thank You.

By the way, the Scientology population of earth has exactly doubled in the last ten months!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs

# THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING

In order to make up one's mind to be responsible for things it is necessary to get over the idea that one is being forced into responsibility.

The power of choice is still senior to responsibility. What one does against his will operates as an overt act against oneself. But where one's will to do has deteriorated to unwillingness to do anything, lack of will is itself an aberration.

Variations in the reactions of pcs to responsibility processes stem from the pc's belief that his power of choice is being or has been overthrown. Where an auditor has a pc balking against a responsibility process, the pc has conceived that the auditor is forcing responsibility on the pc and very little good comes of the session.

There is nothing wrong, basically, with doingness. But where one is doing something he is unwilling to do, aberration results. One does, in such a case, while unwilling to do. The result is doingness without responsibility.

In the decline of any state into slavery as in Greece, or into economic strangulation of the individual as in our modern western society, doingness is more and more enforced and willingness to do is less and less in evidence. At length people are doing without being responsible. From this results bad workmanship, crime, indigence and its necessities for welfarism. At length there are so many people who are unwilling to do that the few left have to take full burden of the society upon their backs. Where high unwillingness to do exists, democracy is then impossible, for it but votes for the biggest handout.

Where high unwillingness to do exists then we have a constant restimulation of all the things one is really unwilling to do such as overt acts. Forcing people who do not want to work to yet work restimulates the mechanism of overt acts with, thereby, higher and higher crime ratio, more and more strikes and less and less understanding of what it is all about.

The individual who has done something *bad* that he was not willing to do then identifies anything he does with any unwillingness to do – when of course he has done this many times. Therefore all doingness becomes bad. Dancing becomes bad. Playing games becomes bad. Even eating and procreation become bad. And all because unwillingness to do something bad has evolved and identified into unwillingness to do.

The person who has done something bad restrains himself by withholding doingness in that direction. When at length he conceives he has done many many bad things, he be-

comes a total withhold. As you process him you encounter the recurring phenomenon of his realization that he has not been as bad as he thought he was. And that's the wonderful part of it. People are never as bad as they think they are – and certainly other people are never as bad as one thinks they have been.

The basic wonder is that people police themselves. Out of a concept of good they conceive themselves to be bad, and after that seek every way they can to protect others from self. A person does this by reducing his own ability. He does it by reducing his own activity. He does this by reducing his own knowingness.

Where you see a thetan who sleeps too much and does too little, where you see a person who conceives bad doingness on every hand, you see a person who is safeguarding others from the badness of himself or herself.

Now there is another extreme. A person who must do because of economic or other whips, and yet because of his own concept of his own badness dares not do, is liable to become criminal. Such a person's only answer to doingness is to do without

taking any responsibility and this, when you examine the dynamics, falls easily into a pattern of dramatized overt acts. Here you have a body that is not being controlled, where most knowledge is obscured and where responsibility for others or even self is lacking. It is an easy step from criminality to insanity, if indeed there is any step at all. Such people cannot be policed since being policed admits of some obedience. Lacking control there is no ability to obey, and so they wind up simply hating police and that is that.

Only when economic grips are so tight or political pressure is so great as it is in Russia do we get high criminality and neurotic or psychotic indexes. Whenever doing is accompanied by no will to do, irresponsibility for one's own acts can result.

Basically, then, when one is processing a pc, one is seeking to rehabilitate a willingness to do. In order to accomplish this one must rehabilitate the ability to withhold on the pc's own determinism (not by punishment) further bad actions. Only then will the pc be willing to recover from anything wrong with the pc – since anything wrong with the pc is self-imposed in order to prevent wrongdoing at some past time.

All types of responsibility processes have this as their goal: to rehabilitate the willingness to do and the ability to withhold on one's own determinism.

Restraint in doing something one knows he should do is a secondary deterrent but comes with other offshoots of responsibility into the cognition area.

Thus we have a formula of attack on any given area where the pc cannot do, is having trouble or cannot take responsibility: (a) Locate the area. (b) Find a terminal to represent it. (c) Find what the pc has done to that terminal that he thinks he should have withheld. (d) Reduce all such incidents.

In short all we have to do to rehabilitate any case is find an area where the terminal is still real to the preclear and then get rid of what he has done and withheld, and we come up with an improved responsibility.

Of all the responsibility processes, the oldest one I developed is still the best one by test and that is:

"What have you done to a (terminal)?"

"What have you withheld from a (terminal)?"

The processing results depend in large part on the accuracy of assessment, on the willingness of the auditor to process the pc and upon running the process as flat as it will go before finding another terminal.

Assessment accuracy depends upon skilled use of the E-Meter. Dynamic Straight Wire is best, and a weather eye upon the tone arm to see what terminal varies it, once one has the dynamic and from that has selected a terminal.

The willingness of the auditor to process the pc depends upon the confidence of the auditor to obtain results – and this is established by deletion of things the auditor has done to pcs and withheld from pcs in general and this pc in particular. Thus co-audit teams would be right always if they took each other as the terminals to be run first, get these pretty flat (and keep them flat during processing with "What have you done to me?" "What have you withheld from me?"), then as the next thing to do run the sex of the auditor off the pc, then clean up Dianetics or Scientology (or use this as step two). And only then go into "case". That would be a pretty fine co-audit team after they have survived the first explosions and gotten them gone.

Then in searching out areas to run as a case, care should be taken not to over-run a terminal or under-run one. A pc running out of answers can get very restless.

Responsibility *can* be rehabilitated on any case and when it has been you have a clear and that's all there is to it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
D of Ps
D of Ts
Staff Auditors

# CREATE AND CONFRONT

The cycle of action (create, survive, destroy) and the communication formula (cause, distance, effect) with Axiom 10 (the highest purpose etc, creation of an effect) become identified in the mind with one another.

The preclear who is having a difficult time is on an inversion of the cycle of action (counter-create, counter-survive, counter-destroy).

Any preclear is somewhere on this cycle. The preclear who only gets death pictures or bad pictures is somewhere late on the cycle of action or late on an inversion cycle.

This preclear believes that every cause brings about a destruction.

Thus he falls out of communication, since any and all received communication will destroy him, he thinks.

All this is covered in the First Melbourne ACC Tapes and will probably not be covered to such a degree again. The Melbourne ACC Tapes are consecutive with the Philadelphia lecture series (fall 1952), and are a little out of the way of our present theory, but have a special place in know-how.

Out of this we now have an understanding of what a limited process is. Any process which makes the preclear create is a limited process and should be avoided. Such processes as "Tell a Lie" are creative processes.

The preclear has creation tangled up with cause and cause tangled up with the overt-motivator sequence. The thing that straightens all this out is any version of responsibility run with the pc at cause. Earlier the best we had to straighten this out was confront. Responsibility is confront and is very senior to confront as a process.

When a pc over-creates he accumulates the unconfronted debris. All you have to do to restimulate debris (stiffen up the bank) is to run the pc on some version of create process.

Havingness is a confront process and straightens out the create factor.

Havingness is the lowest version of responsibility; Confront is the next lowest; Overt-Withhold is the next; and at our present top for practical purposes is just plain responsibility. Actually all these are responsibility processes.

Create is bad only when one does not take responsibility for the creation.

The key process of all processes at this writing is being responsible for having been ir-responsible.

There is a great deal of anatomy to responsibility. A great many answers lie waiting on its track. When one maligns another, he has not taken responsibility for the acts of that other person and so is separate from that other person.

One of the highest points of knowingness which is not at this time known is whether we are all one or if we are actually separate beings. Enough responsibility run achieves a subjective answer to this.

While several offshoots of this present technology are under test at this time it

can be said with certainty now that the best version of responsibility for most cases is:

"What have you done to a (terminal)?"

"What have you withheld from a (terminal)?"

It will be seen at once that what could you do to and what could you withhold from a terminal is a create process, and is therefore slightly limited and leaves debris. Thus it can be said with finality overt/withhold rather than cause/withhold is the best process.

In the presence of ARC breaks, havingness is a must on any responsibility process and is always a good preventive for flops. Don't forget havingness. We know now that it is the lowest rung of responsibility. This becomes evident when we examine the withhold aspects of havingness.

Plain ordinary "What could you be responsible for" is of course a very fine process and oddly enough often goes lower (for a short run) than overt/withhold. Responsibility isn't just a high level process. It works where it works.

It is interesting that while running pure raw responsibility in its non-create form (what have you been responsible for) we see anew the old know-to-mystery scale revealed.

Factual Havingness can be run in its trio form with good results:

"Look around here and find something you could have"

"Look around here and find something you would permit to continue"

"Look around here and find something you would let vanish"

The old restrictions and know-how of running this still apply.

"Look around here and find something you could have" is of course a wonderful process. And whenever you run an hour and a half of any other version of responsibility you had better run half an hour of "Look around here and find something you could have" and be on the safe side.

## SUMMARY:

The data in this bulletin is far from merely theoretical. To some auditors it will come as an emergency super frantic hysterical rush item for they should shift over any version of responsibility they are running to the above versions.

Don't run any other version of overt/withhold than that given above. You can run responsibility as itself on any incident or terminal if the pc can take it. Run a half hour of havingness for every hour and a half of any responsibility subjective process.

## NOTE:

Instead of the CCHs for that low low level case, why not get it going with havingness as above and then find any terminal that ticks on a meter and run O/W on that terminal. Then run more havingness. Then find another terminal that ticks and run O/W on that. Then run more havingness. And so on and on with the same pattern until you get the case shifted on the cycle of action and functional.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden

Fran Hldrs

# CURRENT RUNDOWN

## CONCEPT HELP

Concept processing is very old (1953). The original version of concepts goes:

"Get the idea of………."

The modern version of Concept Help O/W goes:

"Think of helping a………."

"Think of not helping a……."

Two-way Concept Help goes:

"Think of a…helping you"

"Think of you helping a………"

Five-way Concept Help would go:

(a) "Think of a…helping you"

(b) "Think of you helping a………"

(c) "Think of a…helping others"

(d) "Think of others helping a…"

(e) "Think of a…helping a…"

Concept Help has the value of being below, in its effect, the level of articulate thought which of course means that it bangs away at reactive thought.

Just exercising a pc in thinking at command is a sort of CCH on thinkingness, with which, of course, pcs have trouble. They have more trouble with creating than thinking and concepts are more in kind with confronting than with creating. Making a pc invent answers is, of course, right on his worst button. Therefore Concept Help goes a long ways on a case. It is quite unlimited, no matter what form is run, so long as some attention is paid to flow direction. (A flow run too long in one direction gives anaten – unconsciousness, remember?)

## ALTERNATE CONFRONT

Concept Help, however, has the liability of making things "muggy" at times because of its indefiniteness.

Aside from create, the primary button that is awry (but which cannot be directly attacked without often overshooting the case or involving it in heavy bank reaction), the next things mechanically wrong with a pc would be unconsciousness and confusion. Help, of course, is the primary point of association and identification and is **why** things go wrong with a pc. But a scale of **what** is right with a pc in descending order of importance would be, as above:

Creativeness

Consciousness

Order

Control

and these would be flanked by the things wrong with these items which make them decline:

Create – Irresponsibility

Consciousness – Refusal to confront

Order – Unwillingness to bring order

Control – Lack of control.

Help fits in somewhat on this order. One creates to help (and fails). One goes unconscious to help or makes another unconscious to help him/her (and fails). One sees difficulty for others in too much order, seeing that two systems of order clash, and lets down his to help.

One conceives that control is bad and ceases to control and resists control to help others. These are all wrong helps, apparently, and when done, bring about aberration.

Aberration consists, evidently, of wrong-way assistance as follows:

Optimum Condition ———→ Response ———→ Resulting Condition

Creativeness ———→ Irresponsibility ———→ Disowned Creations

Consciousness ———→ Non-Confront ———→ Unconsciousness

Orderliness ———→ Unwilling conflict ———→ Confusion

Ability to Control ———→ Consequence of control ———→ Mis-control.

Confront is a remedy for the consequences of the first three conditions and also communication. An auditing session itself by its TR mechanics, improves control and communication. Therefore Confront in one form or another is needed in routine sessions.

Havingness is an objective and somewhat obscure method of confronting and using it as we do objectively, it is a specialized form of confronting, possibly its best form, objective

or subjective, even though a series of subjective havingness in Washington in 1955 tended to show that profile gains were not made by subjective confront, a conclusion still subject to further checking.

Confront straightens out any "mugginess" churned up by Concept Help. No vast tone arm improvements should be expected from Alternate Confront, but even if it doesn't work well, like havingness, as a primary process, it has very good uses. Alternate Confront gives us a stabilizing tool. Pc feels weird = run Alternate Confront. He'll feel saner. Following this subjective process with the best objective process, havingness, we achieve stability for the gains reached by a help process.

As a comment, beingness is more involved with havingness than with confront.

Confront, on short test, can be run lop-sided, and does disturb the tone arm. "What would you rather not confront?" run all by itself in *one* pc (a BMA type test series!) did very well. "What can you confront?" of course did very well. Alternate Confront has enough wrong with it to be poor as a process for getting gains but wonderful as a process for stabilizing a case. I'll run some more tests on Negative Confront and let you know. But it is a fluke. By theory it is improbable as it is a cousin to the no-good "What could you go out of communication with?" But "What could you withhold?" is the greatest IQ raiser known! And it works. So perhaps Negative Confront, "What would you rather not confront?", will work too. Of course it's a fundamental button. All unconsciousness, stupidity, forgetfulness and enforced beingness result from problems in confronting.

## IDENTIFICATION

A=A=A=A is as true today as it ever was. The inability to differentiate is, of course, a decline in awareness. Identifying Joe with Bill or Rocks with Smoke is loony.

This is identification, a word that is amusing semantically, as its exact opposite, "Identify", is its cure, but is the same word!

Association of things or thoughts into classes is considered all right and may even be necessary to "learn" things. But this is the middle ground, already half way to lazy thinking.

*Help,* as assistance, is an identification of mutual interest in survival. Thus we have (1) possible confusion of beingness and (2) continuation. This makes *help* ripe for trouble. When one *fails* to help he keeps on helping! No matter how. He does keep on helping what he has failed to help. One of many mechanisms is to keep the scene in mock-up.

Help is a fundamental necessity, it appears, to every person. But it is dynamite when it goes wrong.

As a symptom of its continuance (survival factor – see Book ONE) pcs running help readily get the idea that help on some terminal "will never flatten" even though it is flattening nicely!

To handle this as a special item, one can run the confront part of a session with "Continuous Confront", the Alternate form of which is:

    (a)  "What could you continue to confront?"

    (b)  "What would you rather not continue to confront?"

The positive form (a) can be run alone for case gain. And I am going to test the negative form (b) as a single run to see if it can be "gotten away with". In theory, as all anaten is unwillingness to confront and as all help is continuous survival, form (b), Negative Continuous Confront, should do marvels for IQ and *may* become the proper companion for help processes if the session is *ended* with havingness.

At the present moment auditing routine is:

      Pre-session

      Model Session

      Help Processes

      Alternate Confront

      Havingness

all in every session.

<div align="right">L. RON HUBBARD</div>

LRH:js.rd

# CHAPTER SEVEN
## STEP FIVE PC VERSUS MEST

Establish pc as cause over Mest by establishing pc's ideas as cause over Mest.

There are several varieties of spotting processes. The most basic of these is the most basic process to association and this is Connectedness. This process is run directly with the following command: "You get the idea of making that (object) connect with you. Did you? Thank you."

The reason connectedness works is because it is the basic process on association. The most aberrative thing on any case is association with Mest. This does not mean that the individual is not creating the Mest, it does not mean that he has no relation with Mest, but it does mean that theta and Mest interconnected too strongly are the components of a trap. Theta is mixed up with Mest, Mest is mixed up with theta. They are two different things actually, and it is not true that all thought derives from Mest, nor is it true that all Mest derives from thought. A thetan can create Mest by simply creating Mest, not telling it to be created, but simply by putting it there. This is the isness of Mest. Now when he connects his thoughts with the actual mass he gets into trouble and we get association, we get compulsive thinking, we get identification and the old A = A = A of Dianetic days.

Thus you will see at once that connectedness in any form is a very excellent process to run. But note carefully that we have him get the idea of making the object connect with him. We never command the preclear to get the other idea of connecting with the object. This is a no-games condition. This is what is wrong with the preclear.

Now there are a large variety of processes which stem out of this process of basic association. These are Control Trio, Trio, and Responsibility. But all of these things are basically connectedness processes.

The only thing that ever went wrong with connectedness processes was the unreality factor. The auditor would tell the preclear to get the idea of making that wall connect with him, when as a matter of fact the preclear couldn't have gotten much of any kind of an idea of making anything connect with him.

Thus it is mandatory for an auditor to start out a preclear on some level of reality and some two-way comm should precede this connectedness process, such as "Do you think there is anything anywhere that you could get to connect with you?" Once this is cleared up, it will be found that only those things very close in could be real to the preclear on this line of connectedness. Thus the auditor is given no great power of choice in this matter in the first runnings of the process. He will have to run things which are relatively close in to the preclear, then proceed to things which are middle distance and then things which are further from the preclear.

A great deal of good common sense is needed here, and a great deal of two-way comm is necessary to get some idea of whether or not the preclear thought it was real.

Thus the earliest commands of connectedness should probably be the preclear's nose and the auditor's hand; the arm of the preclear's chair and the button on the auditor's shirt; the button on the preclear's shirt and his own left hand, et cetera. Further, the auditor is only asking him to get the idea of making the thing connect with him, not to make the thing connect with him, otherwise he will have the preclear being yanked all over the room.

Control Trio, Trio and Responsibility are actually only complications on top of Connectedness, but they themselves have their own particular peculiar virtues, and a preclear who can actually run straight, old time Trio, "Look around here and find something you could have" can get a very long way on that process all by itself.

Control Trio is actually a three-stage process on a heavy spotting control. It runs in this fashion. "Get the idea that you can have that (object)." And when this is relatively flat, "Get the idea of making that (object) remain where it is" (or continue where it is) and "Get the idea of making that (object) disappear." This is actually a very fine process and undercuts (runs on a lower case than) Trio itself.

Old time Trio is extremely good, however, and is not to be underrated in any way. You can run a whole three-week intensive on this if the preclear can do it. The commands are: "Look around here and find something you could have." And when that is somewhat flat, "Look around here and find something you would permit to remain," and then "Look around here and find something you would permit to disappear." These are run in relationship to each other. In other words, all three of them are run in the same session. Sometimes a preclear will run the third command two hundred and fifty times before he can get either of the other two commands with any reality at all.

Responsibility is another process just like Trio and actually has its three commands, too. "You look around here and find something you could be responsible for." "You look around here and find something you don't have to be responsible for." "You look around here and find something you would permit somebody else to be responsible for."

The emphasis here is "You look", "You connect", "You make" in any of these processes, and the "You" should be entered into the old commands to make the thing as causative as possible.

Although we cover this rather briefly, this is probably the most effective section of Clear Procedure. The whole trick is to get the preclear to actually do it. It does no good for a preclear to run these processes with no reality. It does no good for a preclear to run these processes with no ARC between himself and the auditor. But it does a lot of good to get the processes run.

Basically TR Ten, "You notice that (object)", is a fundamental process on connectedness. It will be discovered that unless the preclear is actually able to look at a few things he will not be able to get an idea about them, too. Furthermore, it will be discovered that there is a process called Short Spotting, wherein the auditor has the preclear spot things that are very close to him. The only thing wrong with Short Spotting is that the auditor must give the preclear things to spot which the preclear can actually see with his eyes. If the preclear cannot see these things with his eyes there is not much use in having him spot them as it will run down his havingness and add to an uncertainty.

Havingness of an objective variety, namely Trio, is one of the greatest processes ever invented. Do not lose sight of this fact. The process can do things that no other process can do. There may be some factors kicking around in havingness which are not entirely understood and which are not entirely connected with connectedness. However, it has been found that connectedness will put a preclear in a condition where he can eventually run havingness. Therefore, connectedness undercuts and possibly even overpasses havingness in general.

This process of connectedness can also be run outside. It can be run on people. It can be run on a certain type of object. It can be used to familiarize a pilot with his airplane and a driver with his car. It can be used to increase ARC between the preclear and the world around him by letting him run it in a heavily populated area or upon a busy street and using bodies. Here we have one of the more interesting processes to run in terms of cognition, because it undoes so much basic association. If your preclear is not cogniting while running connectedness you can be very sure of the fact that somewhere along the line you have not given him a reality and you should flatten it off gracefully and start the intensive all over again.

# TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES

An auditing demonstration given on 23 May 1962

**LRH:** We are going to give you a proper session, and we're going to do some fish and fumble there.

**PC:** *Okay.*

**LRH:** I told you just a moment ago, we're going to look for this tick-tick, and we're going to see if we can find this tick-tick, and find out what it was, because that had me mighty curious when I had you on the line.

**PC:** *That was the one on – on that Prepcheck chain I went down.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** That's right. That was an interesting thing I actually did narrow it down to just that, and – since then.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** So we'll see if it's still there.

**PC:** *Great.*

**LRH:** Okay. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Good. Start of session. Has the session started for you?

**PC:** *Yeah. Not really.*

**LRH:** All right. All right. Here it is.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Start of session.

**PC:** *Okay.*

**LRH:** Okay. What goals would you like to set for this session?

**PC:** *To be able to get to sleep easier at night. I've been having trouble getting to sleep.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *The last few nights. And to ...*

**LRH:** Good.

**PC:** *... to stay in present time when I'm studying. When I sort of run out of – get out of present time, find myself reading over a paragraph of a bulletin or something like that without reading it.*

**LRH:** Okay. All right. Any other goals?

**PC:** *That ought to do it.*

**LRH:** All right. Got an ARC break there? All right, thank you. Any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

**PC:** *I'd like to – well, I have a goal: it's – it's – it's an imp – almost im-*

*possible goal, but maybe it's possible, you know?*

**LRH:** Yeah?

**PC:** *To get Class II by the end of the month, or by the end of this period. But, you know, it's getting pretty close there.*

**LRH:** All right. Anything else?

**PC:** *I'd like to be auditing next week. Start auditing.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Champing at the bit. I want to – like those – a little like those commandos who want to, you know, get out.*

**LRH:** [laughs] All right. Okay, Fred. Now, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. All right. Now, let's see. What process was working on you? It was Touch, wasn't it?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. Put the cans down. All right. We're going to run a little bit of Touch here. All right. Touch that table. Thank you. Touch that wood. Thank you. Touch that ashtray. Thank you. Touch that chair. Thank you. Touch those cans. Good. Give them a squeeze. Squeeze 'em. All right. Squeeze 'em. Hey, that's a difference! All right, thank you. All right. That's it. Now – check this on the meter. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. Thank you. Relatively clean.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** Just a little slowdown; doesn't amount to a hill of beans. Feel better?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Hey, what do you know? That was fast enough, wasn't it? All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you. That's clean. Since the last time I audited you ...

**PC:** [laughs] *A lot of water's gone under the bridge.*

**LRH:** Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? I have an action there.

**PC:** *Well, I – I – I – I got an overt against Robin, I guess.*

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** *I – I thought that was pretty clean. Anyway, when I – I left the – I left that post, I – I wrote a whole series of notes ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *... explaining the job to ever – whoever. I – I addressed them to Franchise Secretary from Fred.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *Whole series of notes explaining the job, explaining various aspects, vari – you know, the various things I was working on. And I – I wasn't exactly sure Robin was going to come on the post, but I was pretty sure. And – but I thought it would be kind of funny if I – you know, it would be interesting, if I ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... wrote these notes and told Robin how to do the job. But anyway, it was kind of an overt on Robin.*

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** *It was.*

**LRH:** All right. Let me check that on the meter.

**PC:**  *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? Got a little tick there.

**PC:**  *Well, it's uh – I uh ...*

**LRH:** That's it.

**PC:**  *... this friend of mine – it's about this – this ... Remember about – suspicions about that key and about ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:**  *... this friend ? This is about that key. I – I never got in touch with him. I wrote him a letter ...*

**LRH:** Hm-mm.

**PC:**  *... saying, "Oh, you know, gee, I haven't seen you, and give me a call." I got the letter back – no – n-n-not at – not at that address.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:**  You *know? And I was, you know, wondering what – what happened. Something's – something's wrong there, you see?*

**LRH:** Hm-mm.

**PC:**  *I have to check in ...*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:**  *... because, (a) he wouldn't move without letting me know his new address.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:**  *Um – (b) I might have wrote it to the wrong address ...*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:**  *... but I – I – I don't think so.*

**LRH:** Mm-mm.

**PC:**  *And something wrong there. I have to look into that.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. All right. Let me check this on the meter.

**PC:**  *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? Little tick, much smaller.

**PC:**  *Yeah.*

**LRH:** That's it.

**PC:**  *I had a party at my place, and some girls over, and kind of a wild party.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay.

**PC:**  *I told you about that, I think...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:**  *... probably the group, you know ...*

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:**  *... but not about that party.*

**LRH:** All right. Let me check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? That's cleaner than a wolf's tooth. Very good?

**PC:**  *Yep.*

**LRH:** All right. Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. That's clean. Okay. Now, I told you about fishing around here.

**PC:**  *Yeah.*

**LRH:** And we're going to do some fish and fumble ...

**PC:**  *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** ... see where we wind up here. And mysteriously, I have no tick-tick.

**PC:** [laughs] *Well...*

**LRH:** Obviously, you're ... What were you going to say?

**PC:** *I don't know. It was on that chain, and it was on that past life, or connected up with it.*

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** *Maybe if I found that again and I could – I don't know if it was that or something else, or what.*

**LRH:** Well, that, you know ...

**PC:** *It was something – it was something about messing with little girls ...*

**LRH:** Yeah?

**PC:** *... You know?*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *Something – messing with little girls ...*

**LRH:** There it is. There it is. There it is.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Ha-ha, ha-ha!

**PC:** *Uhh.*

**LRH:** All right. Well, we didn't have to fish very long there, did we?

**PC:** *No.*

**LRH:** Something about messing with little girls.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** And just like that, we get it back. All right, let me check it now.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Okay? What about messing with little girls? Well, that isn't quite the tick-tick.

**PC:** *No.*

**LRH:** Now, let me see if we can get it just a little closer than that. There it is. What did you just think of?

**PC:** *Dang! I – I – I just look – kind of looked at a little something there, and kind of looked away. I can't – you know, sort of a hunk of something, you know?*

**LRH:** Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

**PC:** *One of those gray hunks of something ...*

**LRH:** That's right.

**PC:** *... that don't have any definite ...*

**LRH:** There it is again.

**PC:** [laughs] *I – it looks like a – a rocket ship nose, or something, or – or a bomb nose, or something like this. I don't know.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *Is that it, or ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *... or not? I ...*

**LRH:** Well, let me check this over again. What about messing with little girls? Ahh, there – there's a tiny little slowdown there.

**PC:** *I looked at that thing again, when you mentioned it.*

**LRH:** Something here about messing with little girls in the nose of a rocket ship?

**PC:** *I – that's what the – I looked at that, and there was something connected there or someplace; I don't know why.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *But, you see, it ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *It's a – it's kind of a, you know, what's happening here? You know? How come – how come this connects up like this or something like that, you know ?*

**LRH:** All right. Well, I'll find it.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** I'll find it. Now – there it is! Who are you looking at?

**PC:** *Well, it – that was th-th-those two little girls that we talked about in that Prepchecking session that I ...*

**LRH:** That's it.

**PC:** *... those two twins.*

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** *They were either twins or – or sisters that I messed with ...*

**LRH:** Uh-uh.

**PC:** *... in – back in early – early days in my life.*

**LRH:** That's it.

**PC:** *I was ten years old, or so. And so ...*

**LRH:** And we were going down that chain.

**PC:** *Yeah. Yeah. We kind of went past them, and ...*

**LRH:** All right. Let me see if I can get a What question that's right into the middle there.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** What about sexually inter-fering with little girls? That's it.

**PC:** *Is it?*

**LRH:** I get a tinier, smaller read.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** I might be able to vary that just a little bit. There it is. What's that?

**PC:** *That's a picture of sexually interfering with a little girl.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *I don't think it's this lifetime. I mean, I don't know ...*

**LRH:** Well, that doesn't matter.

**PC:** *Yeah. That's that sex pervert or ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... probably a sex-pervert thing. But that's tied up with that other – that – that ... Well, it – I – I think it's the same little girl as in that other picture I've had so many years, I looked at.*

**LRH:** What was that? The ...

**PC:** *The one of having a little girl with her panties down, and with a – switching her.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *And seeing – this picture is seeing an – an older man do this. Watch-ing it from the bushes, something like this ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... in – in the yard of this ...*

**LRH:** Right.

**PC:** *... place with ...*

**LRH:** Right.

**PC:** *... a stream going by or*

*something like that.*

**LRH:** Right.

**PC:** *I've had that picture so long, you know?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *And this – I'm not sure if it's the same girl or not.*

**LRH:** All right. Now, hold your cans still there and let me check it.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Let me check another little What here.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** What about punishing little girls? Clean.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** What about sexually interfering with little girls? It's not giving me the same read as the double tick.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** There – what's that?

**PC:** *Switching little girls.*

**LRH:** What about switching little girls? That isn't it.

**PC:** *Eating little girls?*

**LRH:** Beating little girls?

**PC:** *Beating or eating?*

**LRH:** Eating?

**PC:** *Eating little girls.*

**LRH:** All right. What about eating little girls? Well, I get a something of a reaction there. What about eating little girls? It cleaned.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** All right. Let me try another What question here. What about stealing little girls? I get an action here.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** You see, the reason I'm putting that together isn't a shot in the dark. You were talking about taking over a body before this lifetime.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** See, and I was ...

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... getting a reaction on that. Now, what about taking over little girls? I don't get the same reaction.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** What about stealing little girls? I get an instant read on that. What about stealing little girls? It's not the same instant read I'm fishing for, however.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** There it is. There it is. It was just for a minute and we went by it.

**PC:** *Boy, that's awfully fast, you know? It's – it's ... Boy, it's something that's really occluded.*

**LRH:** Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**PC:** *Ha! No – all around it, but I can't ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... can't get to it.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *But I keep popping – keep thinking about – on the same line, I don't know if it's just jazz chat or what. But some incident I ran – some past life incident, way back.*

**LRH:** Hm-mm.

**PC:** *Spaceship – just wound up taking over the ... Supposed to burn off this planet and save one city and rape the city, or something like that.*

**LRH:** What's this now? Take a ...

**PC:** *I – I – I.*

**LRH:** ... a burner ...

**PC:** *Yeah, to burn off the whole planet.*

**LRH:** Oh, you burnt off a whole – I got it.

**PC:** *Yeah, I was supposed to blow – burn the whole thing off, but I saved one city, and I raped the city before I burned it off.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *And part of that was it – at least as I came up in – I don't know, it – hell, it picked them – I mean, it's just not ...*

**LRH:** Well, now there – there's the double tick.

**PC:** *Yeah? It's – I take – took all the – asked all the five-year-old girls in the – all the five-year-old blond little girls in the town into the palace, and raped them all.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm. We're getting the tick-tick.

**PC:** *Yeah. Huh!*

**LRH:** We did.

**PC:** *And then – did that and my – I ordered my men, or my men and I raped – raped all these little girls ...*

**LRH:** Mm-m. There's your tick-tick.

**PC:** *... five-year-old girls. And then afterward, we burned the city off.*

**LRH:** All right. Let's see if I can make up a What here.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** What about raping a city? All right. What about raping little girls? What about raping little girls? No. What about that auditing session? What about that auditing session that you ran that in? That's it. There's a latent on that.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** All right. What auditor was that?

**PC:** *Think it was Stan.*

**LRH:** Who?

**PC:** *Stan Stromfeld.*

**LRH:** Yeah?

**PC:** *Think it was him. Must have been him.*

**LRH:** Was it? I don't get a reaction here.

**PC:** *No?*

**LRH:** Was it Stan Stromfeld that ran that? I don't get any reaction on that.

**PC:** *I'll be darned.*

**LRH:** Somebody earlier than that?

**PC:** *Janine? No. Unless it was New York. Oh, maybe it was Doris. Marge? Damn. I don – I can't remember ...*

**LRH:** All right. Let's put it together here.

**PC:** *... who it was. Raping – past lives and ...*

**LRH:** There – you got the – there's the ghost of a tick.

**PC:** *Denise?*

**LRH:** Yeah. There it is. Microscopically smaller.

**PC:** *Yeah, I know it. You ... Something there.*

**LRH:** I just want to know what auditor it was.

**PC:** *...I'm not sure. You know? I mean, I – I – I don't really get anything.*

**LRH:** All right. Well, let me help you out, may I?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Was it a girl auditor? Was it a male auditor? Male auditor.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** Did it happen in the United States? Did it happen in Paris? All right, did it happen in Paris? Now I've got a double tick.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** What are you thinking about? Happening in Paris?

**PC:** *Vincent? Mario? Maybe it was Jack Campbell.*

**LRH:** All right. Was it Jack Campbell?

**PC:** *Maybe it was.*

**LRH:** All right. Was that auditor Jack Campbell?

**PC:** *Yeah, I guess it was.*

**LRH:** There's something here about it now.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** I'm gettin ...

**PC:** *Yeah, I guess it was. 'Cause he – he – he – he ran me on RT-3, think it was – OT-3.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *And it kind of went way back ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... into a lot of stuff ...*

**LRH:** Now we're getting a double tick here.

**PC:** *... past life stuff. Yeah. There was that.*

**LRH:** All right. You remember this now?

**PC:** *Yeah, yeah.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Okay. And, now, did Jack Campbell miss a withhold on you?

**PC:** *Undoubtedly!* [laughs] *No doubt.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Yeah, I think he did.*

**LRH:** All right. All right. Okay. Let me check that on the meter. Did Jack Campbell miss a withhold on you? I get a reaction.

**PC:** *Yeah.* [laughs]

**LRH:** All right. Now ...

**PC:** *It – it's like saying, did Jack Campbell ever audit you ? You know, I mean, it's like the same question. In fast, it was – it was funny.*

**LRH:** Now, we're taking off from that as a Zero question.

**PC:** *All right. Ooh.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *There must be something there? Line charge? Or something.* [chuckles]

**LRH:** Okay. Now let me check out a possible One.

**PC:** *All right.*

**LRH:** Okay. What did you successfully hide from Jack Campbell? All right, let me check that. Now let me check another one. What have you done to Jack Campbell? Well, we're going to take that first.

**PC:** *Yeah, it would be a good idea, I think.*

**LRH:** Rightly or wrongly, we will take that first, because it'll flatten rather rapidly.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. We will test that now. We know that you have withheld from him.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** All right. Would that be doing something to him?

**PC:** *The action of withholding from him?*

**LRH:** Yeah, we actually are wrong here in phrasing this What question ...

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... but I'm just testing this thing. Is there a specific overt?

**PC:** *Uh...*

**LRH:** I get a tick.

**PC:** *Yeah. It – it's a kind of a – a specific overt, many times, in a sense, you know?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *Well, the first overt, really, is that I considered that kind of – something was not quite right, or I didn't quite ... Well, when I first took the Communication Course in Paris, this ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... You know, in Scientology – the Scientology Communication Course – you take the Communication Course.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *I – I didn't have the money for the course, and I told him that – oh, I was – I – I knew he liked me.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *All right, I knew he and Gernie liked me, I knew they were interested in me, they liked my work in the theater, blah-blah-blah.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *And so I said, "Well, I – I – well, I – I'm – gee, I'd like to take this course, Jack, but I – you know, I can't pay for it. Don't have the money."*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *Like that. Now, I might have been able to scrape the money up if I had really – you know. You know, if he'd said, "Well, no, you go after the money and come and take the course."*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *But he said – I don't have the money. I – I can't take this ..." and he said, "All right. It's all right," he said, "We – we want you to get the course. You can pay me later." I said, "Fine."*

**LRH:** Well, tell me this now. Good. Tell me this now: Was that – the question we're on is doing something to him. Now, what specifically did you do to

him there?

**PC:** *I kind of conned him into – I conned him into giving me the course for nothing. You know?*

**LRH:** All right. Good. You conned him into it.

**PC:** *Yeah. After – yeah ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... after a fashion.*

**LRH:** That's it. All right. Now, what about conning Jack Campbell?

**PC:** *Yeah, that's a good What question.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Yeah. That's a good What question. Very good.*

**LRH:** Good. Well, that's the one we are going to work.

**PC:** *Yeah, it makes me sweat a little bit.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. When was that?

**PC:** *Summer of 1958.*

**LRH:** Very good. Is that all there is to it?

**PC:** *Oh, I thought, well, if – you know, what do I have to lose here, you know? Nothing – nothing in this course, and, well, figured on paying him later on.*

**LRH:** All right. Good enough. All right. And what might have appeared there?

**PC:** *Well, I could have shake – shaken some money up from someplace, I think ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... to pay for it.*

**LRH:** Very good. And who didn't find out about that?

**PC:** *Well, Jack didn't. I – I – I – the fact I could have gotten the money someplace to pay for it, I think.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *You know.*

**LRH:** Very, very good. Okay. When was that? Very specifically.

**PC:** *July of – gee, the Moscow Art Theatre was in town.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *I think it was the end of June. I think it was the end of June. End of June in 1958.*

**LRH:** All right. Good. And what else is there about this?

**PC:** *Well, I – I – I – I went on and took the course, and conned him again into giving me the HPA Course without paying for it over there.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay. And what didn't appear there?

**PC:** *Fifty thousand francs for the HPA Course.*

**LRH:** Oh-ho-ho, I see.

**PC:** *Still hasn't appeared.*

**LRH:** All right. And who didn't find out about that?

**PC:** *Well, the – the people who I owed money to didn't find out that I was spending more money or, you know ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... putting myself into more debt ...*

**LRH:** I see.

**PC:** *... in a sense.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Kind of a little bit of an overt against them. Very funny.*

**LRH:** What?

**PC:** *Just getting more debts without paying them off.*

**LRH:** I see.

**PC:** You *know, something like that.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Now, let's test this What question.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** What about conning Jack Campbell? Have to test it again: What about conning Jack Campbell? That seems to have a tiny little bit of reaction on it. Let me ask you this. Is there any earlier moment there? Is there anything earlier, before that Comm Course? What's that?

**PC:** *Yeah, had coffee or something with Jack and Gernie...*

**LRH:** Yeah?

**PC:** *... and – I – Jack paid for the coffee or the drink or something – earlier, when I first met him. And I kind of conned him there a little bit. You know, he paid for the drink.*

**LRH:** All right. Well, when was that?

**PC:** *Was after a – hm. It – it was – well, it must have been after a – it must have been that spring, along in March or something like that.*

**LRH:** Get a tick-tick.

**PC:** *Yeah. In March ...*

**LRH:** Yeah. All right. Good enough.

**PC:** *... that year. Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. What else is there to that?

**PC:** *I just – that was the first time I saw him. That night.*

**LRH:** That's the first time you ever saw him?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Yeah. Bang.

**PC:** *Yeah. Gernie invited me for a drink after an American Embassy Little Theatre group ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... production.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *I'm not sure if it was hers or somebody else's. And – with her and Jack, and I saw this character first appear.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay. And what might have appeared there?

**PC:** *Hm. Well, I don't know. A couple of hundred francs from my pocket, I guess, to pay for the drinks, could have appeared.*

**LRH:** All right. All right.

**PC:** *I think I was broke, or something, and I had to con him. You know, I couldn't pay the drink. I don't think I had any money on me, or something like this. It was funny.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. who didn't find out about it?

**PC:** *Well Jack and – Jack and Gernie didn't.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Let me test this What question again: What about conning Jack

Campbell? Still got an action. Did you meet him any earlier than that?

**PC:**   *Not that I know of.*

**LRH:** Ah-ah-ah.

**PC:**   *Yeah?*

**LRH:** You meet Jack Campbell earlier than that?

**PC:**   *Man, I don't remember if I do.*

**LRH:** Come on, come on, come on. Did you meet him earlier than that? I got a reaction here.

**PC:**   *No.*

**LRH:** Let me test this very carefully, before I send you off on a wild-goose chase.

**PC:**   *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than that? You've got a reaction here, man.

**PC:**   *I'll be darned. Jack Campbell earlier.*

**LRH:** Yes, Jack Campbell earlier.

**PC:**   *I knew Gernie before I knew Jack.*

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:**   *The first I remember Gernie is meeting her after one of my productions there.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:**   *And, I heard about Jack. Damn! Or something, and I was kind of curious about him.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:**   *And...*

**LRH:** What are you plowing around with there? You got a double tick.

**PC:**   *Yeah. It was meeting Gernie ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:**   *... after that production ...*

**LRH:** Right.

**PC:**   *... in – in – in the foyer of the ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:**   *... American Students and Artists Center ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:**   *... and – this – there's some unknown there. I can't remember about this – that ... Something ... I – I wondered where Jack was, or something like this. I'd never met him, you see?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:**   *But I wondered where Jack was ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:**   *... or something. You know? I mean, there's – there's something like that.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:**   *This – about all I got.*

**LRH:** All right. Just experimentally, was there a desire to withhold yourself from meeting Jack? No. All right. Let me check this What question again: What about conning Jack Campbell? Still reacts.

**PC:**   *I intended on meeting Gernie ...*

**LRH:** Good.

**PC:**   *... I intended to get – get her interested in my theater project.*

**LRH:** Ah!

**PC:** *And maybe that's conning Jack a little bit, by getting Gernie interested.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Inadvertently conning Jack – conning Gernie into – into getting her to back my theater project.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Because I heard she was important, you know ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... she had connections ...*

**LRH:** Now we got little tick-tick. Yeah.

**PC:** *... and money, and – yeah – money and connections, and ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... may – maybe it's kind of overt against Jack, and conning him, too, or something.*

**LRH:** Well, you don't have to add it up to him. Were you trying ...

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... to con Gernie?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Hm?

**PC:** *Yeah, yeah.*

**LRH:** Oh, yeah.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Now is there a missed withhold right there at that meeting?

**PC:** *First meeting with Jack? Yeah.*

**LRH:** No. With Gernie.

**PC:** *Gernie.*

**LRH:** There a missed withhold there with Gernie? What would it be? What didn't she find out about?

**PC:** *On me? Gee, I don't know. That – well, the first I – when I first met her, I – I didn't – here was this big, fat woman here, you know?*

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** *Yeah. And – but – had a lot of – pretty alive, you know? Gernie is pretty alive.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *She – and she was interested in – in – in me because she had seen the production and liked it. And I didn't know who she was.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *She – very nice talking, and gets – I got some admiration there, and stuff like this ...*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *... You know, it was nice.*

**LRH:** Well, have you answered the auditing question there? Is there a missed withhold from Gernie? I haven't got a reaction on it.

**PC:** *No, I – I – I can't think of any.*

**LRH:** All right. Now, let me test this What question again, huh?

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** All right. What about conning Jack? Now, we've still got a little tick here.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Did you meet Jack Campbell – coming back to one we had before ...

**PC:**    *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? All right. Let me ask you once more. Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? I'm not getting a reaction on that.

**PC:**    *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** I'll – I'll say it once more, because you're getting dives here.

**PC:**    *Hm.*

**LRH:** Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? No, that's clean.

**PC:**    *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Now, is there a meeting between that first meeting with Gernie and what you were saying was the first meeting with Jack ...

**PC:**    *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... when he bought the drinks?

**PC:**    *The meeting with Gernie? Between that time?*

**LRH:** Yeah, well, is that – is ... Yeah, yeah. Is there a second meeting with Gernie before you met Jack?

**PC:**    *Gee, I sure got it occluded if there is. There must – I ...*

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:**    *... yeah, there must have been. There must have been.*

**LRH:** Uh-huh. We got a ...

**PC:**    *Must have been.*

**LRH:** The double action is on there.

**PC:**    *Yeah. Funny, I've a little charge, too.*

**LRH:** What goes on here?

**PC:**    *Gee. I'm just trying to think of what it was.*

**LRH:** All right. Good. Good.

**PC:**    *Yeah. You know, it must have been, because by the time I met Jack, Gernie and I were already good friends, you know, there ...*

**LRH:** All right. All right.

**PC:**    *Wonder what happened in there.*

**LRH:** Yeah. All right. When might that have been?

**PC:**    *March? Well, yes. I first met her, right ... God, 58. What was that,* Streetcar Named Desire?

**LRH:** Hm?

**PC:**    *Yeah.* Streetcar Named Desire. *I first met her then, when – when she was – it must have been after Street – no, it must hare been sooner than Streetcar. Man, I've got so much confusion through this period, you know?*

**LRH:** Interesting.

**PC:**    *It's interesting.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:**    *Uh...*

**LRH:** Okay. Well, how can I help you out there?

**PC:**    *Well, I – I – I – I'm not sure what you – what to look for now. I kind of got lost off of that ...*

**LRH:** All right. Now, I asked you if there was a meeting ...

**PC:**    *Yeah.*

**LRH:** **...** with Gernie, before you – from that – between that first meeting ...

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** **...** and when you met Jack. I was asking you ...

**PC:** *Yeah, there must have been several of them.*

**LRH:** **...** when was that period?

**PC:** *Yeah. I can't remember when I first met Gernie.*

**LRH:** That's it.

**PC:** *Do you follow?*

**LRH:** That's it. We haven't got the first meeting spotted, have we?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Well, when might it have been?

**PC:** *I – it seems to me it was after* Waiting for Godot. *I – I – after I did that production. And that was in – sp – well, spring of 57. Yeah.*

**LRH:** We're getting a bit of reaction there.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Is that all there is to that meeting now?

**PC:** *Yeah. You mean that meeting with Gernie?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *Yeah. Far as – yeah.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *Far as I know.*

**LRH:** All right. What didn't appear there?

**PC:** *Well, Jack didn't.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Did you particularly want him to appear on that scene?

**PC:** *No, I didn't even know about him existing, you see, at that – at that point, really.*

**LRH:** Oh, you didn't know he existed at all?

**PC:** *No.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. All right. And who didn't find out about that first meeting? I got a reaction.

**PC:** *Oh, the – yeah, the – the people that ran the American Students and Artists Center didn't find out about that.*

**LRH:** Oh, yeah. All right. Very good.

**PC:** *'Cause they were supporting me, they were behind me, and it was kind of – I don't know.*

**LRH:** Well?

**PC:** *I was – I was getting support from other people, too. Confused. I was, you know, very confused there.*

**LRH:** Well, all right. Now we're getting onto something interesting. While they were supporting you, were you looking for support from other people?

**PC:** *Yeah, for my – well, not really. But I felt kind of guilty about – people would off – or something. You know, I'd – I'd get admiration and stuff like this. I was becoming an independent figure, you see?*

**LRH:** I see.

**PC:** *Kind of like this.*

**LRH:** I see.

**PC:** *In a sense.*

**LRH:** All right. Good enough.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Let me check this over now. Another What question here incidental, just to be checked.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** What about these meetings with Gernie? Now there's a double tick on these meetings with Gernie.

**PC:** *They're certainly occluded, in through here.*

**LRH:** There it is.

**PC:** *There's a year ...*

**LRH:** There it is.

**PC:** *See, there's a year going through there ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... about that.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *You know.*

**LRH:** I'm going to put that down as a ...

**PC:** *Boy, I sure had trouble with Gernie later on, so there must be – there must be something in there.*

**LRH:** Yeah? You do something to her?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** What?

**PC:** *Oh – I – later on there, I fought with her, you know?*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Fought with her ...*

**LRH:** Did you do something to her specifically? We got a tick.

**PC:** *Yeah. I – yeah, one time she wanted to – she wanted to come and have supper with me. I told her no, I was going to go with some other people.*

**LRH:** Hm-km.

**PC:** *I – I – you know, kind of pushed her away.*

**LRH:** You what?

**PC:** *I kind of repulsed her.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Repulsed her and ...*

**LRH:** Well, let me ask this question: What about refusing Gernie? No, that isn't live. It isn't quite right. What would you do to Gernie? You repulsed her, then.

**PC:** *That time. Yeah.*

**LRH:** Well, when was that?

**PC:** *Was quite a bit later. This – I was back ...*

**LRH:** Well, when was it?

**PC:** *Nineteen – Jesus – Sixty. Spring of 60.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good.

**PC:** *March of 60.*

**LRH:** Is that all there is to it?

**PC:** *Well, there's other stuff during that incident. She was producing; I was directing a production there.*

**LRH:** Ah. You were working with her.

**PC:** *Yeah, working together.*

**LRH:** Oh, all right.

**PC:** *Long time.*

**LRH:** Good. All right. And what didn't appear there?

**PC:** *In that particular instance there of repulsing her? Well, some friendliness on my part didn't appear.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

**PC:** *Well, Gernie didn't, really.*

**LRH:** Okay. Thank you.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Let me ask you a couple of just leading questions here, could I?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Is there any affair – is there any affair with Gernie? Is there any refusal to have an affair with Gernie?

**PC:** *Yeah. Not – do you mean love affair? Or ...*

**LRH:** Yeah, I don't care.

**PC:** *Yeah. It was never – it was – it was neither way, you know? It was – we got together one time and – on this American Theatre Association thing, and she said, "Fred," she said, "I'd help you, but I want something out of it."*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *And I – at that time I – I – I – I wondered – I had the consideration that, well, people should help me because they should help me, you know? Not because they want something out of me.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *You know ? Very ...*

**LRH:** All right. We're on the double-tick line.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Go on.

**PC:** *Yeah. And that – that I deserve to be helped. You know?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *I – I – and I don't – I don't need to give anything in return.*

**LRH:** Ah.

**PC:** *Except my – my "contribution of art to the world," you know?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *Or something like that – some jazz like that. I'm important enough, and I'm – you know, I should be helped and not be bothered about things like this, and what have you. I – I kind of left her with a maybe on that whole thing.*

**LRH:** What did she mean by, she expected something out of it? What do you think she meant?

**PC:** *Well, she – she expected to direct a play now and then, when she wanted to, you know ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... enter in artistically into the thing. And I wasn't interested in letting her do this. I didn't consider her capable at the time of ...*

**LRH:** Did she ever find out about this?

**PC:** *She never found out about that, no.*

**LRH:** Oh. Is there a consistent withhold here on the subject of her capability?

**PC:** *There certainly is, yeah. Certainly is. Certainly is. All through – all through our relationship. Kind of culminating up into producing this play ...*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *... together.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *I found out, in working together, that she was very capable.*

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** *Before that – you know.*

**LRH:** You had an opinion through that period?

**PC:** *Yeah. Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. She didn't find out about this at any time?

**PC:** *No.*

**LRH:** Did Jack ever find out about this?

**PC:** *No.*

**LRH:** Might Jack have found out about this when he was auditing you?

**PC:** *Yeah, he might have, if he'd ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... asked me.*

**LRH:** Is there anything else about Gernie that Jack might have found out about? That's it.

**PC:** *I – I had a feeling she was interested in me as a man, you see, sexually.*

**LRH:** I see.

**PC:** *I couldn't – you know. I wouldn't want Jack to know that, that I kind of got the idea from her. Not through any really terribly overt – kind of covertly, I mean.*

**LRH:** I see.

**PC:** *And I wouldn't want Jack to know about that.*

**LRH:** All right. All right. Now let me disentangle ...

**PC:** *Yes.*

**LRH:** ... all of this a little bit here.

**PC:** *Right.*

**LRH:** And let me ask that question again, check it on the meter.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** Might Jack have found out something about you and Gernie when he was auditing you? Getting a little action on this.

**PC:** *Seems to be something else.*

**LRH:** It's what something else?

**PC:** *He might have found something else out – something else about me and Gernie, beside what I said.*

**LRH:** Something else ...

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... than this capability thing.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Was there anything else to find out? Got a reaction.

**PC:** *I didn't like her!*

**LRH:** All right. All right.

**PC:** *I didn't like her.*

**LRH:** Good. Well, might he have practically blown your head off if he'd fount out about your opinions with Gernie? What do you think? Something going on here.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** I'm trying to get to the bottom of it.

**PC:** *Yeah. I – I – I don't know – I – my considerations at the time or my considerations now?*

**LRH:** Your considerations at the time.

**PC:** *At the time. Well, you know, I – he might have – he might not have liked me, or something like that. But that's the missed withhold.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. All right. Let me check this lineup now.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Okay? What about conning Jack Campbell? Got a reaction.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** Instant reaction.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** But it's not now the dirty needle reaction.

**PC:** *Yeah. I mean, there are some other times when I conned him, kind of.*

**LRH:** Oh, just give me a rapid rundown. What's the relationship here?

**PC:** *Well, I – I – I got some books from him and never paid him for the books.*

**LRH:** All right. Good. Thank you. Any other one?

**PC:** *Oh, I – I – I was going to trade twenty-five hours of auditing with him.*

**LRH:** Hm-m.

**PC:** *That's – that was a con, because he was a better auditor than I was.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay.

**PC:** *Actually I got twelve and a half.*

**LRH:** Good. Good.

**PC:** *Uh...*

**LRH:** Any others?

**PC:** *Can't think of any right now.*

**LRH:** All right. What?

**PC:** *No, it's a motivator.*

**LRH:** Well, that's all right. What's the motivator? Perfectly all right with me.

**PC:** *Yeah. Well, there's – there was – there was some confusion with him about when I was on the course – when he came on the ACC over here. That's ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *... when he was a student on an ACC. He and Vincent came over here. And – well, no, there – th-th-th-th-there's an overt in there. Yeah.*

**LRH:** Yeah, that's what I was going to just ask for, but you saved me the trouble.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. What's the overt?

**PC:** *There's an overt in there. He left Mario and myself to teach the course there. Mm?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *And we were supposed to work together in teaching the course.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *But Mario went on a concert tour, didn't come back.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *See? And he was supposed to come back in a week, didn't come back.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *... at all, you know. But I went ahead and taught the course, myself.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:**   *And spent the time blaming Jack, kind of, for not – you know, for Mario – to let Mario – Jack, everybody else, whereby ... The overt was – golly, it's kind of – there's something to do with holding down the whole thing by myself ...*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:**   *... and proving to them that they were no good, or something like this. You know, I don't know.*

**LRH:** All right. All right.

**PC:**   *Something like that.*

**LRH:** Good enough. Thank you. All right, let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? All right. I don't know if that was a reaction or not, I'll check it again.

**PC:**   *Hm.*

**LRH:** What about conning Jack Campbell? I've still got some kind of a reaction. Let's get the 1B checked here.

**PC:**   *All right.*

**LRH:** What about these meetings with Gernie? All right, let me check it again. What about these meetings with Gernie? That is clean.

**PC:**   *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Now let me check the first one again. What about conning Jack Campbell? Let me check it again. What about conning Jack Campbell? I've still got a reaction on that.

**PC:**   *Yeah.*

**LRH:** It's much quieter.

**PC:**   *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Everything is smoothing out. There is something else here. Is that

the first meeting you had with Jack Campbell?

**PC:**   *Yeah!*

**LRH:** Was it?

**PC:**   *Yeah!*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:**   *Far as I know.*

**LRH:** Now, did you and Gernie talk about Jack Campbell? All right. There's no reaction there.

**PC:**   *Hm-m.*

**LRH:** Is there any other con there that you might have skipped? Did you ever borrow money from him, or ...

**PC:**   *Yeah. Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... never paid it back? You so far have just mentioned course fees, and so forth. Did you ever borrow money and not pay it back?

**PC:**   *I think I paid all the money back I borrowed from him.*

**LRH:** I get no reaction on it.

**PC:**   *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Did you ever take a girl away from him?

**PC:**   *No.*

**LRH:** Did you ever steal anything off of him?

**PC:**   *No.*

**LRH:** All right. Did you ever take a fee while you were teaching there and didn't pay it back, or something like that?

**PC:**   *No. No.*

**LRH:** Huh?

**PC:**   *No. Huh.*

**LRH:** What do you mean?

**PC:** *Oh, yeah!*

**LRH:** What?

**PC:** *Yeah, I just remembered an overt I got against him ...*

**LRH:** Yeah, all right.

**PC:** *... on that.*

**LRH:** What is it?

**PC:** *While I was there, teaching – you know, teaching the course, holding things down, his – I'd use his office, you know, I mean, his office there.*

**LRH:** Yeah, yeah.

**PC:** *And he said, well, I wasn't supposed to go in the bottom left-hand drawer of his desk.*

**LRH:** Right.

**PC:** *I'm not supposed to touch that bottom left-hand drawer.*

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** *And so I went in the bottom – so I did go in the bottom left-hand drawer ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... and rummaged around there a bit, and found some dirty pictures down there.*

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** *And never told him about that. Never told him about it.*

**LRH:** Okay. Did he audit you after that?

**PC:** *Yeah. Oh, yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Thank you. Thank you.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Good enough. Now let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? Well, this is getting to look much cleaner.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. What about conning Jack Campbell? I am not now getting an instant read ...

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** ... but it's a little bit before, and it's a little bit after.

**PC:** *Yeah. Well, there's a lot of – must be a lot of – several other things I have done to him, you know?*

**LRH:** Well, think of any offhand?

**PC:** *Hm, hm, hm.*

**LRH:** What's that?

**PC:** *Oh, well, I – yeah. I conned him there.*

**LRH:** What?

**PC:** *I took the test, my final exam paper ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *... from the HPA, home, and did it at home ...*

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** *... in a sense. That's sort of a con. Well, yeah, because I – I – I went home and I – actually, when I took this paper home, I thought it was a joke about learning the Axioms. I – I – you know, learning, memorizing all those Axioms. That was silly.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *And when I – I came – I brought it back. I copied them out of the book, you know.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *Brought them back, you know, I brought them back. And he looked at it, and he checked it over, with me there, and he saw that everything was perfect in it.*

**LRH:** Hm-m.

**PC:** *You know? And he looked at me kind of funny, like "Well, you got it right."*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *I conned him there, because I realized when he looked at me funny that I – it wasn't a joke. I should have memorized those Axioms.*

**LRH:** Oh, I get you.

**PC:** *And I – I hadn't.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *And – and at that moment I knew that – really that – that I hadn't. You know, I mean, I should have, or something, you know ?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm, yeah.

**PC:** *And I conned him there.*

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** We got it taped now.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** All right. Let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? This looks fairly clean.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** I'll check it just one more time. What about conning Jack Campbell? I haven't got anything on it.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** That's clean.

**PC:** *That was a – that was a – actually, that was the big one there. I mean, that – that one there.*

**LRH:** Yeah. That cleaned it. All right.

**PC:** *Funny, because I told you about that once, but it wasn't – it wasn't as precise.*

**LRH:** It wasn't "who missed the withhold," was it?

**PC:** *Yeah. Yeah.*

**LRH:** Yeah. Now, all right. Anything you care to say before we leave this Prepchecking?

**PC:** *Nope.*

**LRH:** All right. Are you sure of that?

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** Anything you care to say before we leave this Prepchecking?

**PC:** *Now about the double tick? Is that off ?*

**LRH:** I knew there was – I can't find it.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** It started disappearing when we cleaned up Gernie.

**PC:** *Hm. Hm.*

**LRH:** And I haven't seen it.

**PC:** *Hm?*

**LRH:** But ... you ask about it there. There's ...

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** ... there's a wide motion, there's a wider motion.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** It's about so long, but it isn't the tick I had in the first place.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** I've got a tick here of some kind or another.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** It's not a tick. I've got a – a stop and a sweep.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** But I was looking for a dirty little tick-tick.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** And it seems to have dived for cover at the moment.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** There – no, there it is again.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Why? What are you thinking of, as you think of that?

**PC:** *I don't know. That's the funny thing, you see? I kind of look at something. I kind of look at an area of the bank.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *You know, or something, or a piece of a ridge there, or something like that.*

**LRH:** Well, that's all right.

**PC:** *You know ? And I get it there ...*

**LRH:** It's all right. It's all right. Okay.

**PC:** *I can bring it back by sweeping, you know? Scanning across.*

**LRH:** Well, try it – to bring it back.

**PC:** *To bring it back? It's – I don't know.*

**LRH:** Yeah. A little bit. Little bit.

**PC:** *Yeah, there's a little button there, it's – push – I don't know.*

**LRH:** All right. There it is.

**PC:** *Creeps up on me. I was just trying there ...*

**LRH:** All right. But do you think we've attained anything there, on that?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Yeah, yeah.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Okay.*

**LRH:** Okay. Now, let's see what we've got here. Okay?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Have you told me any half-truth? What's the half-truth? That's it.

**PC:** *Oh, about writing those things for Robin, maybe. That's what I thought of ...*

**LRH:** All right. All right.

**PC:** *... right there.*

**LRH:** Thank you. I'll check it on the meter. Have you told me any half-truth? Got it. Check, bang. It reacts.

**PC:** *Hm-hm. Half-truths. Gee, I don't know.*

**LRH:** Hm?

**PC:** *I don't know what it was.*

**LRH:** Think of anything at all? What's that?

**PC:** *Oh, well, there must be some other things with Jack, I think.*

**LRH:** Oh, all right.

**PC:** *You know.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *I was ...*

**LRH:** You weren't satisfied that the What question was clean?

**PC:** *Yeah, I was satisfied.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *There was probably other things on the chain there along some – you know, little ones ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... like that, but not enough to ...*

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** Thank you. I'll check the auditing question. Have you told me any half-truth? Clean. Untruth? What's the untruth?

**PC:** *Untruth.*

**LRH:** That's it. Untruth.

**PC:** *About Gernie? I don't know.*

**LRH:** Think of an untruth?

**PC:** *Well, she didn't actually – I don't think she really ever really insinuated that she was interested in me, sexually.*

**LRH:** Ah.

**PC:** *You know? I – it – I think it was mainly my own ideas or something. You know, I mean, I kind of switched things around or something.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Have you told me any untruth? Got a reaction.

**PC:** *Hm. Huh, I don't know what it is. Untruth.*

**LRH:** There's something.

**PC:** *I don't know what it is.*

**LRH:** Something there.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. I'll ask the question again.

**PC:** *Yeah. Yeah.*

**LRH:** Your answer is you don't know what it is?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Thank you.

**PC:** *I- I got an idea.*

**LRH:** What is it?

**PC:** *Something about beginning rudiments.*

**LRH:** Did you think one of them was still hot?

**PC:** *Maybe I had kind of a suspicion or something. I wasn't sure.*

**LRH:** Oh, yeah?

**PC:** *Well, it could of – yeah, well, kind of a – of a missed withhold or something, you know?*

**LRH:** All right. All right.

**PC:** *I was – I was – when you said – when you asked about a present time problem, I had a tiny present time problem that I haven't been able to get to sleep too well ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *... over the last week or so.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *And I thought that it might show up. And then it didn't show up. And I thought it might show up, and uh – but it didn't show up.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *And so I thought maybe that was something wrong there.*

**LRH:** All right. Is there an untruth? Was any of that an untruth?

**PC:** *No, no, there wasn't an untruth on that.*

**LRH:** Well, was it an untruth? Did you tell me that it ... ?

**PC:** *An untruth, huh?*

**LRH:** Thinking of something there.

**PC:** *Well, yeah. If I said I had a present time problem and it didn't react on the meter, then it would be an untruth.*

**LRH:** Is that right?

**PC:** *Yes.*

**LRH:** Is that what occurred?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** You're not sure?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Is that your answer?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. I will check that. All right. Have you told me an untruth? I get a reaction. Let me check it again ...

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** ... because you got a pretty dirty needle.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Have you told me an untruth?

**PC:** *Gee, I don't know what it is.*

**LRH:** This is very equivocal.

**PC:** *Yeah?*

**LRH:** Do you have a guilty conscience about telling untruths or something of the sort here? This is not getting the same reaction ...

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... constantly at all.

**PC:** *I – I – I have a guilty conscience. It's just, you know, a general one-has-a-guilty-conscience guilty conscience, you know?*

**LRH:** Well, does that upset you that I asked you if you've told an untruth?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Is that what this is falling on?

**PC:** *Yeah, maybe.*

**LRH:** Well, is it or isn't it?

**PC:** *Yeah, I didn't expect it to fall.*

**LRH:** Oh, all right. Okay.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Let me check it again. Have you told me an untruth? Now, I still get a reaction on this. That's it.

**PC:** *Oh. About my friend with the letter?*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *My friend ?*

**LRH:** Well, what's the untruth there? That's it.

**PC:** *Well, I'm not – I'm not absolutely positive I wrote it to the right address. Huh? Have to go back, I have to check my – my address book ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... to make sure, because I just – I wrote the address out, you know ...*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... after having remembered it. And I'm not – I have to check my address book.*

**LRH:** All right. Thank you. Is there an untruth in that anyplace?

**PC:** *Well, I said that ...*

**LRH:** What was the untruth?

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** That's it.

**PC:** *Well, that he – that I'm sure – well, that I'm sure that he would have – would have told me if he had moved.*

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** *You know.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *And maybe he wouldn't have. I'm not sure that he would have told me that he moved.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good.

**PC:** *Right.*

**LRH:** Very good. Have you told me an untruth? All right. That's clean. Or said something only to impress me? I'll check that again. Have you said something only to impress me? Have you said something only to impress me? I haven't got any reaction on that. Your needle is banging around here ...

**PC:** *Oh.*

**LRH:** ... so I have to check it a little bit. Would you care to answer it?

**PC:** *I was thinking maybe that this overt on Robin I said, but it wasn't only to impress you. No, it wasn't.*

**LRH:** All right. Good.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Let me check it again.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Have you said something only to impress me? Now I am getting a kick on this.

**PC:** *Oh, it wasn't only to impress you, but maybe I – it was a little bit to impress you. This overt on Robin, about writing him notes and stuff ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... like that.*

**LRH:** Okay. Thank you.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Have you said something only to impress me? That's clean. Or tried to damage anyone in this session? Thank you. That's clean. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Now what's the ping on that?

**PC:** *I was looking for that – that double tick.*

**LRH:** Oh!

**PC:** *You know?*

**LRH:** All right. All right.

**PC:** *Looking for the double tick that I had.*

**LRH:** Very good. All right. I'll check that. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I get a little tick on it still.

**PC:**  *Well, I implied that I could influence, I suppose, to a certain extent, if I could "push the button." I said I could "push the button" there and get a double tick.*

**LRH:** Oh, yeah.

**PC:**  *You know, and that – if that was true, then I could push the button any time and get a double tick.*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:**  *Sort of push the button.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:**  *That wasn't true, you know.*

**LRH:** Okay. All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Very improbable. I will check it one more time.

**PC:**  *Oh, I don't want it to read when – when I can't find anything to – to – for it to read on.*

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:**  *You see?*

**LRH:** All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I haven't got a reading here ...

**PC:**  *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... but subject seems to be kind of mucky.

**PC:**  *Well, I've kind of held my breath at times, hoping that I wouldn't get any read, or something on that. Read a body read or – I mean, it was silly, you know? I was sort of holding my breath or holding my body still and holding my hands still to make sure that the E-Meter doesn't read.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:**  *You know.*

**LRH:** Good. All right.

**PC:**  *Hm.*

**LRH:** Okay. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Well, this is a *bzz-bzz ...*

**PC:**  *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** ... sort of question. It isn't reacting very hard, but there's something there. Feel you gave me a lose by making – I was trying to clean up this double tick, or ...

**PC:**  *Something to do with that. No, not so much.*

**LRH:** ... or something like that? Any feeling like that at all?

**PC:**  *Yeah. Well, yeah, maybe – maybe I thought it at the moment when I said "What happened to the double tick?"*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:**  *And I thought, well, the double tick should have gone by now, you see?*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:**  *It cleared up with Gernie, then that was the end of the double tick.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:**  *Then it came back.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:**  *And in a sense I felt I influenced the E-Meter, or something, to bring it back on, you know, like that.*

**LRH:** Hm. All right. Okay. Now let me check this question again.

**PC:**  *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That is clean. All right. Have you failed to answer any ques-

tion or command I have given you in this session? Thank you. That's clean. Have you withheld anything from me? It's a trifle latent ...

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... but what is it?

**PC:** *I was thinking there was one, just – there was one question that I may have failed to answer ...*

**LRH:** What was that?

**PC:** *... much earlier, and I'm surprised it didn't react. I was thinking there was one, and it should have reacted.*

**LRH:** Oh, all right.

**PC:** *Or something like that.*

**LRH:** All right, what question was it?

**PC:** *The one about "What about those meetings in between?" I never did find a meeting in between ...*

**LRH:** Oh, all right.

**PC:** *...you see, those two.*

**LRH:** Thank you. I'm sorry I asked you a double question there.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Have you withheld anything from me? I got a reaction.

**PC:** *I don't understand what you meant by double question. Or ...*

**LRH:** I ask you a question, you answer it and I ask you another question. I was just apologizing

**PC:** *When was that? 1...*

**LRH:** Just a moment ago.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** All right. Let me check this ...

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** ... again. Hm? Have you withheld anything from me? Well, this – this is greasy. This hasn't anything to do with it.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Have you withheld anything from me? There is not an instant read on this.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Withheld? Well, there's a bing on withheld.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Withheld? Yes, there's a bing on withheld.

**PC:** *Lot of things I'd like to talk to you about. I – you know ...*

**LRH:** Well, all right. Now, get the question here, now.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Have you withheld anything from me? All right. It looks much cleaner.

**PC:** *Yeah. There's a lot of things I – I don't tell you or talk about, or something like that. You know, sometimes I ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *...I've withheld – I've withheld communicating to you how pleased I am to be on the course, and how – how – how ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... and how many gains I have got and how tremendous I think it is. That's all.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *You know?*

**LRH:** Very good.

**PC:** *But it's not an overt act. I'm trying to give overt acts that I've done and I've withheld, you know, or something like that.*

**LRH:** Oh, I see. All right. Have you withheld anything from me? There's a slight needle change ...

**PC:** *Uh-huh.*

**LRH:** ... right there on the end of that.

**PC:** *Uh...*

**LRH:** There it is. There it is.

**PC:** *Yeah. All right. All right. This is very funny. I – I got myself in the front – right at the front of the class ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *... this week, under the assumption I was no longer an old – a new student – that I'm an old student. Last week Herbie caught me in the third row from the back, in the first lecture, and I – here you know I – I kind of snuck up to the third row that first day ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *...you know. He told me I could sit in back, you know ...*

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** *... new student, next time. Well, yesterday I got in the second row from the front ...*

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** *... and no one caught me at it. If – if now, as – a little games condition thing there, and I was just seeing if – if the second week, if you're still a new student, and – and if I wouldn't be (a) I wouldn't get caught at it or (b) I would – could argue my way out that I was a new student.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *And – or something like that. Anyway, it's silly.*

**LRH:** All right. Thank you.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Have you withheld anything from me? A halt as it goes, as it comes back up.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** There.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** There. What are you thinking about?

**PC:** *Well, I ...*

**LRH:** There.

**PC:** *I had an argument with – a little argument with Robin.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *... about – after I took over the post.*

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** *And I ... oh, I don't know, I didn't tell you about it.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Okay?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Is that it?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Let me check this question on the meter. Have you withheld anything from me? It's just a little roughness. Pretty clean. Just a little roughness.

**PC:** *Hm-hm.*

**LRH:** Hardly detectable. A slowed rise.

**PC:** *I'm trying to differentiate between motivators and, you know, overt acts, and what's really a withhold, and what isn't, and, you know, I'm still a little confused on that.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *And...*

**LRH:** Does that answer the question?

**PC:** *Yeah. And I'm not sure what – what a withhold is at this point, in a sense, you see?*

**LRH:** Oh.

**PC:** *And...*

**LRH:** I see.

**PC:** *Because it ...*

**LRH:** I get you.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Well, go ahead, if you want.

**PC:** *Well, it's just a "damage somebody," you know ? I mean, it's not – see, I'm confused .*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *You know, it's – it's that – that's – it's – it's – it's not a withhold, really, because I wouldn't mind telling you*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *You see?*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *So I don't ...*

**LRH:** Very good.

**PC:** *... but if I did tell you, it would be kind of a "damage"; then it would be an overt act, then it – you know, it would – the rudiments would go out. And then, you know, I'm a little confused on what's a withhold. It's something I did.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *And I can't think of anything I did that I, you know, withheld from you.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *You know.*

**LRH:** Let me check the question again.

**PC:** *Hm.*

**LRH:** Have you withheld anything from me? Still get a reaction.

**PC:** *Still get a reaction.*

**LRH:** There it is.

**PC:** *Right there.*

**LRH:** There it is.

**PC:** *Well, I – I – I ...*

**LRH:** There it is.

**PC:** *Well, it's kind of an overt act now. I changed the franchise thing a – a little bit while I had the post.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *And it didn't really become an overt act until Robin got excited about it when he took over.*

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** *And then – then I – something happened.*

**LRH:** Hm-m.

**PC:** *And I put in some – made franchises a little stiffer, you know, to get a franchise.*

**LRH:** Hm-m.

**PC:** *And made co-audit centers beef it up a little bit to – you know, to get more information to them for people who didn't, I felt, deserve franchises or, you know, because they weren't working at it, you know?*

**LRH:** Hm-m.

**PC:** *To kind of give them a gradient to get up to a franchise. Well, I withheld from you telling you that – that since Robin had taken over he's – he's switched it back and made franchise very easy to get, you know, and everything else. And I think that's wrong. And I withheld telling you that I think it's wrong.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay.

**PC:** *But it's none of my business anymore.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Huh.*

**LRH:** Thank you.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Okay. Let me check the question. Have you withheld anything from me? Well, it's clean.

**PC:** *Yeah. Oh, is it?*

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. Thank you. Squeeze them cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Put the cans up on the table.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Touch the table. Now, we were running Feel, weren't we?

**PC:** *Yeah, well, same thing.*

**LRH:** Does it mean anything?

**PC:** *Yeah, yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Touch the table. Thank you. Touch your chair. Thank you. Touch that. Good. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Good. Touch the top of your head. Good. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Touch your chair. Good. All right. Pick up the cans. Okay. Squeeze the cans. That's much better. Squeeze them again. All right. We are going to let it go at that. Thank you. All right. Made any part of your goals for this session?

**PC:** *I think so.*

**LRH:** Okay. All right.

**PC:** *I think cleaning off this stuff on Jack will help me in Scientology – (a) in Scientology, help me in my – in studying.*

**LRH:** Stay in PT while studying? All right.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Good.

**PC:** *And – what was my other goal?*

**LRH:** Sleep.

**PC:** *Sleep?*

**LRH:** Sleep at night?

**PC:** *Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, no trouble. No trouble. Won't have any trouble.*

**LRH:** You're postulating that, or do you – do you know?

**PC:** *No, I know. I just know.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *I'll just go to sleep easily.*

**LRH:** You're not trying to make me look good?

**PC:** *No, no.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *No. I – I just – I just feel better, and feel kind of tired, and feel like sleeping, instead of nervously tired. There's a difference.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Okay.

**PC:** *Yeah. I've been nervous. And I don't feel as nervous now.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *So...*

**LRH:** I see. All right. Well, have you made any other gains in this session you care to mention?

**PC:** *Cleaned up on Scientology.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Remembered a few things, that...*

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** *... didn't remember other-wise.*

**LRH:** Anything else?

**PC:** *Hm ... I just feel more rested ...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *...you know. I don't feel as frantic as I used to feel.*

**LRH:** Good. All right. Thank you.

**PC:** *I got on television again.* [laughs]

**LRH:** All right. Okay.

**PC:** *It's a game.*

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Is there anything you care to say or ask before I end this session?

**PC:** *No, but thank you.*

**LRH:** All right. You're sure?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Let me check that. Anything you care to say or ask before I end this session? Thank you. All right. You're all right, then, huh?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right, here it is. End of session. Has the session ended for you?

**PC:** *Yeah. Yeah, it has.*

**LRH:** Has it?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** Very good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

**PC:** *You're no longer auditing me.*

**LRH:** Thank you.

# PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING

How do you use Form 3 (the Joburg), Form 6A and other forms with Prepchecking?

These forms have great value in improving a case, they dig up things. They get off the overts against Scientology that hold up many a case.

Now that Prepchecking is here, with all its vast ability to clean up this life, you still need these forms. For the most general auditor fault in Prepchecking is going too shallow. By using these forms this is to a large measure remedied by the use of all our Sec Check forms as released on HCO Policy Letters or even in Information Letters.

An old auditor, for instance, will make much faster case progress (or even make case progress) if given the Saint Hill Special "last 2 pages of the Joburg and a Form 6A".

Prepchecking and Sec Checking come together with a simple formula:

**If a Sec Check question doesn't at once clear on the meter by simple revelation, the auditor prepchecks it.**

The smoothest way to clean a Sec Check question is to ask the pc to consider it carefully, then clean the needle of any response to it and go on. There is no varying the question.

If a question doesn't clear on one or two revelations, you then swing straight into a formal Prepcheck of the question.

This specific drill, shortly to become a TR, should be precisely followed.

Auditor (watching meter) (using Sec Check Form question): "Have you ever stolen anything?"

(Auditor may tell pc if needle reacted and steer pc's attention.)

Pc: "I stole a watch once." (Or whatever response.)

Auditor: "Thank you. I will now check the question: 'Have you ever stolen anything?'"

**If needle doesn't react:**

Auditor: "That seems clear at the moment." (Asks next Sec Check question.)

**If needle still reacts:**

Auditor: "There's still something on this."

(Auditor writes down the question on his report as a Zero A question. Auditor probes for a specific single overt, finds one, forms the *What* question for use in a chain, writes it on his report and goes straight into routine Prepchecking. When the *What* question is null, the auditor returns to the same Sec Check question as above, tests it for now being clean. If not, more Prepchecking on it is indicated. If clean now he goes to next question on Form.)

If the auditor knows this drill his progress down a form will be relatively rapid.

The theory of this is that if a question doesn't promptly clear on the needle then it is part of a chain and must be Prepchecked to get all of it.

The phrasing of the *What* question for Prepchecking is *not* the Sec Check question. The *What* question is derived only from the overt discovered.

Any Sec Check question Prepchecked is tested before leaving it just as though it were found reacting in the first place (same drill as above).

## USE OF RUDIMENTS IN PREPCHECKING

Do not continually ask the pc, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" while doing *any* Prepchecking. In Prepchecking one asks for missed withholds only after cleaning a What question and in End Rudiments.

Prepchecking sends the pc down the track. If an auditor says during Prepchecking a chain, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" it yanks the pc back to present time and out of whatever incident he or she is in.

In doing a Routine 3 Process one asks for missed withholds often and at any time, but not in a Prepcheck session.

If you do five or so Sec Check questions without a single one having to be Prepchecked, it is, however, good policy to ask for missed withholds. Ask for missed withholds in Prepchecking only after a What question is nul, but always ask and clean it then.

In Routine 3 processes ask for missed withholds at any time.

## HELP THE PC

In general, when getting rudiments in or getting off missed withholds or invalidations, help the pc by guiding his attention against the needle.

This is quite simple. The auditor asks the question, the needle instantly reacts, the pc (as he or she usually does) looks puzzled if the auditor says "It reacts." The pc thinks it over. As he or she is thinking, the auditor will see the same reaction on the needle. Softly the auditor says "That" or "There" or "What's that you're looking at?" As the pc knows what he or she is looking at at that instant, the thing can be dug up.

This is auditor co-operation, not triumph.

Most often the pc does not know what it is that reacts as only unknowns react. Therefore an auditor's "There" when the needle twitches again, before the pc has answered, coordinates with whatever the pc is looking at and thus it can be spotted and revealed by the pc. This is only done when the pc comm lags for a few seconds.

Remember, the pc is always willing to reveal. He or she doesn't know What to reveal. Therein lies the difficulty. Pcs get driven out of session when asked to reveal something yet do not know *what* to reveal.

By the auditor's saying "There" or "What's that?" quietly each time the needle reacts newly, the pc is led to discover what should be revealed.

Auditors and pcs get into a games condition in Prepchecking and rudiments only when the auditor refuses this help to the pc.

New auditors routinely believe that in Prepchecking the pc *knows* the answer and won't give it. This is an error. If the pc knew all the answer, it wouldn't react on the meter.

Old-timers have found out that only if they steer by repeated meter reaction, giving the pc "There" or "What's that?" *can* the pc answer up on most rudiments questions, missed withholds and so on.

This is the only use of reads other than instant reads on the E-Meter.

Help the pc. He *doesn't* know. Otherwise the needle would never react.

Even if doing a Sec Check form still call it Prepchecking when done this way. This is "Prepchecking on Forms." The Zero for the whole lot of course is "Are you withholding anything?" Thus Sec Check form questions, when they do not nul at one crack become Zero A questions, and the What formed from the overt found becomes the No. 1 question.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

# E-METER DRILL-21

**Number:** EM-21.

**Name:** E-METER STEERING.

**Purpose:** To train a student auditor to assist the preclear in finding an answer to a question, when difficulty arises, with a "That" each time a latent read duplicates the instant read of a question. To teach the student auditor that this is one method of cleaning a dirty needle.

**Position:** The student auditor and a student sit facing each other across a table with an E-Meter set up and the student holding the electrodes. The sensitivity can be set at 16 or 32 depending upon the model of the E-Meter, and the sensitivity booster knob can be at any position necessary to ensure reads will be obtained.

Commands: "Consider the events of today."

**Training Stress:**

    **Step 1.** The student auditor has to give the above command and carefully observe the characteristic of some read which occurred while the student is executing the auditing command.

    The student auditor must indicate the read he has observed by asking the student, "What was that?" When this is asked of him. The student should not answer, but should think of various other things. Having done this, the student now thinks the origin thought which produced the read the student auditor questions where upon that same read will re-occur on the E-Meter.

    When the read re-occurs, the student auditor must indicate that he has observed it by saying. "That was the same thought."

    If the student auditor has called the exact, same read, what the student is now thinking of will be what he originally thought when the student auditor first queried him. If this is not the case, then the second read that the student auditor called was not really a duplicate of the one he originally observed. This is naturally a flunk, and the student auditor will have to try again being more careful to observe the exact characteristic of a read and to pick that same read up when it re-occurs.

    **Step 2.** The student auditor should observe the needle behaviour of the student on the E- Meter. If the needle is clean (a clean needle is a needle that acts when the auditor speaks and does nothing the rest of the time), the student auditor should get another student.

    If the needle is not clean, the student auditor should tell the student that he is now going to clean the needle and will want to know what the student is thinking of when the student auditor says, "That".

    The student auditor observes a certain needle characteristic in the dirty needle phenomena (i.e., a particular double tick of a certain size or a stop in a jitter of activity) and proceeds to clean this read off the needle by steering (saying "That" whenever that particular,

exact read occurs) and getting the student to say what he was thinking of. When that particular read is cleaned off the needle, then another particular read is noted and handled in the same fashion until the needle is clean.

NOTE: that in regular auditing one would only use steering, as given in Step 1 above, when the preclear was having difficulty answering a rudiment question, a prep-check question, or a question given in auditing- by- list. Steering is used only when cleaning a needle or cleaning a question on the needle. Further, a preclear can answer a question whenever he has an answer. The student is asked not to answer the question in Step 1, so as to give the student auditor practice in steering.

This drill is passed when the student auditor can demonstrate the ability to steer correctly and to clean a needle to the satisfaction of the supervisor. A pink sheet is given for any earlier drill or E-Meter drill in error.

**History:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard at Saint Hill in 1961 to enable students of the Saint Hill Briefing Course to assist their preclears in answering questions which are cleaned by the needle and to enable students to clean a needle more readily and easily.

# TV DEMO :SEC CHECKING WITH COMMENTS BY LRH

### An auditing demonstration given on 27 March 1963

Well, how are you today? How are you today?

We've got a demonstration today. We're going to be sec checking somebody, showing how you dig something up. Your attention is recommended to the fact that the auditor is not there to miss withholds on the pc. This is not a definition of an auditor.

What's the date, by the way? Twenty...

*Female voice: Twenty-seventh.*

Twenty-seventh of March 1963.

And the art of Sec Checking is very, very well established. It's one of the finest arts that we have. But it is to a large degree an art. It is restimulating the material to be picked up. And then picking it up.

I think somebody here recently went through a – in one week of four hours of auditing – I think that was right, wasn't it – one week of four hours of auditing, went through the last two pages of the Joburg, a Form 6A and what else?

*Female voice: And a student Prepcheck.*

And a student Prepcheck. Oh, boy! That's really remarkable. I don't know how he did that. In the first place, it isn't that we want to audit slowly, we want to audit thoroughly. And thorough audit is very much the point.

Now, one of the things which you will find, one of the things which you will find consistent and so forth is that a good auditor gets something done. He audits the pc in front of him. He gets something done. And it's *not* getting *through* the Prepcheck; it's getting *through* to the pc.

Withholds restimulate. They are actually not there. They have to be keyed in. And I think you will see some of that happening now.

Now, let me see if we're ready downstairs here. Yes, we're all ready downstairs, and we're about to see some Sec Checking. Okay? There we are.

**Auditor:** Hmm? Is that right?

**PC:** Nearly. This will do.

**Aud:** Okay, Leslie. Well, what we're going to do in this session is that I've got here the uh – Joburg, the last two pages of the Joburg...

**PC:** Hm.

**Aud:** ...which I understand has been flattened on you over the – in the pavilion.

**PC:** Well, we got something alive on it.

**Aud:** You still got something alive.

**PC:** Something alive.

**Aud:** All right. So what I'm going to do, I'm going to check down this list, to see what's reading or not, and then if we get through that, then I've got some more questions I'm going to put to you, to clean those up as well.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** All right?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** Okay. If I can get some of these questions alive, that's good for both of us, all right?

**PC:** All right.

**Aud:** Good. All right, now, that's fine, thank you. Just give the cans a squeeze. Thank you. Let them go. All right. Just once more and let them go – right. Thank you. All right now, I'm not going to put in Model Session here, if we do need it however, I will, but I'm not going to put Model Session in. Is that all right with you?

**PC:** Yes, it's all right.

**Aud:** Okay. Now, is there anything you want to tell before we start, at all?

**PC:** No, except that we were having trouble cleaning up something this morning and I felt a bit sort of shaken since. I was quite sure this morning I didn't have a missed withhold that they think I had.

**Aud:** Okay. All right. Now, anything else?

**PC:** No.

**Aud:** Good. All right, now how about this room? Is it all right to audit in this room?

**PC:** Yes, it's all right.

**Aud:** All right. Very good. Now, is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** Okay. Start of session! Session started for you?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** Very good. What goals would you like to set for this session?

**PC:** To clean up anything that's been missed.

**Aud:** Good. All right, any other goals for this session?

**PC:** Just to do my best.

**Aud:** Good. All right, is there anything else?

**PC:** I think that'll – that'll be all right.

**Aud:** That'll be all right, very good. All right. Good. All right, now we're going into – straight into the questions here, and the first question I'm going to ask

you is: Do you know any communists personally? All right. That's the question I'm going to ask you. Now, tell me what does this question mean?

**PC:** Well, it means, do I know anybody who I know is a communist.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** And I think it means in this life.

**Aud:** All right, thank you. All right, well now, here's the question. Do you know any communist personally?

**PC:** No.

**Aud:** All right. Did – a good look at that?

**PC:** Well, if I – if I do, I don't know that they are.

**Aud:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** I mean, I might know somebody who is a communist unknown to me, but not known to me.

**Aud:** All right, thank you. Has anybody told you – think who might be a communist or anything, do you know?

**PC:** Well, I just thought of one preclear who gave us a bit of trouble about a year ago, but I don't think he was a communist.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** I just thought of him then.

**Aud:** Okay. Is there anybody else?

**PC:** No.

**Aud:** All right. I'll check this question on the meter now.

**PC:** Hmm.

**Aud:** Do you know any commu-

nist personally? All right. You possibly have an answer there, do you?

**PC:** No, no – I just felt nervous and wondering if it would read or not.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm. All right. Okay, I'm going to check that question.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** We had an equivocal read there.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** Do you know any communist personally? There is a read here.

**PC:** The only thing I get there is something which has come up in processing before.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** It's some – came up on this question, some past lives stuff, that's very confused and I'm not sure about it. But that's all I get.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** Hmm.

**Aud:** What actually do you get here?

**PC:** I usually think of Lenin and...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ...sometimes Karl Marx.

**Aud:** Yeah.

**PC:** ... and I used to get the idea that I had had something to do with starting communism.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** And it gave me a horrible scare ...

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ... and I backed off that one.

**Aud:** Okay. Now, I'll ask you the question, do you know any communist personally?

**PC:** No.

**Aud:** All right. I'll check it on the meter. Do you know any communist personally? All right, do you agree that's clean?

**PC:** Hmm.

**Aud:** Okay, thank you. All right, now, the next question I'm going to ask you is: Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology? That's the question I'm going to ask you. Now, tell me, what does that mean to you?

**PC:** Um, have I ever damaged it or hurt it in any way, or...

**Aud:** Yes...

**PC:** ...um – injured – it could mean have I prevented it from advancing, like I really feel it shouldn't advance, by...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ...by not doing things, too.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. And on the question "On Dianetics," what's this mean to you?

**PC:** Well, I haven't had very much to do with Dianetics except for...

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** ... trying to sell the book to a few people.

**Aud:** Right.

**PC:** Hmm.

**Aud:** And Scientology?

**PC:** That means just the general science all over the world?

**Aud:** All right, okay. Now, how long have you been in Dianetics or – and/or Scientology?

**PC:** '59.

**Aud:** Since 1959?

**PC:** Hm.

**Aud:** All right. Okay, well, have you been working in an organization or something?

**PC:** No, with Eddie, in the franchise center.

**Aud:** Hm-mm.

**PC:** Uh – I did – did a little bit of auditing in Melbourne.

**Aud:** All right. Okay, well now, I'm going to give you this question. All right. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

**PC:** Well, the thing I thought of there, straight away, was uh – the preclear I had in Melbourne ...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ... auditing her.

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** I was – I had to leave Melbourne and go back to New Zealand and I hadn't completed her intensive. She still had missed withholds at that time.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** It wasn't a break of agreement there, but the fact was that I felt that I could have done a better job auditing her than I did do.

**Aud:** All right. What did you actually do there?

**PC:** Well, I left Melbourne while she still had missed withhold.

**Aud:**  All right. Okay. Any other doingness there?

**PC:**  I didn't use my own judgment...

**Aud:**  All right.

**PC:**  ...in the sessions.

**Aud:**  Very good. Anything else there?

**PC:**  No, I don't think so. I think that's all.

**Aud:**  All right, okay. I'll give you the question again. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

**PC:**  Yes, by being slow with dissemination.

**Aud:**  All right. Now, when was that?

**PC:**  Thing I thought of there was once – uh – we were going to put an advertisement in the paper for a course in something and I slowed Eddie down in doing it in some...

**LRH:**  You notice that rock slam – that rock slam there that she's turning on over this question. You notice that it's early and late. That is quite common.

**PC:**  ...very banky sort of way, and...

**Aud:**  Hm-hmm.

**PC:**  ... oh, no, we won't do it just yet, you know, sort of – I said something like that, and we actually put it off.

**Aud:**  Yes, all right. Okay. Now, I didn't quite hear what Ron said then and I wondered if he could repeat it.

**PC:**  Yeah.

**Aud:**  All right.

**LRH:**  I said it was just early and late, that rock slam, and that she does have a rock slam there on this subject – but it doesn't get instant when they do that on a Sec Check. You can expect it to turn up and turn off, and she's really shadow boxing with something. That's all I said.

**Aud:**  Thank you.

**LRH:**  You bet!

**Aud:**  All right, now. I'm sorry, I didn't get – quite get the last of your communication there.

**PC:**  I've forgotten what I ...

**Aud:**  All right, okay. I'll tell you what I'll do, I'm going to give you this question again. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

**PC:**  I didn't get any definite answer there, nothing that ...

**Aud:**  Hm-hmm.

**PC:**  ... I've definitely done.

**Aud:**  All right. Um – what – were you looking at there?

**PC:**  Well, what I was looking at before was uh – slowing Eddie down in getting an advertisement put in the paper advertising testing, that might have been.

**Aud:**  Hm-hmm.

**PC:**  Sort of a back-off of confronting new people.

**Aud:**  All right. Okay.

**PC:**  And I – and I was successful in doing it. I realized it was an overt.

**Aud:**  Hm-hmm. All right. Anything else you did around that time?

**PC:**  No, I didn't get anything there at that time.

**Aud:** All right. Well, let's have another look. [PC laughs] All right. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

**PC:** I feel as if I have, but I don't get anything there.

**Aud:** All right. Well, what are you looking at there? Something there.

**PC:** Just – just a feeling of grief.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm. All right.

**PC:** The – the thing is that I feel that I've done wrong, and – and – to do with Scientology and Dianetics, is in – in not making myself get a bit of necessity level on it and start things.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** That's the thing I feel.

**Aud:** Okay, when didn't you – when didn't you do this thing?

**PC:** Oh, I haven't done that all the time. Ever since I came into Scientology, all the time, it's been constant really. I – I do a little bit, now and then.

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** And when I do, I usually do – well, a good enough job to know that I ought to do a bit more, you see?

**Aud:** All right. Give me an example here. What's that?

**PC:** Well, that was 1960, before we started practicing Scientology.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm. Yes?

**PC:** And feeling we ought to start. I think it was 1960, I'm not quite sure of my dates.

**Aud:** Yes. All right.

**PC:** But at that particular time we were having a bit of confusion, Ed and

I, and Ed was a bit down, and I had the feeling that I ought to do something.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** Sort of get cracking, you know, quite strong, and I just didn't do it. But I – I knew I should have done it a certain time, and then I sort of forget about it.

**Aud:** Yes, well what was it you didn't do here, at that time?

**PC:** I'm getting a bit mixed up.

**Aud:** Yes, well...

**PC:** I – I didn't run a PE Course.

**Aud:** All right, okay.

**LRH:** That's a pumping needle, by the way, you see there, class, that's a pumping needle.

**Aud:** All right. Now. What was at – at that time, what was it you actually did?

**LRH:** It can also be caused by somebody having their cans against their clothing while breathing.

**Aud:** There.

**PC:** It would be – the thing I did would be, say, just go out to the pictures or something like that and do a...

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** ...just do lazy sort of things instead of doing something worthwhile.

**Aud:** Yes, very good. Very good. Can you give us a specific time when you did this. An incident?

**PC:** Gee, I've got this shut off.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. Some time when you went to the pictures.

**PC:** I just get the idea of – of going in the truck, you know, just being –

having my body in the truck, moving toward the picture theater some time, but I couldn't tell you exactly when it was, it must...

**Aud:** Yeah.

**PC:** ...have happened dozens of times.

**Aud:** All right, now you're telling me that you got this feeling you – what was it you were doing? What was this general thing you were telling me here?

**PC:** Doing things like being irresponsible, going to the pictures, instead of getting here.

**Aud:** All right, have you got one time when you went to the pictures?

**PC:** Well, the – the time I've got when I – I had this urge to do something was ...

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** ...coming home from the pictures. I've got that time.

**Aud:** All right, what happened there? What was it you did?

**PC:** Oh, I think I'm starting to see a bit of daylight.

**Aud:** All right, very good.

**PC:** There's more to this, this – this – I was processing Eddie at the time...

**Aud:** Right.

**PC:** ...and he was getting upset as a – as a preclear.

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** I think that was what it was.

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** And – um – this is before missed withholds, you know.

**LRH:** See that needle go clean?

**PC:** ...and uh – the cause would be in giving – giving bad auditing and no results, because he was confused and didn't want to – didn't want to start until he was sort of more sure.

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** And I had this urge to do something, real strong this time, and I probably made him feel guilty about it, but the fact was I had done an overt before that.

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** Because if I had done good auditing he would have felt all right.

**Aud:** All right. So what – where was this overt to here then?

**PC:** I don't know which overt you want.

**Aud:** The actual overt you got in mind when you said you'd done some bad auditing on him.

**LRH:** See, this is ...

**PC:** I don't have it there, except that I – just a general idea of – of a bit of confusion near his processing.

**LRH:** See that needle dirty up again the moment that she started talking about this bad auditing.

**PC:** And...

**LRH:** Moving on down toward what she really did.

**PC:** Once I blew of from him in the session.

**Aud:** I beg your pardon?

**PC:** Once I blew from him in the session...

**Aud:** I see, yes.

**PC:** ...probably around about that time.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm. You – what actual – how did you blow the session? What actually did happen? Tell me about it.

**PC:** Uh...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** The – the one – I've got one there now.

**Aud:** Good.

**PC:** I've done it after this, too. I – I did this a – a few times.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** Uh – first one would be – uh – I was trying to get his case going and I'd be running a process – "What part of that scene you are looking at can you be responsible for?" or something like that

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** ...and he got upset in the session, you see, and I'm trying to get this process going and I got angry because he was angry and I blamed him, you see?

**Aud:** Right.

**PC:** It just went – and I think I said, "You can go to hell," and I just left. And I realized when I got to the door – I was in a real rage...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ... what I'd done, and I came back.

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** I don't even remember if I ended that session or not. But I did go back.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. Now, is

there anything else you did to that – in that session?

**PC:** Oh. Break the Auditor's Code.

**Aud:** All right. Anything else? Anything else there?

**PC:** I – I didn't get anything. There must be, but I sort of ran up against a blank wall.

**Aud:** All right. Well now tell me, when was the first time you blew sessions on this preclear? That's it.

**PC:** There was twice, very close together and I don't know whether the one I'm telling you about is the first one. I think it is the first one.

**Aud:** Well, what was the other one here, then?

**PC:** The other one was – uh – one – early one morning.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** Quite close to that time, probably within two months.

**Aud:** All right. Now, what happened on that occasion? Hm-hmm? You have got something there.

**PC:** Not – not anything yet.

**Aud:** And what happened in that session? The other session where you blew? It's there. It's there.

**PC:** Oh, yes.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** Uh – he – he got upset about my auditing.

**Aud:** All right. Okay.

**PC:** And I just – I just didn't confront that.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** So I blew.

**Aud:** All right, and what had you done then in here?

**LRH:** Notice the auditor properly called that a motivator, see? "He got upset and I blew," so now we got to get the overt, see?

**Aud:** There it is.

**PC:** I didn't want to audit him.

**Aud:** All right. Now, the – when – when was that? That.

**PC:** I – this was all the same time. It was the – the one... it directed me to another one, there were two close together

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ...and this is the one morning before I went off to – to school.

**Aud:** Right, fair enough. Now, what had you done in this session? There. There. There you are.

**PC:** I get the feeling I haven't got it yet.

**Aud:** Okay, just have a look there, something you did. There you are. There.

**PC:** Oh, I thought I started the session late.

**Aud:** All right, okay. Well, is that what you did?

**PC:** I'm not sure, but that's what I've got, that's what came up...

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ...just then, when you said "that."

**Aud:** All right. Okay. Now, is there anything else in that session that you

did? Something there.

**PC:** Well, I would've Qed and – Qed and A – Q-and-Aed before I got angry. I – I would have said something back.

**Aud:** Oh, all right.

**PC:** I don't remember what.

**Aud:** Okay. Let's have a look at this. What – what was said in this session that led to this? Something there.

**PC:** Uh – all I got there was the idea of Ed saying to me I wasn't doing something right, and I can't even remember what I was doing or what it was I wasn't doing right.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. Now, what was before that, was it, that you weren't – that you'd done in this session? Before he said that to you? ... You've got something here.

**PC:** Not seeing anything yet.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm. Let's have a look. Was it an auditing flub?

**PC:** Well, it would be an auditing flub.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm. All right.

**PC:** Would be an auditing flub.

**Aud:** Well, what was the auditing flub?

**PC:** Not understanding the preclear.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. What didn't you understand there?

**PC:** I'm getting a bit of – bit of it back.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm, good.

**PC:** Um – I didn't listen fully and – and acknowledge his difficulty.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** There was some difficulty with processing...

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** ...in Scientology, and his case. At that time he felt that he could help other people with Scientology but nobody had helped him, you see?

**Aud:** Right.

**PC:** And – uh – it used to come up a lot in sessions.

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** And now I think it's – feel that that would be what it was.

**Aud:** What would it be, actually, then?

**PC:** Well, I must have done something that he – made him feel awful, the preclear was feeling lousy anyway, that's for sure.

**Aud:** I didn't quite hear that.

**PC:** I must have done something to make him feel bad, because the preclear would have been feeling really bad in the session.

**Aud:** Oh, all right. Okay.

**PC:** And – and got a failure...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ... somehow or other, about auditing.

**Aud:** Yes. Now, was there something on this you didn't understand or something that you did in the session?

**PC:** Oh, I didn't understand it.

**Aud:** Oh. All right. Now, where – um – well, tell me this, which house was this a – did this session take place in?

**PC:** Oh, this was in – uh – uh – River Road, 574 River Road.

**Aud:** All right. Is it a big building? Small building?

**PC:** No, a medium-sized house.

**Aud:** All right. How many rooms in it?

**PC:** Oh, I don't know how many rooms – one, two, three, four, five.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** Five major rooms.

**Aud:** All right, now which room were you auditing in?

**PC:** We were in the front – the front lounge.

**Aud:** All right. Tell me, how – how's that room furnished in?

**PC:** Oh, I get that view all right!

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** A carpeted floor and a settee and the sofas.

**Aud:** Hmm, yes. Very good. All right, have you got the picture of that, when you – when you had this session with him?

**PC:** Yeah. Yes.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** It's getting better.

**Aud:** Good. Anything – um – distinguishing – anything distinguishing about the preclear that day?

**PC:** Only being upset, I guess.

**Aud:** Yes, all right, well, his attire or his clothing?

**PC:** I seem to think he had on his green jersey, but that's what I think.

**Aud:** All right, very good. All right, now have a look at this session, see what it was you did ... It's kicking here ... All right. How you doing?

**PC:** Uh – all right.

**Aud:** Good.

**PC:** I'm sort of just looking, trying to find something.

**Aud:** Yes, all right. Well what – what process were you running? What sort of auditing were you giving him on this occasion?

**PC:** It would be what was out at that time, I think.

**Aud:** Well, what would be – what was it – what were you running in the session.

**PC:** Gee, it's hard to recall. Could have been Havingness and Confront.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** Or it could have been uh – uh – one of those routines.

**Aud:** Well, all right. Was it one of those routines?

**PC:** There was another one, another – another routine there and I'm trying to pick it up, what it would be.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** Hmm. I'm not sure.

**Aud:** All right, now what – what were you doing at the moment when he – when you started to get – when he started to get ARC broken then?

**PC:** Running a process, I'd be running a process when it happened.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. And what were his words to you?

**PC:** I'm not sure whether this is right or not, but...

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** ...I get the idea...

**Aud:** Yes...

**PC:** ... of him saying, "I don't think this is doing me any good."

**Aud:** All right. Okay. Now, what was it – what would it be that wasn't doing him any good then? What process were you running at that time?

**PC:** Christ! I don't know.

**Aud:** All right, how's this doing – going?

**PC:** It's a bit hard to get – get what it is.

**Aud:** All right. Well now, tell me, this wasn't the first time you'd audited this PC?

**PC:** No.

**Aud:** All right. Now, were there some earlier sessions when you'd audited this PC?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** All right, now, in any of those earlier sessions that you got something that you'd done wrong in them?

**PC:** Plenty of things. I hadn't blown in those earlier sessions, but...

**Aud:** Pardon?

**PC:** ...I hadn't blown...

**Aud:** No, all right, okay.

**PC:** ...in those earlier sessions, but plenty of things.

**Aud:** All right. Now, was there an earlier session you can recall here, with this PC?

**PC:** Well, it – it might be the first or second session I gave him.

**Aud:** All right, now how's that session seem to you? What did you do in that one?

**PC:** We were running uh – overts and withholds.

**Aud:** Good. All right, yes. Now, what – uh – what did you do in that session?

**PC:** Well, I'd be running "What have you done to me," "What have you withheld from me?" That would be what I'd be doing.

**Aud:** All right. Now, how did that session go?

**PC:** First session went all right.

**Aud:** Good. Your second session?

**PC:** Second session...

**Aud:** Yes?

**PC:** Ah yeah, the second session was when I started getting uh – uh – some trouble with the ARC...

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ...in the session.

**Aud:** Very good. Now, what was it you did in that session?

**LRH:** There's an additive in that first session.

**PC:** All I can get in the second session was, uh...

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** In the second session I gave him uh – we were – were at this time, we weren't married...

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** ...and we were just going

together, and I was a bit keener than Eddie was at that particular time.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** And in the second session, some of this started coming up as his withhold, you see...

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** ...in that session. But I didn't do anything wrong in that session, I just acknowledged and went on. But I felt shaken up, but I might have done something before that.

**Aud:** All right, very good. Well, what about the first session then, that you ran? Yes? [pc laughs] Hm-hmm, yes?

**PC:** I've looked at this before, and...

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ...the first session I ever gave him, the only overt I could – I can think there, is quite a – quite a good-sized one, really ...

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** ...and it would be – would be teaming up – I sort of suggested that we audit each other...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ...and the – the teaming up there was sort of for Scientology, but the – my main goal uh ...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ... was second dynamic goal, I sort of – sort of fell for him, you see. And I was really...

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** ...after him...

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ... in a cunning sort of way. So the auditing would be as a means for that, really, underneath.

**Aud:** All right. Now, was there anything in your auditing, along these lines? Second dynamic lines at all?

**PC:** No, not at that point, I don't think, no.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** I was only running overt-withhold on me.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** Oh, well, I get his overts off on me, and he won't fly!

**Aud:** Pardon?

**PC:** I get his overts off on me and his withholds, and he won't fly.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. Is that it?

**PC:** Oh, yes, well, that's part of it.

**Aud:** All right, now, is there anything else in that session?

**PC:** No, I don't see anything else there.

**Aud:** All right. Well now, how about this pc now? And the subsequent ARC breaks? Still something there.

**PC:** He didn't really start ARC breaking...

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** ... him... himself, until that's – probably about three or four sessions, and maybe even a week later.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** I think it would be within a week, really.

**Aud:** Okay. Now, after the first

session, what about the second session? Is there anything you did in that session? Yeah?

**PC:** I don't get anything I did, I was just looking at the session...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ...just – just looking at it there.

**Aud:** All right. Now, was that – how – what was the purpose of running that session?

**PC:** The purpose would be to clean up the overts and withholds, get the – get it clean.

**Aud:** Yes. Very good. All right, now any other purpose as far as you were concerned?

**PC:** No, no, the – actually the other one I told you about, I didn't consciously fully realize it about that at the time, but...

**Aud:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** ...I could see it afterwards...

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ...that it was there. But it wasn't – uh – I had it nicely suppressed.

**LRH:** [talking to auditor]

**Aud:** Um. Uh-huh. Uh-huh. All right. Okay, well now, why did you come into Scientology then? What was the original idea of coming into Scientology?

**PC:** Uh – the original idea of coming into Scientology.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** I had read a little bit about it in a book.

**Aud:** Yeah, hm-hmm.

**PC:** And got a bit interested...

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** ...and I then heard a bit about it from my father, just a little bit.

**Aud:** Right.

**PC:** And then I saw – I was very bored and dissatisfied with my job...

**Aud:** Right.

**PC:** ...and so I wrote to the Christchurch Scientology people to find out if they had a course. And that's – that's...

**Aud:** Yes.

**PC:** ...primarily – I think that was the first reason why I came in.

**Aud:** Yes, all right. And you wrote for the course, then what did you do?

**PC:** Pardon?

**Aud:** You wrote for details of the course...

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** ...then what did you do?

**PC:** I went to the PE Course!

**Aud:** Right, yes. All right.

**PC:** And Eddie was running it. That's where I first met him.

**Aud:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** That's where I got my eye on him.

**Aud:** Pardon?

**PC:** I said that's where I got my eye on him.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** Sounds awful, doesn't it?

**Aud:** Okay. Thank you. Now, what – uh – then – was there any purpose then of continuing on?

**PC:** No, no, I don't think I had any strong second dynamic feelings until probably partly through the week, I sort of thought "Oh, he's nice," something like that.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** And I thought, gee, you know, nice boys like that in Scientology...

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** ...you see. But first of all I really was sure at that time that Scientology was something.

**Aud:** Good, all right.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** So what was your – what happened after the PE Course, what was the next move?

**PC:** I – I went on to a co-audit...

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ...in Christchurch. And did the extension course.

**Aud:** Okay. Now, why'd you go on that co-audit? Yes?

**PC:** I went on that co-audit with the – with the reason – I don't want to own up to this one.

**Aud:** All right. Yes?

**PC:** Because I thought he might audit me.

**Aud:** All right, okay. All right. Now, any more on that?

**PC:** No, he didn't.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. So that was the original purpose there, was it.

**PC:** It would be part...

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** ...would be partly, not wholly.

**Aud:** All right, okay. All right. I'm going to check this original question again now, all right?

**PC:** Hm-hmm.

**Aud:** Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

**PC:** I feel a lot better about it, but I don't really see one.

**LRH:** Yeah, nice and clean, isn't it, huh? Nice and clean.

**Aud:** All right. I didn't quite hear what you said here.

**PC:** I – I feel a lot better about it.

**Aud:** Hmm, right.

**PC:** But I don't know if there's anything there or not.

**Aud:** Well, we got a nice clean needle here now, all right?

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** Okay.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** All right.

**LRH:** You can close it off.

**Aud:** All right, now, uh – it's a nice point to finish up...

**PC:** Hm.

**Aud:** ...on the session, so if it's all right with you I'm just going to finish the body of the session now.

**PC:** Yes, that's all right.

**Aud:** All right. Anything you want to say before I do uh – finish the body of the session?

**PC:** Well, I've had a little look for this before...

**Aud:** Hmm.

**PC:** ...since missed withholds came out, with Ed, but I haven't had a good a look at the whole sort of picture like this before.

**Aud:** All right. Okay.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** All right. Well then, have you made any part of your goals for this session?

**PC:** Hmm.

**Aud:** Which was to clear up anything that has been missed, and to do your very best.

**PC:** Hmm.

**Aud:** All right.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** How'd you make out in those?

**PC:** I feel good about that.

**Aud:** All right. And on this one "to do my best"?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** All right. Now, are there any other gains you've made in this session you'd care to mention?

**PC:** I didn't feel too worried about the audience.

**Aud:** All right. Very good. All right, anything else?

**PC:** Only – only a comment.

**Aud:** On goals and gains I was

asking you if...

**PC:** Yeah, yeah.

**Aud:** You want to make a comment? Do so.

**PC:** Oh, just – just a comment that it was so much easier to get – get to it when – when we went earlier.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** I got – couldn't get that later one at all.

**Aud:** All right. Very good.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. Now, I'll just check your havingness, all right?

**PC:** Hmm.

**Aud:** Just – uh – good. Now, give the cans a squeeze, would you? Let them go. All right, now, your havingness is down. What is your Havingness Process?

**PC:** "Touch that" or "feel that," I think they work.

**Aud:** All right, okay. Put the cans down, then, would you? All right, I'm going to run "touch that," okay? Touch that table. Good, all right. Touch that cord. Good. Touch the top button of your jacket. Very good. Touch your right cuff. Good. All right, touch your nose. Fine. Touch your hair. Very good.

Pick up the cans, would you? Good. Give the cans a squeeze. Well, that's working nicely. Put the cans down, would you please? Thank you. All right, touch this cord. Good. Touch your right elbow. Good. Touch your left elbow. Very good. Touch your right ear. Good. Touch your right knee. Very good. Touch that can. Good. Touch the microphone. Very good. Touch that little bit of dirt there. Very good.

All right, pick up the cans. Okay. All right, now, good. Now, give the cans a squeeze. Okay. Let them go. All right. And once more. All right. Well, we're almost back to where we started there and I'm going to leave it at that. How do you feel about that?

**PC:** I feel all right.

**Aud:** All right, very good. Now, is there anything you care to – uh – end of Havingness Process. All right, is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this session?

**PC:** No, just thank you.

**Aud:** All right. Is it all right with you if end the session now?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** Okay, here it is: End of session! Session ended for you?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** Very good. All right, tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

**PC:** You're no longer auditing me.

**Aud:** Good. All right, thank you.

**PC:** Okay.

Well, there you have an example of Sec Checking, actually, with a first cousin to the withhold system. Pressing it back to the earliest time, picking up the earliest charge and carrying it on forward.

I want to call to your attention, very distinctly and very definitely, that there is a wealth of difference between Sec Checking and getting mid ruds in or some other type of activity.

Now, you get the mid ruds in, something like that, or clean up something, it is simply for the perfunctory, the perfunctory purpose of getting a session going, getting things out of the road, momentarily, so that you can carry on with what you're doing.

In Sec Checking, you are doing auditing with this type of action. You're doing auditing with it. In doing a Prepcheck, such as on purposes, you are doing auditing. That's different, don't you see? You're doing auditing of the pc's case with the process. In other words, with Sec Check questions and with Prepchecking – doesn't include Prepchecking a goal or something like that – but in Prepchecking – by which I mean you're trying to find times when well, you're trying to find out how certain purposes have been suppressed and that sort of thing – you are actually doing the auditing with the Prepcheck. You understand?

So on, however, goals running or 3M or some other process, you are simply using the mid ruds; you're simply using the mid ruds to brush the pc off of it – so they won't get in your road, do you understand?

Now, you can either audit with these things – as you just saw a demonstration of – you can either audit with these things or you can just set a pc up so they can be audited. Do you see that? In other words, there's two distinctly different uses to such things as a Sec Check question or a Prepcheck question, do you understand? They are two distinctly different uses.

The one use is to get auditing *done* with it. And of course, that's hammer and tongs. That's get the earliest one on the chain. That's this, that's that, that's the other thing, you see. Steering the pc's attention, finding out if there is anything. Restimulating the pc, if you please, to find out if there's anything that can be picked up and then going ahead and picking it up.

And then on the other side – on the other side – we have their use, very permissive, just lightly brush off, "In this session has anything been suppressed?" "In this session has anything been suppressed?" Pc says no, you say, "All right, I'll check it on the meter: In this session has anything been suppressed? That doesn't read on the meter." And away we go. You understand?

Now, that same question, that same question, used on the subject of purposes might go very well this way: "How has a purpose been suppressed?" The pc says, "Oh, I don't get anything on that." Oh, no! We're doing a Prepcheck, you see, we're using this thing to get auditing done. So we have to say "Well, what do purposes mean to you?" "What are purposes all about?" "What's suppression?" "Did you ever have any purposes, like that? Do you suppose there... any purpose was ever suppressed? Anybody's purpose was ever suppressed?" Anything like that.

Pc says, "Oh, I see what you mean. Yes, well, I've badly suppressed my father's purposes, and so forth." Well, of course, you realize by the limits of the question you can't just have "What purpose was suppressed?" That's a bad process. You have to say – it's like "Look around here and find something you could go out of ARC with." Spin the pc. So you have to say, "All right. Now, how did you suppress that purpose?" And all of a sudden, why, the pc is

giving you answers. You don't have to keep badgering the pc – that isn't the point, you can just keep giving the question, as long as the pc gives you answers.

Your tone arm sitting there, as you've had tone arm motion and so forth, and the pc all of a sudden puts on the brakes and he says, "That's all!" Well, all you've run into is something the pc is unwilling to tell you. So you just have to go ahead and find out if this is the case. It's – pc has something there that he doesn't want to tell you.

There's a difference here, in other words. When you use Sec Checking and Prepchecking for the purpose of auditing, you are pressing the question home to the pc. You are making sure that the pc *understands* that question. You're making sure that the pc knows this question applies to his life. And you're trying to pick up the earliest incident that is available and carrying it on forward. You've walked the pc down a chain, and so forth. You get auditing done, in other words, with this question.

But, over here, on the other side, just rudiments and Havingness. All right, well, we just do a light brush-off, with the rudiments, we make sure they don't read on the meter, we run some Havingness on the pc – pc comes up smiling. We don't badger the pc at all. Do you see that is a difference? Two entirely different modes of auditing. The mode of auditing done in W is very different than the mode of auditing done in Z. You have to learn both modes of auditing. You need both of them.

How are you going to pull somebody's missed withholds, to set him up so they aren't going to explode in your face all the time while you're trying to do 3M? Well, you'll have to take up the whole question with him, you have to restimulate these things, in other words. You have to discuss these things with him. Sec Checks, of course, are very good to do this with.

Now, your concept and understanding of this is invited. You haven't – you actually can't be called an auditor unless you can sec check and press it home. You understand? And you actually can't be called an auditor if you don't know this other method of just a light brush-off and dash on. You understand? Because you're trying to get your Routine 2, Routine 3 processes done these days, don't you see? Well, you're not trying to press anything home.

But let's take the borderline process, which is your 2G1. And that pc just goes on answering, answering, answering smoothly. But if the pc isn't answering, you have to know how to press that question home and get it answered. So it's at 2G1 that you have the great divide between these two things. It's a part of each, you understand?

Now, where a pc is having difficulty and a rough needle and a lot of things are very poor about the situation, where all these things are going on – pc is uncomfortable, and so forth, about life – you can straighten them out with a Sec Check. And your procedure would be more or less the way you saw it.

But as I press home to you, it is an art. It is an art. It's not a – it's not a one-two-three – four-shift, one-two-three-four-shift, one – you have to audit the pc in front of you. Pc's saying, *"Rah, I don't rah, rah, rah, gahr* and I've never done anything to Dianetics and Scientology, except, of course, I'm pretty critical of the way you're auditing me and I'm pretty critical of the organization," and so on. Well, realize that there must be an overt beneath the criticism,

that's one of the stable data of Sec Checking. It's up to you to find that chain of overts. And it's up to you to get the bottom chain of overts. It's up to you to release those overts. You notice this girl went down to female Clear read on this. Well, one of the things that happens on Sec Checking is that a high tone arm gets cancelled out. And you get them coming down on it, if you do good Sec Checking.

So it's quite an activity all by itself. And it's a distinctly different activity than that carried on in Routine 3 and finding goals and that sort of thing. Do you see that?

Now, you have to learn both kinds of auditing and learn when to use each. And I hope that you've got some idea of that now.

There's one remark I'd like to make technically, rather than post it on the board, and that is that 2G1 is not run on the needle. Sec Checking is run on the needle. 2G1 is right part of its old ancient grandfather – and I'll give you more talks about it – was Routine 2 Prehav levels. And that is all run on the tone arm. And you run it up to a high tone arm, more or less stuck, and then shift to your next level. And it's all done on the tone arm. It is *not* done on the needle. No part! Nothing! And no part of the auditing commands are run on the needle in 2G1. Do you understand that? Only the tone arm. And you have to be able to persuade the pc to answer it a few more times. As long as there's tone arm motion going on, you have answers.

Now, there's 2GPH, which is the original Routine 2 Process, which is by Prehav level, applied to purposes. And you will be learning that one, too.

But I'm just calling that to your attention because those early 2Gs are all tone arm. All tone arm. Not needle. Sec Checking, rudiments, Havingness is *all needle, not tone arm.* You got the idea? They're quite distinctly different. Not only different processes – they use different parts of the E-Meter.

All right. Well, I'm very pleased with that demonstration and I think we ought to give Reg and Leslie a big hand.

Thank you. Thank you very much, and good night.

Remimeo
HCO Secs
I&R Hat
Ethics Hat
Tech C/S
Qual Personnel

Reinstitutes HCOB 30 July 1970
"THE TECH AND ETHICS OF CONFESSIONALS" as a BTB

# THE TECH AND ETHICS OF

# CONFESSIONAL

(Compiled from a Briefing to 3rd Mate and
4th Mate Flag given by L. RON HUBBARD.)

HCO is primarily interested in **Justice**.

The method of justice practiced in the 17th and 18th Centuries was to catch the offenders and hang them, thus keeping the countryside "quiet".

Although useful as a method of quieting things down, however, it doesn't do people any good to be hung! You will find the remedy expressed in this rule:

**When you give a confessional to a person without finding the earlier basic, you hang them.**

If you can't chase back a confessional question to an F/N you are going to get continuous Ethics trouble from that person from then on until it is remedied.

When you give a guy a confessional and it doesn't produce anything and the needle is clean you should indicate that the confessional was unnecessary. You will probably get an F/N.

HCO's interest in someone is normally in what is going on, what is he up to **now**. So one tends to omit to ask how come this guy has been committing overts for the past two-and-a-half years – the *same ones* – and it is *still* going on? Back in that earlier zone is one hell of an overt, continuous overts against Scientology or LRH. So what is it? You should trace it back and you could find a dilly!

It's the **earliest** item available on that chain that will get the F/N. And remember that overts of Omission are always preceded by overts of *Co*mmission. So you should ask yourself, "How come all these overts of omission?" There's an earlier overt of *co*mmission, you can be sure.

This gives us another rule:

**If you cannot F/N a question, you haven't got it.**

Now it could be the buttons are out (invalidate, protest, action unnecessary). Did you know you can beef up a TA (send it up high) by doing an unnecessary action? It acts somewhat like forcing a wrong item on a pc. It puts him on a protest, a rejection and an effort to stop the action. That is where a lot of the unpopularity of earlier techniques stems from.

Of the rudiments ARC Break, problem, withhold, confessional specializes in overts and withholds. So the full panorama of a confessional buttons is Ruds plus False, Suppress, Invalidate, Evaluate, Protest, Unnecessary. So if the TA goes up during a confessional you should check buttons.

**If you can't get an F/N on a confessional and have to end session you must have a line to Qual that cleans it up within 24 hours.**

Every time a confessional action won't fly it has got to be a 24-hour urgent repair. The confessional Repair List consists of the ruds and buttons.

HCO's technical action should be "Why the hell doesn't this thing fly?" There is earlier stuff on that chain, or there is *other* stuff not yet found. That it flies (F/Ns) means he hasn't done *that.*

It can of course be an ARC Break needle – people ARC Break with the physical universe, with fellow men, feel wronged in some way and have to take it out on somebody, and so commit the overt. But the somebody they attack is not the source of the upset. They misidentify the source. If their think was straight they would be able to see what the score was and have no charge on it.

An overt therefore is preceded by an ARC Break, and you will find an ARC Break is the result of a problem.

So each time you don't take a question to F/N you run up against this. This gives another way for them to get unpopular. But if it didn't F/N, you also know it *was* necessary to give the person a confessional!

If you give a person a confessional and you see a trail of catastrophes in that person's wake afterwards you *know* it didn't fly. Similarly a person who makes huge overts out of every little action, which is in essence self-invalidation, has behind that somewhere a huge overt – big enough to set the police of several galaxies after them!

If it doesn't F/N you haven't got it!

The F/N has never been integrated into confessional technology up 'til now. There hasn't been anything issued that says run a confessional to F/N and tells you what to do if it doesn't or won't F/N.


## THE E-METER AND THE CRIMINAL


The joker in all this is that the E-Meter reads on *Reality.* So you can have a guy who reads on none of your questions, but you find out the next day he had done exactly what you asked him. Yet it didn't read! A real criminal just doesn't read on having killed his grand-

mother in cold blood five minutes before the Processing. Even if he admits it it doesn't read! But a real criminal *won't* clear and *won't* F/N. Occasionally they will R/S.

You have to handle it on a gradient of reality. "Why wasn't that an overt?" is one way you could try. He would at first be very surprised at the very thought of it being an overt. But you could get a stream of justifications off. Another way is to magnify the overt. You can use that on a "no-overt" case.

The Tech of it belongs in the field of auditing. However, HCO should make an attempt to fly it. It doesn't matter how good or bad. If there is any question on the F/N or if you can't take it to F/N send it over to Qual to find the reason why.

Any time a confessional is done, some notification of the fact *must* go into the pc folder otherwise the C/S can make an error in C/Sing because of the omitted data. In fact unless there is criminal data in the confessional the whole thing should be slid into the folder.

## HCO AND CASE GAIN

(See HCO PL 20 July 1970, Cases and Morale of Staff")

The percentage of people who have case gain will be proportional to the level of morale in your Org. So it is of interest to HCO to ask the C/S how many no-case-gain cases he has (Pile 4), trace them down and isolate them. The names of those not doing well (Piles 2 and 3) should also be known and the numbers so you can make sure the greater percentage is getting good case gain.

HCO can get trouble stemming from lack of staff case progress. For instance you find an Exec giving excuses for not doing his job. It can be due to a no-case-gain under him enturbulating seniors and associates. They in turn, not recognizing him as the source of the enturbulation, buy the stops and the "can't be dones" and find some other excuse as to why not to do their job. Recognize that when someone dumps his hat on you he has *overts,* man!

An Executive instead of reporting that people don't want to work in his division should be asking, "How come they don't want to work in the division?"

Things will get better to the degree that such cases producing stops and "can'ts" have a line for them to be handled on.

HCO should turn over to the C/S a list of those who have received confessionals, the files of the confessionals are turned over and on those that did not F/N, using the repair list, Qual gets it cleaned up or otherwise.

Begin a campaign to get all these cases winning.

If there is any query as to which of the four categories of case folders (per HCO PL 20 July 70) a person belongs on, it goes on the one lower. For instance a category, Pile 2, queried as to status immediately becomes Pile 3.

Pile 4 cases go to HCO and are given confessionals. If he gets an F/N, okay. If he doesn't, then it is purely a Div 1 disciplinary action – Non Enturbulation order or whatever.

Put up a notice where it can be seen to the effect that "Anyone who feels bad after a confessional or who feels they have been falsely given a confessional should turn in their names to the Qual Examiner."

The Ethics Officer can "hot-up" his confessional by putting in some test buttons – overts, withholds, missed withholds. You could even do a pre-assessment for the confessional. It's all in what you are looking for.

## STATISTICS

HCO has its neck out to the degree that it does not have Stats. Make sure there is someone in Dept 3 who can handle stats, collect them, graph them and post them up. A person with bad or low stats on post will always trace back to having committed an overt of some kind or another.

## AMNESTIES

In order to take advantage of an amnesty, the person accepting it should make a written statement of the crimes on which he is accepting the amnesty.

## STATUS OF REPAIR ACTION

A confessional repair action is not classed as an auditing session in that the data revealed in it is actionable and is turned over to HCO. So before turning over to Qual a confessional that didn't F/N, tell the person "You have told me all you wish to. You recognize that any further discoveries in this line will be actionable."

Written into published form
by 4th Mate Flag

for
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Reissued as a BTB by
Training and Service Bureau

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

Remimeo
HCO Hats
Tech Hats

# CONFESSIONALS

HCOs may not do Confessionals or "Sec Checks".

HCO may only do Meter Checks. This consists of putting the pc on a meter and noting down the TA, state of needle and attitude of pc.

Where these reads are non optimum (no F/N VGI state of meter) the pc may be sent to Qual for further check.

Too many cases, too many case programmes, have been fouled up by non C/Sed Sec Checking or Confessionals in the past for the practice to continue.

Real criminals may have bad meters but crimes are often so unreal to them that they do not read (meters needle read only on things within the reality or borderline reality of a person). This permits unskilled Sec Checking or Confessional actions to pass right by the culprit.

HCO should learn full investigatory procedure and should only do metering to establish the pc's meter state, asking no questions.

HCO Investigatory Procedure P/Ls that **must** be known to HCO are:

HCO P/L May '65 - ETHICS OFFICER HAT

HCO P/L 19 Sept '70 - Data Series No. 16, INVESTIGATORY PROCEDURE

HCO P/L 19 Sept '70 Issue II - Data Series No. 17, NARROWING THE TARGET

## TECH & QUAL

Asked to do "Confessionals" or "Sec Checks" Tech and Qual may do them only as part of a C/S programme and only as a gradient in the general action of improving the reality of the case.

An R/S still means crimes. All the other data is true and should be known but **polygraphs, lie detectors, meters only register at the reality level of the being**, and the reality level of a criminal is too bad for reads to occur in a majority of cases. Thus the guilty are falsely freed and the innocent are subjected to annoyance and upset.

Overts, crimes, etc. may come off first as a critical thought under which lies a harmful (overt) act. On such gradients one builds up reality and so releases overts.

No meter or Sec Check or Confessional is sufficiently valuable to use in detection of crime. The state of the meter itself is of value since it tells one whom to investigate.

Thus neither Tech nor Qual should assist investigations but should work on the case against proper C/Ses to get off the overts and withholds for the case benefit.

Overts disclosed in sessions may not be used for justice purposes. Therefore only crimes discovered by routine investigation are actionable.

It could be that a crime discovered by investigation is also gotten off in session. That it was also gotten off in session does not protect the person from discipline. That it was gotten off in session is irrelevant and sessions are not part of justice procedures.

## SICKNESS

The broad general clues about suspects are:

The person with the worst meter (TA and needle state) is the most suspect.

The person whose job product is itself an overt act is the most likely to commit other crimes.

The person who is most crazy is the most likely to be the guilty one.

The person who is chronically ill is a suspect.

These are true because the cause of insanity and sickness is overts.

The person who acts most "PTS" is the one who has most harmed his fellows.

The person with the worst stats is the most likely suspect.

Beyond these technical observations one cannot go in the field of justice.

HCOs should learn Investigatory procedures when looking for criminals. Confessionals and Sec Checks will fail them and they also mess up cases. Investigatory procedures are quite good enough.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JULY AD 12

Central Orgs
Franchise

# REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

As the Prepchecking we have been doing is a complicated skill and as recent rudiments developments open the door to simplified handling of overts, you may lay aside all versions of previous Prepchecking and Security Checking and substitute the following.

This is in the interests of improvement of auditing and keeping pcs from being enturbulated by unskilled auditing. The version herein is far easier to train students into as it uses the same actions as Repetitive Rudiments.

## REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

We will still use the term "Prepchecking" and do all Prepchecking by repetitive command.

We will refer to the older version as "Prepchecking by the Withhold System" and abandon it as of this date as too complicated and too susceptible to restimulation of pcs in semi-skilled hands.

## THE AUDITING PROCEDURE

We handle any Zero question exactly as in repetitive rudiments, (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962).

The session is started exactly as per Model Session, HCO Bulletin June 23, 1962, (or as may be amended). A Mark IV Meter is used (using earlier meters on Prepchecking can mean disaster as they miss withholds).

The auditor then announces for the body of the session, that a Prepcheck will be done on such and such a subject or Form.

The auditor then takes an already prepared Form (such as Form 3[1], 6A[2], Prepcheck Mid Ruds, Goals Prepcheck Form [not yet released]).

---

[1] Editor's Note: See HCO PL 22 May 61, "Only Valid Security Check", Vol. IV, p. 275

[2] Editor's Note: See HCO PL 7 July 61, "HGC Auditors Sec Check", Vol. IV, p.356

## Step One

Without now looking at the Meter, the auditor asks the Form question repetitively until the preclear says that's all, there are no more answers.

## Step Two

The auditor then says, "I will check that on the meter" and does so, watching for the Instant Read (HCO Bulletin May 25, 1962).

If it reads, the auditor says, "That reads. What was it?"[3] (and steers the pc's attention by calling each identical read that then occurs). "There… That… That…" until the pc spots it in his bank and gives the datum.

## Step Three

The auditor then ignores the meter and repeats Step One above. Then goes to Step Two, etc.

## Step Four

When there is no read on Step Two above, the auditor says, "Do you agree that that is nul?" The auditor watches for an Instant Read on this and if there is an Instant Read on it, does Step Two above, then Step Three.[4] This gives a double check on the flatness of a question.

This is *all* there is to Repetitive Prepchecking as a system. Anything added in the way of more auditor questions is destructive to the session. Be sure not to Q and A (HCO Bulletin of May 24, 1962).

Be sure your TR4 is *excellent* in that you *understand* (really, no fake) what the pc is saying and acknowledge it (really, so the pc gets it) and return the pc to session. Nothing is quite as destructive to this type of auditing as bad TR4.

## THE ZERO QUESTIONS TIME LIMITER

There must be a time limit on all Zero questions. Although it says, "Have you ever stolen anything?" the auditor must preface this with a **Time Limiter** such as "In this lifetime…" "In auditing…" or whatever applies. Form 3 (the Joburg) has to be prefaced with "In this lifetime…" on every question. Form 6A, as it speaks of preclears, etc, is already limited in Time.

---

[3] Editor's note: Note the later datum from HCOB 3 July 71R, "Auditing by lists": "We do **not** tell the pc what the meter is doing… We do not say to the pc, 'That's clean' or 'That reads'."

[4] Editor's note: revised by HCOB 4 July 62 as per which the auditor should not pay attention to any reaction to the question. As per today's tech a reading confessional question must be brought to F/N, ref. HCOB 14 March 71R, "F/N everything".

In Prepchecking the Middle Ruds, use "In auditing…" before each question or other appropriate limitations.

The Zero *must not* swing the pc down the whole track as Middle Rudiments then become unanswerable and a fruitful source of missed withholds.

## MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

In Repetitive Prepchecking the Middle Rudiments can be Fast Checked (HCO Bulletin of July 2,1962), (using the package question "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" If one of the four reads, use it singly to clean it in the same worded question and do the remainder of the Middle Ruds singly: "In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal?").

Use the Middle Rudiments Fast Checked every time you clean a Zero Question, whether the pc had answers for it or not.

## PREPCHECKING THE MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

To begin or end a series of sessions (such as an intensive), Prepcheck also the Middle Rudiments.

In such Prepchecking the Middle Ruds, for havingness sessions,[5] the Zeros are as follows:

"Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have suppressed?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have invalidated?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have failed to reveal?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have been careful of?"

To these standards add, in the same question form, "suggested" "failed to suggest" "revealed" "told any half truths" "told any untruths" "damaged anyone" "influenced the E-Meter" "failed to answer a question" "failed to answer a command" and "Since I have been auditing you have you shifted your attention?" Flatten off with O/W as below.

## O/W ASSISTS

As a Prepcheck by form and even beginning rudiments are not calculated to handle a pc who is *very* distraught before the start of session by reason of upsets in life (howling PTPs

---

[5] Editor's note: "Havingness session": Mentioned in HCOB 23 June 62 "Modell Session revised." It says there, "If a pc has a badly behaving needle, do a perfect Model Session on pc for 2 or 3 sessions using Havingness or, better, Prepchecking in the body of the session, and you will see the needle smooth out." Thus in this text here such a "Havingness session" is meant where one uses Prepchecking instead of Havingness, as opposed to a "normal session" where you would run a major action in the body of the session.

accompanied by misemotion) or who is too ill physically to settle into auditing, an earlier rudiment immediately after start of session can be used. This is general O/W (Overt-Withhold):

"What have you done?" "What have you withheld?"

These are run alternately. This is *never* run on a terminal (i.e. What have you done to George? etc). Only the general type command is now used.

When the pc is much better, go into the usual rudiments.

(Note: This is, by the way, the best repetitive process for an assist.)

This is run to a nul needle on both questions. If either gives an Instant Read, continue to run both until both are nul, much as in steps One, Two, Three and Four of Repetitive Prepchecking.

When used to flatten off a Prepcheck on the Middle Rudiments, whether for Prepchecking or for goals type or ordinary Repetitive Prepchecking, the O/W command wording is as follows:

"Since I have been auditing you, what have you done?"

"Since I have been auditing you, what have you withheld?"

Both must be nul to conclude the process. If either is found alive on the needle, run both.

When used to begin a session, or when used to Prepcheck the Middle Ruds, O/W must be followed by a Fast Check of the Mid Ruds.


## SUMMARY

This type of Prepchecking – Repetitive Prepchecking – is more easily done and more thorough than Prepchecking by the Withhold System and its earlier forefather Security Checking. It replaces both of these.

In view of the fact that the same system is used for Repetitive Rudiments (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962), by learning one, the student also learns the other, thus saving a lot of time in study and training.

Repetitive Prepchecking replaces former auditing requirements for Class IIa and *is* the Class II skill.

It should be thoroughly instilled in the auditor that extra doingness by the auditor is detractive from the system and that every additive is a liability, not required in the system and liable to upset the pc. It is a *must* that the auditor be very capable with TR4 and that the auditor makes no attempt to shut off routine pc originations as the intensity of "In Sessionness" generated by modern Model Session used with Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking is such as to make the ARC breaks quite shattering to the pc if TR4 is bad.

If Repetitive Prepchecking is run right, with good metering, the only remaining source of missed withholds is the inadvertent withhold caused by bad TR4. (The pc said it but the auditor didn't *understand* it.)

This bulletin culminates three years of exhaustive research into the formation of Model Session, Rudiments and the handling of overts, and overcoming the limitations of the auditor and student in handling sessions. This, coming with the broad success of Routine 3GA, rounds out auditing from raw meat to clear for all cases capable of speech. These techniques represent a data span of 13 years and a general research of 32 years.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

Revises and Reinstitutes
HCO Bulletin of 4 January 1962
"Security Checking: Fundamentals"
as a BTB

Remimeo
Franchise

# CONFESSIONAL FUNDAMENTALS

The most fundamental thing to know about confessionals is that a case with withholds will not clear. And the next most fundamental element to know is that; **a case with withholds will not clear.** Perhaps, if this is repeated loud enough and long enough, not only preclears, but perhaps even Auditors will realize that this is an absolute, unavoidable truth, one which can not be overlooked or neglected at any time, under any circumstances.

First of all, what is a withhold? A withhold is a no action after the fact of action in which the individual has done or been an accessory to doing something which is a transgression against some moral code consisting of agreements to which the individual has subscribed in order to guarantee, with others, the survival of a group with which he is co-acting or has co-acted toward survival.

Because a withhold is a no action or no motion after doingness, it naturally hangs up in time and floats in time – due to the actions or the overts which preceded the no action or no motion of the withhold. The reactive mind is, therefore, the combined withholds stacked up which the individual has against groups from which he feels that he is individuated from but from which he has not separated due to the fact that he has these withholds in his bank and also all the combined agreements toward survival of all these groups, from which he is not separate, and which he uses reactively to solve problems now without inspection.

Example: The individual belonged at some time to the Holy Fighters. One of the mores of this group was that all should be destroyed who do not accept the Word. The Holy Fighters went out on a punitive expedition against a neighboring tribe who would not accept the Word, but accepted some other belief. There was a great battle with much killing, however, during the battle, the individual took pity upon a helpless child and did not kill him, but took the child off the field of battle, gave him food and drink, and left him; returning, himself, to the battle.

After the battle was successfully won, the Holy Fighters had their usual service during which all spoke of how they had killed all non-believers. Our individual withheld from the group that he had not only failed to kill, but had saved the life of a non-believer. Thus we have the no action of the withhold after the overt or action of saving the child, all of which added up to a transgression against the mores of the Holy Fighters.

Because of such similar transgressions, the individual finally individuated from the group of Holy Fighters and became a member of the Board of Directors of the Society for

Kindness to Humans, which itself has its own agreements to survival and with which the individual agreed; however, when difficulties or problems arose, the individual instead of treating all with kindness tended to covertly try to destroy all who would not accept the tenets of kindness. So he reactively was solving the problems of the Society of Kindness with a survival more of the Holy Fighters. Due to all his transgressions and withholds of his destructive impulses while a member of the Society for Kindness, he finally individuated from this group.

Now he is a member of Anti-Emotions, Incorporated, but he finds that he can't rule out all his emotions, but tends to be destructive and kind at the same time. So he is still solving problems not only with the mores of the Holy Fighters, but with those of the Society for Kindness to Humans. And so it goes.

Processing this individual we will find that he has all these withholds of overts against the Holy Fighters, the Society for Kindness to Humans, and Anti-Emotions, Incorporated. After we have pulled all these overts, he will truly be separate from these groups and no longer reactively use their survival mechanisms as solutions to problems.

Further the action of withholding is one point where the preclear does what the reactive mind does. He withholds his own overts of transgressions against the moral code of a group in order to avoid punishment, thusly enhance his own survival, and he withholds himself from the group finally in an effort to avoid committing further overts. So just as the reactive mind contains all past survival agreements which are used to solve problems threatening the survival of the individual, so does the individual decide to withhold transgressions, in order to survive himself, and withholds himself from groups to avoid committing overts. Withholding and surviving occur at the same time. So the communication bridge between the preclear and the reactive mind is the withhold.

The pulling of overts which have been withheld then is the first step towards getting the preclear to take control of the reactive mind. The more withholds he gives up, the more the old survival mechanisms of the reactive mind are destroyed.

Further as a withhold of an overt creates a further overt act of not-know on the group with which one is co-acting with toward survival along an agreed upon moral code, so we are running off all the ignorance created for others by an individual which results in ignorance to himself. In this fashion, we are processing the individual up toward Native State or Knowingness.

Therefore, in doing confessionals upon a preclear, you are really attacking the whole basis of the reactive mind. It is an activity which the auditor should earnestly and effectively engage upon. In doing this the auditor always assumes that the preclear can remember his overts and can overwhelm the reactive mind. Just as with the CCHs so with confessionals, any objections raised by the preclear as regards confessionals are only a confusion being thrown up by the reactive mind, but the individual is really trying to look for what is there despite the reactive mind's doing this. This is why any failure to pull an overt is considered a crime against the preclear. The auditor in failing to pull an overt has given the reactive mind a win and the preclear a failure, and has further given the preclear another overt against the group he is now associated with, namely, that of Scientology, because he has succeeded in withholding from it.

So in confessionals the auditor on any particular question never looks at the E-Meter on that particular question, until the preclear has reached an impass on that question, and says that he really and truly can think of no further answers. This creates confidence that the Auditor and the preclear are really working together to overwhelm the reactive mind.

When the impasse is reached on any particular question, then the auditor asks the whole question looking all the time at the E-Meter. If the meter gives an instant read (any needle reaction, i.e. Fall, Rock Slam, Theta Bop or change of needle characteristic which occurs within half of a second or up to three-quarters of a second, in case the preclear has a delayed circuit on hearing) to the question or any word or phrase in the question, then the auditor uses the E-Meter to assist the preclear in pulling all further overts.

It is only at this point of impasse where the preclear *insists* he has no further answers, but the question or parts of the question still react, that the auditor varies the original confessional question, compartments the question as to reacting words and phrases, and cleans all reactions off any word or phrase in the question or the question itself. A stable datum as regards this is that if the question or any part of it still reacts, there are further withholds there or not all about a particular withhold was pulled. Never allow a preclear to persuade you that it is only already pulled withholds which are still reacting. A withhold pulled will not cause a question to still reacting; it can only be that not all about the withhold was pulled or that there are further undisclosed withholds on that question.

**Do not leave a confessional question until the auditor, the preclear, the reactive mind, and the E-Meter are in absolute agreement that there is nothing more on a particular question.**

Remember the E-Meter is not bound by the Auditor's Code. If it still reacts on a question, then the auditor must null that question.

What is meant by nulling a question is that the auditor in the first place has enough presence as an auditor to get the E-Meter to read properly, and remember this depends upon his ability to get Rudiments in well and upon the ratio of his reality to the preclear, and the whole original question and no part of the rudiment question gets any reaction including no needle pattern, at Sensitivity 16. Any needle pattern on a confessional means that there is a reaction to the question and all must be pulled on that question until the needle is null, or rising.[*]

A confessional question must never be left unnulled. If the preclear's intensive is terminating, you must null that question no matter how many extra hours you have to put in on the preclear. If he is continuing his auditing, you tell him that the question is not null and you will null it in the next session. Any failure to pull an overt is a crime against that preclear.

Eliminate all 'unkind thought' questions on any confessional, and substitute 'done anything to' in the question. Unkind thoughts are merely tags telling you that the preclear has actually done something. Unkind thoughts are merely a mechanism of lessening the overt.

---

[*] Editor's note: As per HCOB 14 March 71R, "F/N Everything", a reading confessional question must be brought to an F/N. This datum was not known in 1962.

In pulling overts, be careful that you do not allow the preclear to give you his justifications for having committed it. In allowing him to give you motivators or 'reasons why' you are allowing him to lessen the overt.

You are only interested in what the preclear has done, not what he has heard that others have done. So never allow a preclear to get off withholds to you about others, except in the case where he has been an accessory to a criminal act. A preclear reactively trying to give you other people's withholds, normally is giving lying withholds, so you must be careful to check over your new end rudiments carefully.

Remember that your duty as an auditor is to simply employ your skill to obtain a greater decency and ability on the past of others. You do this by performing well your function of clearing the meter and getting off all overts and withholds. An auditor is not an enforcer of public morals. If an auditor tries to make a preclear guilty, he is violating Clause 15 of the Auditor's Code, which says: 'Never mix the processes of Scientology with those of various other practices.' Punishment is an old practice which is not part of our activities in Scientology. Do confessionals against the reality of the preclear and his moral code and do not try to make him guilty. The value of any withhold is only the value the preclear puts on it.

As a case improves, his responsibility level will increase, and if his responsibility level is increasing he will get off further, new withholds. If an auditor is not getting new withholds coming off a preclear, he had better look for a gross error in his auditing. He either is disinterested and unwilling to help the preclear, or he is technically unskillful on his TRs, Model Session, and the E-Meter, or he does not have the preclear in session or he has withholds himself. Only an auditor with withholds will fail to pull them on others.

The number of withholds a preclear has available at any given time depends upon those that are available at that given time. To clarify this point, assume that all preclears have the same set number of withholds. Well, the number available within the realm of the preclear's present state of reality and responsibility will naturally vary. Preclears with a high reality and responsibility level will have more withholds available for pulling than preclears with a low reality and responsibility level. This is why it is so important that confessionals be continued throughout auditing. His reality and responsibility level will increase throughout processing bringing to light many new overts. If these are not pulled, the preclear will be forced into unintentionally withholding them and his case will bog down and not progress.

There are many HCO WW Confessionals to assist you in pulling withholds. In using these, an auditor must never, never omit a question on any of these, but he can add questions to them. Then there is the Problems Intensive, Dynamic Confessionals, specialized confessionals tailored to fit the professional or present activities of the preclear, and special confessionals to cover the transgressions of the preclear against the moral code of any group with which he has co-acted. On the latter, as a person in one lifetime only has belonged to many different groups, you can see the tremendous possibility of confessionals applied to the moral code of all groups on a whole track basis. Particular attention must be paid to the present group with whom he is currently co-acting, namely Scientology. This is why it is important to do the last two pages of the Form 3 and all of Form 6 on all Scientologists first because in the first place he is expecting something to help him against which he has overts and to that degree these overts are overts against himself as they will, if not pulled, prevent him from being helped, and in the second place overts against current groups are most important, then overts

committed in this lifetime, and then overts committed on the track, the reason being that he is still connected with these current groups and with this lifetime.

Confessionals are the most fruitful source of cognition, because you are pulling off the preclear's not-knows on the Third Dynamic, which have kept others in ignorance and himself in stupidity. Besides this, you tremendously increase the preclear's ability to communicate. And on top of all this you make a preclear much easier to audit. And if all his withholds are pulled, he can be cleared.

Pretty good gains to work for? Well then, let's get busy.

Taken from the Tape Lectures of
the Saint Hill Special Briefing
Course
By Mary Sue Hubbard
For
L. RON HUBBARD FOUNDER

Revised by
Training & Services Bureau
Authorized by AVU for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:AH:RT:LRH:MSH:esc:lf

Central Orgs
Franchise

# SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING

(As Security Checking is the one form of auditing that does not interfere with R2 or
R3, I asked Reg Sharpe to do a rundown on what we know about it – L. RON HUB-
BARD.)

Security Checking has an important part to play in modern auditing. We have the da-
tum that as a pc comes up in responsibility so does his recognition of overts. This factor can
seriously hamper a pc's progress. Security Checking is a case cleaning activity and it should
be thoroughly and competently applied. It is not something to be done just for form's sake. It
is done to speed up the advance of the case. A pc who has overts ready to be pulled just can-
not make the rapid progress which modern clearing techniques make possible. So don't un-
derestimate the value of Sec Checking. Learn to do it. Learn to do it well and when you do it,
go in and do an expert and thorough job.

Security Checking is a specialized type of auditing, and it takes a lot of skill and at
times some courage to do it well. Auditors must not be kind nor yet unkind. This does not
mean that you steer a luke warm middle course between kindness and unkindness. Neither of
these two impostors have anything to do with it. You just go in and audit, you go in to find –
and that means dig for **overts**. If you go in with pc's needle clean and your questioning can
get that needle to react, then you are winning.

The success of an auditor can be measured by the extent to which he can get reactions
on the needle and then cleaning those reactions getting more reactions and cleaning those and
so on. It's a probing operation like probing for sore places on a body, locating them and then
healing them. The skilled auditor, however, gets to the root of the trouble and clears up a
whole batch of overts at once.

Security Checking is done in Model Session. The beginning rudiments are put in and
by the time you start the body of the session, in this case the security check, the pc should
have a nice clean needle. The next thing is to tell the pc that you are going to help him to
clean up, and really clean up, the questions on the Form that you are using. **Remember it is
the question you are going to clean – not the needle.** You've already got a clean needle and
you could probably keep it clean by bad TR 1, failure to dig, or just sheer bad auditing. No,
it's the question you are cleaning, and in the process you are going to get a dirty or reacting
needle. So really get it over to your pc that you are going to **clean the question**.

The next action is to announce the first question that you are going to clean. The im-
portant thing at this stage is to groove in the question. There are a variety of ways to do this,
e.g., ask what the question means. What period or time the question covers. What activities
would be included. Where the pc has been that might be something to do with the question. If
any other people are likely to be involved. In other words you are steering the pc's attention to
various parts of his bank and getting him to have a preliminary look. When this has been

done, using very good TR 1, you give him the question – **off the meter**. You can forget your anti Q and A drill. You take your pc's answer and bird dog him about it. If he gives you a general answer you ask him for a specific time (or a specific example) **don't accept motivators**. If he gives you a motivator you say "OK, but what did you do there?" and you want something before the motivator. Example: – Pc: "I got mad at him because he kicked my foot." Aud: "What had you done before he kicked your foot?" In this case the pc is giving an overt "I got mad at him" but in fact he is cunningly selling the motivator "He kicked me in the foot". So the rule here is "go earlier than the motivator". Similarly you don't accept criticisms, unkind thoughts, explanations. You want what the pc has done and you want the Time Place Form and Event.

When you have succeeded in this you don't leave it there. You ask for an earlier time he had done something like it and you keep going earlier. What you are after is the earliest time he stole, hit somebody, got angry with a pc or whatever is his "crime". Get the earliest one and you will find that the others will blow off like thistledown.

Keep a sly eye on your meter and you can tell when you are in a hot area. Use it to help you to know where to dig, but don't use it to steer the pc at this stage. This encourages laziness on the part of the pc. **You** want him in there foraging about and digging up his bank in the process.

Only when your pc is thoroughly and healthily exhausted do you check the question on the meter. If you have done an excellent job the question will be clean.

However if you get a read you steer your pc by saying "There", "There" whenever you see a repetition of the original read. When he finds it you repeat the procedure outline above. **You** don't go back to the meter until you have really got all there is to be got. When you have got a clean needle you put in your mid ruds on the session, and if these are clean and only if they are clean you go on to the next question. If the ruds do bring out something then you go back to the question and start over again. And so you go on cleaning question after question. The success of a Sec Check Session is not judged by the number of questions cleaned but by the amount of looking you succeeded in making your pc do.

If you do this properly, that is the whole outline, you will have a well satisfied pc. If he ARC breaks then you have missed something, so pull your missed withholds. A rising TA is a clue to something missed. If a pc isn't happy – very happy – at the end of a question then you have missed something. Pc's will tell you a hundred and one things that are wrong with your auditing, the D of P's instruction, the form of the question, etc., but they all add up to the same thing – something has been missed.

Finally do End Ruds and these should run quickly and smoothly. Run a bit of havingness if necessary. Sharpen your pencil for the goals and gains and you'll leave the session happy and satisfied because that's how your pc feels.

One word of warning. If you leave a question unflat, mark it on your auditor's report and **tell your pc** it isn't flat.

Good digging.

Issued by: Reg Sharpe
SHSBC Course Secretary for
L. RON HUBBARD

# AUDITING RUNDOWN

# MISSED WITHHOLDS

# TO BE RUN IN X 1 UNIT

(supersedes HCO Bulletin of July 11, 1963, same title,
which was issued to Sthil SHSBC only)

1.  Ask pc following question:

    "In this lifetime what have you done that you have withheld from someone?"

2.  When pc has answered ask:

    (a) "When was it?"

    (b) "Where was it?"

    (c) "Who failed to find out about it?"

    (d) "Who nearly found out about it?"

    (e) "Who still doesn't know about it?"

Each withhold and answer must be written down and the sheet of withholds and answers must be turned in with the auditing report.

The sheet will be made available to all instructors on the Briefing Course.

The above suggestion was made by Bernie Pesco, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course student, and accepted for use.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.jh

Franchise

# NEW FACTS OF LIFE

### Security Checks

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

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

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

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

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

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

Auditor:  What shouldn't be known about rape?

PC:  Answers.

Auditor:  Good. What should be forgotten about rape?

PC:  Answers.

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

PC:  Answers.

Auditor:  What are you looking at?

PC:  This picture that came up about this rape.

Auditor:  Is it still there?

PC:  Yes.

Auditor:  (as picture seems stuck or sticky): What is unknown about that picture? (Goes on asking such questions, does not permit PC to wander off from *that*

one picture *so long as Meter needle is reacting* on questions about unknowingness in that picture.)

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

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

PC:    Answers.

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

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

*Do not* leave a Sec Check question until

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

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

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

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

### ARC Break Prevention

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

1.  Rudiments are out, particularly withholds.

2.  Routine 1A (problems) is unflat.

3.  An intolerance of unknowingness which makes PC edgy about what the auditor is doing.

4.  An intolerance of motion.

5.  A great scarcity of auditing.

6.  Has given auditor an order on his case which auditor then obeyed.

## An Observation of Terrible Truth

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

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

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

Example:

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

Auditor:    OK, are you withholding anything?

PC:          (ARC breaks, chews out auditor.)

Example:

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

PC:          It should be men.

Auditor:    Well, all right, Men, then.

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

Why?

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

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

That'll fix the PC.

Look it over. It's a terrible truth.

*This is* the real meaning of Q and A.


                                                        L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.cden

Franchise

# SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED

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

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

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

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

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

————————————

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

————————————

## THE REMEDY

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

1. Know E-Meter Essentials.

2. Know the E-Meter.

3. Work only with an approved E-Meter.

4. Know the various bulletins on security checking.

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: md.cden

# WITHHOLDS, MISSED

# AND PARTIAL

I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge.

I don't appeal to reason. Only to faith at the moment. When you have a reality on this, nothing will shake it and you'll no longer fail cases or fail in life. But, at the moment, it may not seem reasonable. So just try it, do it well and day will dawn at last.

What are these natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, lost PE members, ineffective motions? *They are restimulated but missed or partially missed withholds.* If I could just teach you that and get you to get a good reality on that in your own auditing, your activities would become smooth beyond belief.

—————————————

It is true that ARC breaks, present time problems and withholds all keep a session from occurring. And we must watch them and clear them.

But behind all these is another button, applicable to each, which resolves each one. And that button is the restimulated but missed or partially missed withhold.

—————————————

Life itself has imposed this button on us. It did not come into being with security checking.

If you know about people or are supposed to know about people, *then* these people expect, unreasonably, that you know *them* through and through.

Real knowledge to the average person is only this: a knowledge of his or her withholds! That, horribly enough, is the high tide of knowledge for the man in the street. If you know his withholds, if you know his crimes and acts, then you are *smart*. If you know his future you are moderately wise. And so we are persuaded towards mind reading and fortune telling.

All wisdom has this trap for those who would be wise.

Egocentric man believes all wisdom is wound up in knowing his misdemeanors.

**If** any wise man represents himself as wise and fails to discover what a person has done, that person goes into an antagonism or other misemotion toward the wise man. So they hang those who restimulate and yet who do not find out about their withholds.

This is an incredible piece of craziness. But it is observably true.

This is the **wild animal reaction** that makes Man a cousin to the beasts.

A good auditor can understand this. A bad one will stay afraid of it and won't use it.

———————————

The end rudiment for withholds for any session should be worded, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

———————————

Any ARC broke pc should be asked, "What withhold have I missed on you?" Or, "What have I failed to find out about you?" Or, "What should I have known about you?"

———————————

An auditor who sec checks but cannot read a meter is dangerous because he or she will miss withholds and the pc may become very upset.

———————————

Use this as a stable datum: If the person is upset, somebody failed to find out what that person was sure they would find out.

———————————

A missed withhold is a should have known.

———————————

The only reason anyone has ever left Scientology is because people failed to find out about them.

———————————

This is valuable data. Get a reality on it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:sf.cden

Franchise

# ARC BREAKS MISSED WITHHOLDS

**(*How to use this bulletin.***

**When an auditor or student has trouble with an "ARC breaky PC" or no gain, or when an auditor is found to be using freak control methods or processes to "keep a pc in session", the HCO Sec, DofT or DofP should just hand a copy of this bulletin to the auditor and make him or her study it and take an HCO exam on it.)**

After some months of careful observation and tests, I can state conclusively that:

**All ARC Breaks stem from Missed Withholds.**

This is vital technology, vital to the auditor and to anyone who wants to live.

Conversely:

**There are no ARC Breaks when Missed Withholds have been cleaned up.**

By **Withhold** is meant **an undisclosed contra-survival act**.

By **Missed Withhold** is meant **an undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed**.

———————————

This is **far** more important in an auditing session than most auditors have yet realized. Even when some auditors are told about this and shown it they still seem to miss its importance and fail to use it. Instead they continue to use strange methods of controlling the pc and oddball processes on ARC Breaks.

This is so bad that one auditor let a pc die rather than pick up the missed withholds! So allergy to picking up missed withholds can be so great that an auditor has been known to fail utterly rather than do so. Only constant hammering can drive this point home. When it is driven home, only then can auditing begin to happen across the world; the datum is that important.

———————————

An auditing session is 50% technology and 50% application. I am responsible for the technology. The auditor is wholly responsible for the application. Only when an auditor realizes this can he or she begin to obtain uniformly marvellous results everywhere.

———————————

No auditor now needs "something else", some odd mechanism to keep pcs in session.

**Picking up Missed Withholds keeps PCs in session.**

There is *no* need for a rough, angry ARC Breaky session. If there is one it is *not* the fault of the pc. It is the fault of the auditor. The auditor has failed to pick up missed withholds.

As of now it is not the pc that sets the tone of the session. It is the auditor. And the auditor who has a difficult session (providing he or she has used standard technology, model session, and can run an E-Meter), has one only because he or she failed to ask for missed withholds.

———————————

What is called a "dirty needle" (an erratic agitation of the needle – not limited in size – which is ragged, jerky, ticking, not sweeping and tends to be persistent) is caused by missed withholds, not withholds.

———————————

Technology today is so powerful that it must be flawlessly applied. One does his CCHs in excellent 2 way comm with the pc. One has his TRs, Model Session and E-Meter operation completely perfect. And one follows exact technology. And one keeps the missed withholds picked up.

———————————

There is an exact and precise auditor action and response for every auditing situation, and for every case. We are not today beset by variable approaches. The less variable the auditor's actions and responses, the greater gain in the pc. It is terribly precise. There is no room for flubs.

Further, every pc action has an exact auditor response. And each of these has its own drill by which it can be learned.

Auditing today is not an art, either in technology or procedure. It is an exact science. This removes Scientology from every one of the past practices of the mind.

Medicine advanced only to the degree that its responses by the practitioner were standardized and the practitioner had a professional attitude toward the public.

Scientology is far ahead of that today.

———————————

What a joy it is to a preclear to receive a completely standard session. To receive a text book session. And what gains the pc makes! And how easy it is on the auditor!

It isn't how interesting or clever the auditor is that makes the session. It's how standard the auditor is. Therein lies pc confidence.

———————————

Part of that standard technology is asking for missed withholds *any* time the pc starts to give any trouble. This is, to a pc, a totally acceptable control factor. And it totally smooths the session.

You have *no* need for and must not use any ARC Break process. Just ask for missed withholds.

———————————

Here are some of the manifestations cured by asking for missed withholds.

1.  Pc failing to make progress.

2.  Pc critical of or angry at auditor.

3.  Pc refusing to talk to auditor.

4.  Pc attempting to leave session.

5.  Pc not desirous of being audited (or anybody not desirous of being audited).

6.  Pc boiling off.

7.  Pc exhausted.

8.  Pc feeling foggy at session end.

9.  Dropped havingness.

10. Pc telling others the auditor is no good.

11. Pc demanding redress of wrongs.

12. Pc critical of organizations or people of Scientology.

13. People critical of Scientology.

14. Lack of auditing results.

15. Dissemination failures.

Now I think you will agree that in the above list we have every ill we suffer from in the activities of auditing.

Now **please** believe me when I tell you there is **one cure** for the lot and **only** that one. There are no other cures.

The cure is contained in the simple question or its variations *"Have I missed a withhold on you?"*

---

## THE COMMANDS

In case of any of the conditions l. to 15. above ask the pc one of the following commands and **clean the needle of all instant read**. Ask the exact question you asked the first time as a final test. The needle must be clean of all instant reaction before you can go on to anything else. It helps the pc if each time the needle twitches, the auditor says, "That" or "There" quietly but only to help the pc see what is twitching. One doesn't interrupt the pc if he or she is already giving it. This prompting is the *only* use of latent reads in Scientology – to *help* the pc spot what reacted in the first place.

The commonest questions:

- "In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?"
- "In this session have I failed to find out something?"
- "In this session is there something I don't know about you?"

The best beginning rudiments withhold question:

- "Since the last session is there something you have done that I don't know about?"

Prepcheck Zero Questions follow:

- "Has somebody failed to find out about you who should have?"
- "Has anyone ever failed to find out something about you?"
- "Is there something I failed to find out about you?"
- "Have you ever successfully hidden something from an auditor?"
- "Have you ever done something somebody failed to discover?"
- "Have you ever evaded discovery in this lifetime?"
- "Have you ever hidden successfully?"
- "Has anyone ever failed to locate you?"

(These Zeroes do not produce "What" questions until the auditor has located a specific overt.)

---

When Prepchecking, when running any process but the CCHs, if any one of the auditing circumstances in l to 15 above occurs, ask for missed withholds. Before leaving any chain

of overts in Prepchecking, or during Prepchecking, ask frequently for missed withholds, "Have I missed any withhold on you?" or as above.

––––––––––––––––

Do not conclude intensives on any process without cleaning up missed withholds.

––––––––––––––––

Asking for missed withholds does not upset the dictum of using no O/W processes in rudiments.

––––––––––––––––

Most missed withholds clean up at once on two way comm *providing* the auditor doesn't ask leading questions about what the pc is saying. Two way comm consists of asking for what the meter showed, acknowledging what the pc said and checking the meter again with the missed withhold question. If pc says, "I was mad at my wife," as an answer, just ack and check the meter with the missed withhold question. Don't say, "What was she doing?"

In cleaning missed withholds do not use the Prepcheck system unless you are Prepchecking. And even in Prepchecking, if the zero is not a missed withhold question and you are only checking for missed withholds amid other activities, do it simply as above, by two way comm, not by the Prepcheck system.

To get auditing into a state of perfection, to get clearing general, all we have to do is:

1.  Know our basics (Axioms, Scales, Codes, the fundamental theory about the thetan and the mind);

2.  Know our practical (TRs, Model Session, E-Meter, CCHs, Prepchecking and clearing routines).

In actual fact this is not much to ask. For the return is smooth results and a far, far better world. An HPA/HCA can learn the data in l above and all but clearing routines in the material in 2. An HPA/HCA should know these things to perfection. They are not hard to learn. Additives and interpretations are hard to get around. Not the actual data and performance.

––––––––––––––––

Knowing these things, one also needs to know that all one has to do is clean the E-Meter of missed withholds to make any pc sit up and get audited smoothly, and all is as happy as a summer dream.

––––––––––––––––

We are making all our own trouble. Our trouble is lack of precise application of Scientology. We fail to apply it in our lives or sessions and try something bizarre and then we fail

too. And with our TRs, Model Session and meters we are most of all failing to pick up and clean up **Missed Withholds**.

_____

We don't have to clean up all the withholds if we keep the Missed Withholds cleaned up.

Give a new auditor the order to clean up "Missed Withholds" and he or she invariably will start asking the pc for withholds. *That's* a mistake. You ask the pc for *Missed Withholds.* Why stir up new ones to be missed when you haven't cleaned up those *already missed?* Instead of putting out the fire we pour on gunpowder. Why find more you can *then* miss when you haven't found those that *have been* missed.

_____

Don't be so confounded *reasonable* about the pc's complaints. Sure, they may all be true **but** he's complaining only because *withholds* have been *missed.* Only then does the pc complain bitterly.

_____

Whatever else you learn, learn and understand this please. Your auditing future hangs on it. The fate of Scientology hangs on it. Ask for missed withholds when sessions go wrong. Get the missed withholds when life goes wrong. Pick up the missed withholds when staffs go wrong. Only then can we win and grow. We're waiting for you to become technically perfect with TRs, Model Session and the E-Meter, to be able to do CCHs and Prepchecking and clearing techniques, *and* to learn to spot and pick up missed withholds.

If pcs, organizations and even Scientology vanish from Man's view it will be because you did not learn and use these things.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

Revised & Reissued
19 September 1974 as BTB

Remimeo

(Revision in Arial)

Cancels
HCO Bulletin of 30 August 1962
Same Title

# MISSED WITHHOLD HANDLING

There are three very important factors mentioned in the HCO Bulletin of May 3, 1962, ARC BREAKS MISSED WITHHOLDS and the HCO Bulletin of July 4, 1962 BULLETIN CHANGES, and these appear to be completely overlooked by most Auditors.

The first is that whenever one of the fifteen manifestations of a Missed Withhold occurs in an auditing session or whenever the Auditor learns of the preclear doing any of these outside session, his primary duty is to pull the missed withhold or missed withholds which have caused any of these manifestations to occur.

If the preclear begins to boil off in a session, the Auditor should immediately pull the missed withhold or missed withholds. If he is in the middle of the Auditor rudiment and the preclear begins to boil off, he immediately pulls missed withholds and then returns to cleaning the Auditor rudiment. He does not wait until he has cleaned the Auditor rudiment or wait until he has completed the beginning rudiments to pull the missed withholds.

If the preclear becomes angry and critical of the Auditor in the middle of a process the Auditor, there and then, pulls the missed withhold. He does not wait until he has completed the process.

The reason for this is that any missed withhold will, if not pulled immediately, cause the preclear to go to some degree or to go completely out of session and will cause the E-Meter to respond less well for the Auditor.

So when any of the fifteen missed withhold manifestations occur in a session, immediately pull the missed withholds and then return to whatever cycle of action was interrupted and complete that cycle of action.

The second factor is that the missed withhold rudiment or random rudiment is always used *repetitively*. You ask "In this session have you thought, said, or done anything I have failed to find out?" by the repetitive system. The reason for this is that because of the missed withholds, the preclear is practically out of session and the E-Meter is not functioning as well as it could.

By the repetitive system, you get the preclear talking to you, thusly putting him more into session and making your E-Meter more operative.

The last and most important factor is that a missed withhold or missed withholds have been pulled when the preclear no longer demonstrates the existence of one of the fifteen missed withhold manifestations. This is a factor most Auditors do not comprehend in the least. Daily I will have some Auditor come to me and say, "The preclear is in a terrific ARC broken state. I pulled the missed withholds and preclear is still angry as everything." Say I, "Then you haven't pulled the missed withholds. Pull them." Says the Auditor, "Oh, yes I did. The random rudiment is clean and gets no reaction on the E-Meter." Say I, "Your preclear would not still be angry if you had pulled the missed withholds. The only proof that you have pulled all the missed withholds is not whether your random rudiment is clean, but whether your preclear is no longer angry. Pull the missed withholds."

So the missed withholds have been pulled when the dopey preclear is no longer boiling off, when the angry preclear is no longer angry, when the non-communicative preclear is communicating, when the exhausted preclear is no longer exhausted, when the critical preclear is no longer critical of the Auditor, Scientology, Scientology Organization or Scientologists and so on – not when the E-Meter, which doesn't operate well if the preclear is not in session, indicates no reaction to the random rudiment question.

Auditors needing a rule or a set pattern to work by always ask me what to do when the E-Meter shows no reaction to the random rudiment question and the question appears clean. Well an Auditor can do one of two things. He can put in the reality factor by telling the preclear, when the preclear is insisting that there is nothing on the random rudiment question and the E-Meter, not working as well, appears to agree with the preclear, that the Meter isn't reading on the question, but as the preclear still appears upset, would he continue to look and answer the question. Or the Auditor can ask and clean repetitively any question which will pull the missed withholds and get the preclear back into session.

Here are some examples of questions which will pull missed withholds and which can be used as a random rudiment when required according to the preclear's manifesting the presence of missed withholds:

1.   In this session has anything been misunderstood?

2.   In this session has anything happened which I failed to know?

3.   In this session have I missed a withhold on you?

4.   In this session have you decided not to tell me something?

5.   In this session has anything occurred to you which I should know, but don't?

There are many, many possible questions to ask. Just keep to the basic definition of what a missed withhold is and you won't be far wrong. A missed withhold is "an undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed". So keep this fundamental in mind and really pull missed withholds.

MARY SUE HUBBARD

Revised & Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234

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

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:MD:AL:MH:MSH:mh

CenOCon
Franchise

# SECURITY CHECKING

# TWENTY-TEN

# THEORY

All valences are circuits are valences.

Circuits key out with knowingness.

This is the final definition of havingness.

*Havingness is the concept of being able to reach. No-havingness is the concept of not being able to reach.*

A withhold makes one feel he or she cannot reach. Therefore withholds are what cut havingness down and made runs on havingness attain unstable gains. In the presence of withholds havingness sags.

As soon as a withhold is pulled, ability to reach is *potentially* restored but the pc often does not discover this. It requires that havingness be run to get the benefit of having pulled most withholds.

Therefore on these principles, I have developed Twenty-Ten. Providing the following items are observed and the procedure followed exactly, Twenty-Ten will appear to work miracles rapidly.

## REQUISITES

1. That the auditor is Class II (or Class IIb at Saint Hill).
2. That a British HCO WW Tech Sec approved meter is employed and no other.
3. That the auditor knows how to find the pc's havingness process (36 Havingness processes).
4. That the havingness process is tested for loosening the needle at the beginning of each time used.
5. That standard HCO Policy Letter Form Sec Checks are used. The last two pages of the Joburg and Form 6 for Scientologists, the childhood check and Form 19 for newcomers, the remainder of the Joburg and other checks for all
6. That the procedure of Twenty-Ten is exactly followed.

## TWENTY-TEN

### A Class II Auditor's Skill

1.  Use Model Session HCO B of 21 December 1961 or as amended.

2.  For every Twenty Minutes of Security Checking run Ten Minutes of Havingness.

3.  If the Security question is not nul when the Twenty Minutes period is ended, say to the pc, "Although there may be withholds remaining on this question, we will now run Havingness."

4.  If an unflat question is left to run havingness, return to it after Ten Minutes of havingness and complete it.

5.  Run by the clock, not by the state of the question or meter on both security questions and havingness.

6.  Be prepared to have to find a new havingness process any time the one being used fails to loosen needle after 8 to 10 commands. Do can squeeze test before first havingness command and after 8 to 10 questions every time havingness process is used.

7.  Do not count time employed in finding a havingness process as part of time havingness is to be run.

8.  Use "Has a withhold been missed on you?" liberally throughout session. Use it heavily in end rudiments.

---

## APPLICATION TO GOALS PROBLEM MASS

The GPM is often curved out of shape by present life enturbulence to such an extent that only lock valences are available for assessing. This gives "scratchy needle" and also can lead to finding only lock valences.

Lock valences are appended to a real GPM 3-D item. They register and even seem to stay in but are actually impossible to run as 3-D items. An item found by an auditor and then proven incorrect by a checker was usually a lock item. If this happens, even the new item found by the checker may also be a lock item.

To uncover correct 3-D items it is better to run Twenty-Ten and other preparatory processes for 75 to 200 hours before attempting to get a 3-D package.

If the whole GPM keys out, one need only find a goal and **Modifier** to key it in again.

Preparatory time is not wasted as the same or greater amount of time is all used up anyway, at a loss to the pc, if a pc has a twisted GPM with earlier lock circuits abundantly keyed in in present time. In such cases (the majority) the preparatory time would be eaten up in keeping the pc in session, let alone improper items.

—————————————

Twenty-Ten is urgently recommended for immediate use in all HGCs.


L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.cden

Remimeo

(Revision in this type style)

(Also issued as an HCO Policy Letter under same date and title.)

# PROCLAMATION

# POWER TO FORGIVE

A Scientology minister who has been duly trained and certified in the Confessional procedure of the Church of Scientology and is in good standing with the Church with his certificates in force, is invested with the power to forgive the admitted sins of an individual to whom he has administered full Confessional procedure.

Confessionals have been part and parcel of religion nearly as long as religion has existed.

It has been broadly recognized down through the ages that only when a person has owned up to his sins can he experience relief from the burden of guilt he carries because of them.

In Scientology we have had, since the early years, procedures whereby an individual is able to confess his withholds and the overt acts underlying them. We have long known that confessing one's overt acts is the first step toward taking responsibility for them and seeking to make things right again.

The acknowledgement that follows each confession in Scientology procedure is an assurance to the person that his confession has been heard.

Such assurance helps him to end cycle on the bad things he has done and unsticks him from a preoccupation with his guilt over them to where he can then put his attention on constructive activities.

That is the purpose of any Confessional.

There is another element that further helps the individual to accomplish this, and that is forgiveness.

Thus, at the end of a Confessional, when it has been fully completed, the Scientology auditor who has administered the Confessional must inform the person that he is forgiven for the sins he has just confessed, and that he is cleared of these sins and free of them.

The statement that is used is:

"By the power invested in me, any overts and withholds you have fully and truthfully told me are forgiven by Scientologists."

A special certificate is to be issued to each Scientology minister who has been trained and certified on the Level II Course or the Confessional Course to administer Confessional procedure, and who is in good standing with the Church with his certificates in force, investing him with the power to forgive the sins confessed to him by an individual in a Confessional session.

Any auditor who is trained to deliver the Ethics Repair List has priority in the issuance of such certificate.


L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jk.nc

C/Ses
Auditors
Tech/Qual
Confessional Course

# PROCLAMATION: POWER TO FORGIVE

## ADDITION

Addition to HCOB 10 Nov 78R, Issue I
Proclamation: Power to Forgive

Reference: BTB 8 Dec 72RC,
The Confessional Repair List (LCRC)

**On any adverse reaction to the proclamation of forgiveness, get the rest of the withhold or repair the withhold session.**

When the Scientology minister doing a Confessional or Ethics Repair List acknowledges the confession and informs the person that his confessed overts and withholds are forgiven, the usual response is instant relief and VGIs. Rarely the person may react adversely such as not being able to accept forgiveness or still feeling bad. This is because something has been missed. The person is still stuck in the shame, blame and regret of the unconfessed overt or withhold and will not feel better until all is told. The Scientology minister encountering this in session must get the rest of the withhold or repair the withhold session. Should the person show this reaction later, outside of session, the folder must be turned in to the C/S to handle immediately.

An incomplete confession can be due to the following errors:

(a)  Did not tell "all."

(b)  Thought of one overt, but told a different overt.

(c)  Told part of a withhold but not the rest.

(d)  An overt or withhold was not taken earlier similar to basic.

(e)  During the session an overt or withhold was restimulated, but not asked for or gotten off.

(f)  There have been errors in the Confessional such as withholds gotten off more than once, false reads, out-TRs, invalidation, evaluation, etc., and these must be cleaned up.

The above categories and the Confessional Repair List are useful to a C/S in correcting any adverse reaction to the Power to Forgive Proclamation, by ensuring that the person gets the full relief and VGIs which invariably accompany a complete confession and forgiveness.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dm.kjm

Remimeo

# CONFESSIONAL REPAIR LIST – LCRD

This is the Prepared List to use for repairing/correcting Confessionals, whether done in session or by a tech trained and qualified HCO terminal, or for repairing other O/W actions such as O/W write-ups.

If, after a Confessional or O/W write-up, the person Red Tags at the examiner or if he gets sick or upset or falls on his head, this list is assessed and handled to straighten the matter out. The repair action would be a 24 Hour repair priority.

If there is a bog *during* a Confessional action, the auditor would first check for Missed Withholds, False Reads and ARC Breaks in that order and handle what he found. (Ref. HCOB 30 Nov 78 CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE.) This action will handle many bogs and resolve the difficulty. If it doesn't, use the following list.

The list can be assessed Method 3 or Method 5. All reading items are handled to EP per the instructions given.

The list should be used with a prefix which acts as a time limiter such as "In this session _____", "On your O/W write-up _____,', etc.

PRECLEAR: _____ DATE:___ _____

AUDITOR: _____

1. **Out Int?** _____
   Check to make sure the read on Int is a valid read and not a protest or false read. If it is a valid read, end off for C/S instructions.

2. **List Error?** _____
   L4BRA and handle.

3. **Did you have an ARC break?** _____
   ARCU, CDEINR E/S to F/N.

4. **Did you have a problem?** _____
   2WC E/S to F/N.

5. **Has a withhold been missed?** _____
   Pull it getting who nearly found out, etc. E/S to F/N.

6. **Did you tell part of a withhold but not the rest?** _____
   Get all of the withhold, flatten it E/S to F/N.

7.   **Did you misdirect the auditor?**          _____
2WC E/S to F/N. Flatten any unflat Confessional chains uncovered.

8.   **Did you avoid telling one overt by giving a different one?**          _____
Pull it, E/S to F/N.

9.   **Were you waiting for a more accurately worded question?**          _____
2WC E/S to F/N. Then pull any overt chains that were missed.

10.   **Did the auditor fail to find out something about you?**          _____
Get what, flatten it E/S to F/N.

11.   **Were you worried about reputation?**          _____
Clean it up 2WC E/S to F/N.

12.   **Are there opinions you don't dare say?**          _____
Get what. 2WC E/S to F/N.

13.   **Are you here for undisclosed reasons?**          _____
Find out why he's here, 2WC E/S to F/N. Note for further handling.

14.   **Was there an earlier overt undisclosed?**          _____
Pull it and clean it up E/S to F/N.

15.   **was a chain of overts not taken back to basic?**          _____
Take it back to basic.

16.   **Are you withholding anything?**          _____
Get what it is, E/S to F/N.

17.   **Did you tell any half-truths?**          _____
Get all of the withhold, flatten it E/S to F/N.

18.   **Was there something the auditor should have known about you that he didn't?**          _____
Get what. Pull it E/S to F/N.

19.   **Did you fail to answer a confessional question?**          _____
Find out which question and handle.

20.   **Is there more that should be known about something?**          _____
Get it all E/S to F/N.

21.   **Was a read missed?**          _____
Find out on what question and handle it to EP.

22.   **Was a reading question not taken up?**          _____
Find out which question and handle it to EP.

23.   **Did the auditor call an f/n when you didn't feel you were f/ning?**          _____
Indicate it if so. 2WC E/S to F/N. Find out what question or overt was being handled and handle it to F/N.

24.   **Did you tell a lie?**          _____
2WC E/S to F/N ensuring you get the lie or what he was covering up by lying and who missed it. Then flatten any unflat questions uncovered if necessary.

25.   **Was a question left unflat?**          _____
Find out which one, indicate it, flatten it.

26. **Did you have to get the same W/Hs off more than once?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N.

27. **Was there a false read?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N. Indicate the false read if so. Can also clean it up with suppress, inval, protest, if needed.

28. **Someone demanded a W/H you didn't have?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N. Indicate it if so.

29. **Was there a false accusation?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N.

30. **Had you told all?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N. Indicate it if so.

31. **Has an overt been protested?**  _____
    Get what it was and get in protest button on it, check for E/S.

32. **Was there a withhold that kept coming up?**  _____
    Get who wouldn't accept it, who said it still read. Indicate false read. 2WC the concern.

33. **Were there overts or withholds that weren't accepted?**  _____
    Get what. Get who wouldn't accept it. Get off any protest and inval, and clean it up E/S to F/N.

34. **Did the auditor not hear or acknowledge what you said?**  _____
    Indicate the BPC. Get what the auditor missed and clean it up E/S to F/N.

35. **Did the auditor get angry at you?**  _____
    If this happened, indicate it is illegal to do so. 2WC E/S to F/N. Clean up any ARC Break to F/N.

36. **Were you afraid of what might happen?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N.

37. **Was there an injustice?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N.

38. **Was there a betrayal?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N.

39. **Was anything suppressed?**  _____
    Clean it up E/S to F/N.

40. **Was anything invalidated?**  _____
    Clean it up E/S to F/N.

41. **Was anything protested?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N.

42. **Was there any evaluation?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N.

43. **Has something been misunderstood?**  _____
    Clean it up, clearing any MU words each to F/N.

44. **Was there something wrong with the meter or cans?**  _____
    False TA handling.

45. **Were you tired or hungry?**  _____
    2WC E/S to F/N.

46.  **Had you recently taken drugs _____ , medicine _____ , alcohol ____ ?**          _____
     2WC E/S to F/N. Note for C/S.

47.  **Had something been overrun?**          _____
     Get what, rehab.

48.  **Was a question overrun?**          _____
     Find out which question and rehab.

49.  **Was an F/N missed?**          _____
     Find out on what and rehab.

50.  **Was some action unnecessary?**          _____
     Find out what it is. Indicate it if so. E/S to F/N.

51.  **Was the purpose of the confessional already fulfilled?**          _____
     2WC to find out, if so. Indicate it if so. Rehab the EP of the Confessional.

52.  **Were you in the middle of another auditing action?**          _____
     2WC E/S to F/N. Note for C/S.

53.  **Is there another confessional list more appropriate to your scene?**          _____
     2WC E/S to F/N. Note for C/S.

54.  **Was there something else wrong?**          _____
     If so and it doesn't clean up on 2WC, GF M5 and handle.

55.  **Has the upset been handled?**          _____
     2WC. If so, indicate it to F/N.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Revisions assisted by
Research and Technical
Compilations Unit

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:RTCU:bk

Remimeo
Class II Auditors

Revised to change the word "sec checking" in the 2<sup>nd</sup> para of the section
"Confessional Procedure" to "Confessionals", to replace in step 13 of
the procedure "In this confessional" by "In this session" and to clarify
how to ask for E/S in step 6 of the procedure.

# CONFESSIONAL

The subject of Security Checks, Prepchecking and the running of overts has a long history in the tech, dating back to the 1950s. There have been many changes to the technology used in relieving the preclear from overts and withholds he has collected on his case. This Qual Board Recommendation Bulletin is intended to give a guideline to the technology as it can be taught on Level 2 of the Academy, based on the working and proven technology of the 1960s, combined with later stable technical data.

The Qual Board recommends to use this method as the BTB 31 Aug 72RB "Confessional Procedure", BTB 5 Dec 72RA "Procedure" and HCOB 30 Nov 78 "Confessional Procedure" introduced the datum that the auditor first had to get a read on a Confessional Question before the preclear was allowed to look at it and anything could be done about. No LRH reference can be found that a Confessional question has to read in the first place, rather the opposite.

The procedure recommended here is also less rote and will enable the preclear to really confront his overts and withholds in a given area and develop his confront on each one by entering into it on a gradient. On the other hand it is simple enough to teach it on Level 2 and does not demand the technical skill and experience necessary to the original handling of Prepchecking given in the HCOBs and lectures of spring 1962 (which was later given up by LRH because it was too difficult to teach but still can be learned and applied by SHSBC students).

The most important reference materials that were used to write this bulletin are:

HCOB 3 Jul 62 REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

BTB 29 Mar 63 SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING

BTB 30 Aug 62 MISSED WITHHOLD HANDLING

HCOB 10 May 62 PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING

HCOB 16 Nov 61 GENERALITIES WON'T DO

HCOB 11 March 63 AUDITING RUNDOWN MISSED WITHHOLDS

HCOB 14 March 71R F/N EVERYTHING

Tape 27 March 63 TV DEMO: SEC CHECKING WITH COMMENTS BY LRH

Tape 23 May 62 TV DEMO - FISH AND FUMBLE - CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES

───────────────────

Today we are giving Confessionals not Sec Checks. Sec Checks were developed to protect orgs from criminals. L Ron Hubbard writes in the HCO PL 26 Aug 68 SECURITY CHECKS ABOLISHED:

"The practice of security checking from security check lists like the "Joburg" has been abolished.

There are several reasons for this:

1.  We have no interest in the secrets and crimes of people and no use for them.

2.  Security checking is often done without regard to the point where the person feels better and so became overrun.

3.  Security checking is often done in disregard of the state of a person's case.

4.  Low level cases do not react on actual crimes and so the "security" furnished is often a false security.

5.  There is public criticism of security checking as a practice.

6.  The existence of lists of crimes in folders often makes it necessary to destroy the folders which may contain other technical data which is constructive and valuable.

7.  If a person *is* a criminal or has overt acts which affect his case, and speaks of them to an auditor of his own volition, the auditor is bound by the Auditor's Code not to publish, use or reveal them.

Nothing in this policy letter alters standard grade processing or rudiments."

───────────────────

In many HCOBs and BTBs it is clearly written that you do not check a Confessional question at first:

### HCOB 6 July 61 ROUTINE 1A:

"If the pc owns up to a question, don't refer to the meter. Don't even look at the meter when asking a Sec question the first time. If the pc then says he hasn't done it, look at the needle and without looking at the pc ask again."

### BTB 4 January 61 Confessional Fundamentals:

"So in confessionals the auditor on any particular question never looks at the E-Meter on that particular question, until the preclear has reached an impasse on that question, and says that he really and truly can think of no further answers. This creates confidence that the Auditor and the preclear are really working together to overwhelm the reactive mind."

**HCOB 3 July 62 Repetitive Prepchecking:**

"Without now looking at the Meter, the auditor asks the Form question repetitively until the preclear says that's all, there are no more answers."

**BTB 29 March 63 Summary of Security Checking:**

"When this has been done, using very good TR 1, you give him the question – **off the meter**."

Later, for unknown reasons, it was demanded that a Sec Check question must read. Starting with BTB 31 Aug 72(RB) CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE, BTB 5 Dec 72(RA) PROCEDURE and HCOB 30 Nov 78(R) CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE:

"With good TR 1 give the person the first question, keeping an eye on the meter and noting any instant read."

Hence the following BTBs and HCOBs, which are not written by L. Ron Hubbard, as far as we know, are *not recommended* to be used in the Ron's Orgs:

- BTB 31 Aug 72(RB) CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE

- BTB 5 Dec 72(RA) PROCEDURE

- HCOB 30 Nov 78(R) CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE

Thus, the stable datum remains that a Confessional question is not supposed to read in the first place. Before using the meter at all you first get off all answers to it.

## CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE

This bulletin is teaching *Confessional Procedure* as it finds its roots in the HCOB 3 July 1962 REPETITIVE PREPCHCKING.

*Prepchecking by the Withhold System* is another method for Confessionals and is taught on a higher level.

0.  Take any appropriate Confessional List, avoid any Sec Check lists which were developed for security reasons specifically. A good general confessional list is HCO Info Ltr of 11 April 1962, "Dynamic Processing Checks" which covers the eight dynamics and can be added to by the C/S.

1.  Give the pc the R-factor that you are going to do a Confessional with him. Clear with him the procedure including the necessary words which are used in the end ruds and the LCRD.

2.  Fly the rudiments.

3.  Take the first question from your confessional list. Clear it.

4. If needed groove in the question. There are a variety of ways to do this, e.g., ask what the question means. What period or time the question covers. What activities would be included. Where the pc has been that might be something to do with the question. If any other people are likely to be involved. In other words you are steering the pc's attention to various parts of his bank and getting him to have a preliminary look.

5. With very good TR 1, you give him the question – **off the meter**. You can forget your anti Q and A drill. You take your pc's answer and bird dog him about it. If he gives you a general answer you ask him for a specific time (or a specific example). **Don't accept motivators**.

    To any overt get the What, When, Where, All and Who. (Who question: Who failed to find out about it? Who nearly found out about it? Who still doesn't know about it?)

6. Go E/S with the overt found, getting the What, When, Where, All and Who on each overt you get, until you get an F/N or the pc can find no earlier one. On going E/S make sure you do not just ask for an earlier similar overt, but to include the wording of the original question, e.g. "Is there an earlier similar time you stole an apple?"

7. Handle all overts the pc gives in the way given in no. 5 and 6.

8. Only when your pc is thoroughly and healthily exhausted do you check the question on the meter. If you have done an excellent job the question will be clean. When there still is an instant read clean it. Help the pc with the meter as needed. If the question neither F/Ns on checking nor shows any instant read, use the buttons suppressed, invalidated and not-ised to get a read which you then can proceed to handle. If you now take up an overt, you must get it to F/N, if necessary by going Earlier Similar, as you now have a reading question.

9. Re-check the question. If it still reads, continue as given above.

10. A question the pc had no answers to from the beginning and neither any instant read needs only to be clean. Otherwise you continue to run the question as given above, re-checking it each time you have finished one chain to F/N, until on re-checking the question itself F/Ns.

11. Continue with the next question of the Confessional list, do steps 3-10 with it.

12. When you encounter any troubles, check (in this order) for Missed Withhold, false read and ARC-break. If you cannot handle it with those, use an LCRD.

13. Before ending the session, fly the end ruds.

    - In this session, have you told any half truth?
    - In this session, have you told any untruth?
    - In this session, is there something you have not told all about?
    - In this session, is there something I do not know?
    - In this session, have you tried in any way to influence the meter?
    - In this session, were you withholding anything?
    - In this session, did you fail to answer a question?

Get each question answered without checking it on the meter and handle all you get, then check the question on the meter and clean it to F/N, if it reads.

———————————————

The auditor has to be familiar with the references quoted at the beginning of this bulletin and should drill the procedure until he has it down pat.

QUAL BOARD of the
RON'S ORG COMMITTEE

As assisted by the

TECH EXAMINATION BOARD
I/C: Max Hauri
2$^{nd}$: Otfried Krumpholz
Dominic O'Brien

ROC QB:TEB:MH:ok