

FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN

FPRD

Black/White Version (suitable for print) (BW, Black/White)
Compiled 26. April 2010

a) Table of Contents, in Checkcheet order:

1. KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
2. TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	9
3. SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY	11
4. AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN.....	13
5. NEW GRADE CHART.....	23
6. SUPPRESSED PCS AND PTS TECH.....	29
7. CATASTROPHES FROM AND REPAIR OF "NO INTEREST" ITEMS	31
8. THE HANDLING OF CASES – GREATEST OVERT.....	33
9. COMMUNICATION, OVERTS AND RESPONSIBILITY	49
10. O/W MODERNIZED AND REVIEWED	71
11. THE PRIOR CONFUSION	95
12. THE FAILED CASE.....	117
13. THE CYCLE OF ACTION: ITS INTERPRETATION ON THE E-METER	141
14. PROBLEMS INTENSIVE	163
15. CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS	187
16. ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR.....	189
17. PSYCHOSIS, NEUROSIS AND PSYCHIATRISTS.....	195
18. SERVICE FACSIMILE THEORY AND EXPANDED DIANETICS	199
19. JUSTIFICATION	201
20. MORE JUSTIFICATIONS	205
21. HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY	207
22. SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF.....	219
23. THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H AND CONTINUOUS OVERT WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS.....	223
24. PSYCHOSIS.....	227
25. PSYCHOSIS, MORE ABOUT	233
26. R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN.....	235
27. CONFESSIONALS AND EXPANDED DIANETICS	241
28. THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT.....	243
29. ROBOTISM.....	247
30. JOKERS AND DEGRADERS.....	253
31. THE GAMBLER	255
32. PREPCHECKING HOW METERS GET INVALIDATED.....	257
33. TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES	259
34. INSTANT READS	291
35. TRAINING DRILLS MUST BE CORRECT.....	295
36. REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN.....	297
37. AUDITING ALLOWED	301
38. E-METER DRILL-22.....	303

39. ROUTINE 2H ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT	305
40. METER READS, SIZE OF	309
41. UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS	313
42. AUDITING BY LISTS REVISED.....	315
43. INSTANT READS	319
44. DEFINITIONS	321
45. PROCEDURE	325
46. INTEGRITY PROCESSING AND OWS REPAIR LIST L1RA	329
47. CONFESSIONAL REPAIR LIST – LCRD	333
48. OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	337
49. CONFESSIONAL FUNDAMENTALS.....	341
50. SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING.....	347
51. DEFINITIONS FPRD COURSE	349
52. CONFESSIONALS.....	353
53. THE TECH AND ETHICS OF INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	355
54. CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS.....	359
55. RUDIMENTS.....	361
56. REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN.....	363
57. INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS MUST BE F/NED	367
58. GENERALITIES WON'T DO.....	369
59. WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL	371
60. HELP THE PC.....	373
61. HAVINGNESS.....	375
62. INTEGRITY PROCESSING INFO.....	377
63. C/SING INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	381
64. FORMULATING INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS	383
65. ORDERING PERSONNEL TO INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	387
66. SECURITY CHECKS ABOLISHED.....	389
67. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN	391
68. THE “LOST TECH” OF HANDLING OVERTS AND EVIL PURPOSES	393
69. THE PRIOR CONFUSION	397
70. A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE.....	399
71. THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION.....	401
72. THE PRIOR CONFUSION: NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH.....	405
73. CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS.....	409
74. AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN	411
75. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN COMMANDS.....	421
76. C/SING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN.....	423
77. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN AUDITOR ERRORS.....	429
78. FLATTENING A PROCESS.....	431
79. PERSISTENT F/N.....	453

80. END PHENOMENA	457
81. ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE	461
82. SERVICE FACSIMILES AND ROCK SLAMS	465
83. ASSESSMENT DRILLS	469
84. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN CORRECTION LIST.....	477
85. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN BASIC FORM.....	489

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	_____	CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS	187
2.	_____	DEFINITIONS FPRD COURSE	349
3.	_____	E-METER DRILL-22.....	303
4.	53-11-15	ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR	189
5.	57-12-18	PSYCHOSIS, NEUROSIS AND PSYCHIATRISTS.....	195
6.	59-11-26	THE HANDLING OF CASES – GREATEST OVERT	33
7.	60-01-21	JUSTIFICATION	201
8.	61-10-03	THE PRIOR CONFUSION	95
9.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE	163
10.	61-11-02	THE PRIOR CONFUSION	397
11.	61-11-09	THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION.....	401
12.	62-01-04	CONFESSONAL FUNDAMENTALS.....	341
13.	62-05-23	PREPCHECKING HOW METERS GET INVALIDATED	257
14.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES	259
15.	62-05-25	INSTANT READS	291
16.	62-05-26	TRAINING DRILLS MUST BE CORRECT	295
17.	62-06-30	A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE.....	399
18.	62-07-02	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN.....	297
19.	62-07-02	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN.....	363
20.	62-07-14	AUDITING ALLOWED	301
21.	63-03-29	SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING.....	347
22.	63-06-25	ROUTINE 2H ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT	305
23.	64-03-01	METER READS, SIZE OF	309
24.	64-03-19	FLATTENING A PROCESS.....	431
25.	64-06-09	THE CYCLE OF ACTION: ITS INTERPRETATION ON THE E-METER	141
26.	64-06-16	COMMUNICATION, OVERTS AND RESPONSIBILITY	49
27.	64-07-02	O/W MODERNIZED AND REVIEWED	71
28.	64-07-08	MORE JUSTIFICATIONS	205
29.	64-10-27	THE FAILED CASE.....	117
30.	65-02-07	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
31.	65-02-14	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY	11
32.	65-04-05	HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY.....	207
33.	65-08-07	SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF	219
34.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT.....	243
35.	68-06-06	INTEGRITY PROCESSING INFO.....	377
36.	68-08-26	SECURITY CHECKS ABOLISHED.....	389
37.	70-05-27	UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS	313
38.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	9
39.	70-10-08	PERSISTENT F/N.....	453

40.	70-11-15	CONFESSIONALS.....	353
41.	70-11-28	PSYCHOSIS	227
42.	71-07-03	AUDITING BY LISTS REVISED.....	315
43.	72-04-20	SUPPRESSED PCS AND PTS TECH.....	29
44.	72-05-10	ROBOTISM.....	247
45.	72-09-13	CATASTROPHES FROM AND REPAIR OF "NO INTEREST" ITEMS	31
46.	72-12-04	DEFINITIONS	321
47.	72-12-05	PROCEDURE	325
48.	72-12-08	INTEGRITY PROCESSING AND O/WS REPAIR LIST L1RA	329
49.	72-12-11	THE TECH AND ETHICS OF INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	355
50.	72-12-12	RUDIMENTS.....	361
51.	72-12-13	INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS MUST BE F/NED	367
52.	72-12-14	GENERALITIES WON'T DO.....	369
53.	72-12-15	WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL	371
54.	72-12-16	HELP THE PC.....	373
55.	72-12-17	HAVINGNESS.....	375
56.	72-12-21	FORMULATING INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS.....	383
57.	72-12-22	ORDERING PERSONNEL TO INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	387
58.	72-12-23	C/SING INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	381
59.	73-12-15	THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H AND CONTINUOUS OVERT WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS.....	223
60.	74-02-15	SERVICE FACSIMILE THEORY AND EXPANDED DIANETICS	199
61.	74-03-21	END PHENOMENA	457
62.	74-08-31	NEW GRADE CHART.....	23
63.	74-12-09	OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	337
64.	76-08-10	R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN.....	235
65.	77-02-05	JOKERS AND DEGRADERS.....	253
66.	77-03-16	THE GAMBLER	255
67.	77-05-09	CONFESSIONALS AND EXPANDED DIANETICS	241
68.	77-05-09	PSYCHOSIS, MORE ABOUT	233
69.	78-08-05	INSTANT READS	319
70.	78-09-05	ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE	461
71.	78-09-06	SERVICE FACSIMILES AND ROCK SLAMS	465
72.	80-04-22	ASSESSMENT DRILLS	469
73.	80-07-23	CONFESSIONAL REPAIR LIST – LCRD	333
74.	84-06-05	FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN	391
75.	84-06-06	THE "LOST TECH" OF HANDLING OVERTS AND EVIL PURPOSES	393
76.	84-06-07	THE PRIOR CONFUSION: NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH.....	405
77.	84-06-08	CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS.....	359
78.	84-06-08	CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS.....	409
79.	84-06-09	AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN.....	13

80.	84-06-09	AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN.....	411
81.	84-06-10	FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN COMMANDS.....	421
82.	84-06-11	C/SING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN.....	423
83.	84-06-12	FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN AUDITOR ERRORS.....	429
84.	84-06-13	FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN CORRECTION LIST.....	477
85.	84-06-14	FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN BASIC FORM.....	489

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1. A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE.....	399
2. ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE	461
3. ASSESSMENT DRILLS	469
4. AUDITING ALLOWED	301
5. AUDITING BY LISTS REVISED.....	315
6. AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN	13
7. AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN	411
8. C/SING INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	381
9. C/SING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN.....	423
10. CATASTROPHES FROM AND REPAIR OF "NO INTEREST" ITEMS	31
11. CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS.....	359
12. CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS.....	409
13. COMMUNICATION, OVERTS AND RESPONSIBILITY	49
14. CONFESSIONAL FUNDAMENTALS.....	341
15. CONFESSIONAL REPAIR LIST - LCRD	333
16. CONFESSIONALS AND EXPANDED DIANETICS	241
17. CONFESSIONALS.....	353
18. CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS	187
19. DEFINITIONS FPRD COURSE	349
20. DEFINITIONS	321
21. E-METER DRILL-22.....	303
22. END PHENOMENA	457
23. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN AUDITOR ERRORS.....	429
24. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN BASIC FORM.....	489
25. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN COMMANDS.....	421
26. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN CORRECTION LIST.....	477
27. FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN	391
28. FLATTENING A PROCESS.....	431
29. FORMULATING INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS.....	383
30. GENERALITIES WON'T DO.....	369
31. HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY	207
32. HAVINGNESS.....	375
33. HELP THE PC.....	373
34. INSTANT READS	291
35. INSTANT READS	319
36. INTEGRITY PROCESSING AND OWS REPAIR LIST L1RA.....	329
37. INTEGRITY PROCESSING INFO.....	377
38. INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS MUST BE F/NED	367
39. JOKERS AND DEGRADERS.....	253

40. JUSTIFICATION	201
41. KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
42. METER READS, SIZE OF	309
43. MORE JUSTIFICATIONS	205
44. NEW GRADE CHART.....	23
45. O/W MODERNIZED AND REVIEWED	71
46. ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR.....	189
47. ORDERING PERSONNEL TO INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	387
48. OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	337
49. PERSISTENT F/N.....	453
50. PREPCHECKING HOW METERS GET INVALIDATED.....	257
51. PROBLEMS INTENSIVE	163
52. PROCEDURE	325
53. PSYCHOSIS.....	227
54. PSYCHOSIS, MORE ABOUT	233
55. PSYCHOSIS, NEUROSIS AND PSYCHIATRISTS.....	195
56. R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN.....	235
57. REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN.....	297
58. REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN.....	363
59. ROBOTISM.....	247
60. ROUTINE 2H ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT	305
61. RUDIMENTS.....	361
62. SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY	11
63. SECURITY CHECKS ABOLISHED.....	389
64. SERVICE FACSIMILE THEORY AND EXPANDED DIANETICS	199
65. SERVICE FACSIMILES AND ROCK SLAMS	465
66. SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING.....	347
67. SUPPRESSED PCS AND PTS TECH.....	29
68. SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF.....	219
69. TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	9
70. THE "LOST TECH" OF HANDLING OVERTS AND EVIL PURPOSES	393
71. THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT.....	243
72. THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H AND CONTINUOUS OVERT WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS.....	223
73. THE CYCLE OF ACTION: ITS INTERPRETATION ON THE E-METER	141
74. THE FAILED CASE.....	117
75. THE GAMBLER	255
76. THE HANDLING OF CASES – GREATEST OVERT.....	33
77. THE PRIOR CONFUSION	397
78. THE PRIOR CONFUSION	95
79. THE PRIOR CONFUSION: NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH.....	405

80. THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION	401
81. THE TECH AND ETHICS OF INTEGRITY PROCESSING.....	355
82. TRAINING DRILLS MUST BE CORRECT	295
83. TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES	259
84. UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS	313
85. WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL	371

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

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

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

ALL LEVELS

KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

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

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

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

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

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

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

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

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

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

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

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

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

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by instructors and supervisors consistently.

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

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

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

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JUNE 1970R
REVISED 9 APRIL 1977

(Revision in this type style)

Remimeo
Applies to all SHs and
Academies
HGCs
Franchises

URGENT AND IMPORTANT

TECHNICAL DEGRADES

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

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

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

These checksheets were not approved by myself, all the material of the academy and SH courses **is** in use.

Such actions as this gave us "Quickie Grades", ARC broke the field and downgraded the academy and SH courses.

A condition of **Treason** or cancellation of certificates or dismissal and a full investigation of the background of any person found guilty, will be activated in the case of anyone committing the following **High Crimes**.

1. Abbreviating an official course in Dianetics and Scientology so as to lose the full theory, processes and effectiveness of the subjects.
2. Adding comments to checksheets or instructions labeling any material "background" or "not used now" or "old" or any similar action which will result in the student not knowing, using, and applying the data in which he is being trained.
3. Employing after 1 Sept 1970 any checksheet for any course not authorized by myself and the SO Organizing Bureau Flag.
4. Failing to strike from any checksheet remaining in use meanwhile any such comments as "historical", "background", "not used", "old", etc. or **verbally stating it to students**.

5. Permitting a pc to attest to more than one grade at a time on the pc's own determinism without hint or evaluation.
6. Running only one process for a lower grade between 0 to IV, where the grade EP has not been attained.
7. Failing to use all processes for a level where the EP has not been attained.
8. Boasting as to speed of delivery in a session, such as "I put in grade zero in three minutes." etc.
9. Shortening time of application of auditing for financial or laborsaving considerations.
10. Acting in any way calculated to lose the technology of Dianetics and Scientology to use or impede its use or shorten its materials or its application.

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.lf.jg

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 FEBRUARY 1965
(Reissued on 7 June 1967, with the word
„instructor” replaced by „supervisor”.)

Remimeo
All Hats
BPI

SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Squirreling is today destructive of a workable system.

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

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:jw.jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCOB BULLETIN OF 9 JUNE 1984RA
Revised 22 March 1996

Remimeo
False Purpose RD Auditors
False Purpose RD C/Ses
Cramming Officers

(Revised to handle compilation errors which gave an incorrect sequence of taking up volunteered evil purposes before pulling the pc's overts, and did not clearly state the EP of an FPRD chain. With this revision the procedure exactly follows LRH tech data and handles the possibility of auditors missing withholds. Revisions in Arial.)

False Purpose Rundown Series 5RA

AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN

References:

LRH TECHNICAL TRAINING FILM TR-14,	CONFESSIONAL TRS
HCOB 30 NOV 78R REV. 10.11.87	CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE
HCOB 5 JUN 84R FPRD SERIES 1R	THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN
REV. 11.01.90	
BOOK: ADVANCED PROCEDURE AND AXIOMS, CHAPTER „POSTULATES“	
HCOB 28. NOV 70 C/S SERIES 22	PSYCHOSIS
HCOB 09. MAY 77 II ExDN SERIES 24	PSYCHOSIS, MORE ABOUT
HCOB 28 FEB 84 C/S SERIES 118	PRETENDED PTS
HCOB 27. MAR 84 C/S SERIES 119	STALLED DIANETICS CLEAR: SOLVED
HCOB 07. JUN 84 FPRD SERIES 3	THE PRIOR CONFUSION: NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH
HCOB 08. JUN 84 FPRD SERIES 4	CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS
HCOB 06. NOV 64	STYLES OF AUDITING (LEVEL II - GUIDING STYLE)
HCOB 21. MAR 74	END PHENOMENA
HCOB 01. MAR 77 II	CONFESSIONAL FORMS

The False Purpose Rundown is a brand-new development in the handling of overts, withholds, evil purposes and destructive intentions. Using this new technique they are traced straight down to their origins and **blown**.

EVIL PURPOSES

An evil purpose is a destructive purpose, intention or postulate.

I discovered in 1970 that evil purposes are the basis of insanity. A person who continuously commits harmful acts has evil purposes. He is prompted by these purposes to commit overts. (Such a person often tries to keep these overts carefully hidden while continuing to commit them.)

This does *not* mean that every pc who gives off an evil purpose is a raving psychotic or a John Dillinger or is bent only on destruction. It does *not* mean that any pc who discovers he has been dramatizing a destructive intention is an SP. What it does mean is that this is an area that will cause (or, more likely, has already caused) a great deal of difficulty or conflict not only for the pc himself but for those around him.

POSTULATES

Evil purposes are, in effect, postulates.

Research on purposes and postulates and their role in the general aberration of a case goes back as early as 1950, and a lot of material exists on this in HCOBs and in basic Dianetics and Scientology books.

In dealing with this subject we are, in reality, dealing with a whole spectrum of what are actually postulates: considerations, intentions, purposes, service facsimiles and computations. These are all postulates.

Such false purposes, false considerations, quasi-evil purposes and the like can sit squarely in the road of attempts to hat or train or get case gain on a person.

NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH

Underlying an overt chain you will very often find an evil purpose or destructive intention. In other words, when you start tracking down O/Ws with E/Ses keeping on a certain type of O/W, you will very likely run into an evil purpose on a case. The underlying evil purpose prompts the person to commit and continue committing harmful acts.

The breakthrough that I have made on this line is in the application of prior confusion tech to the handling of overts and evil purposes. Just as an evil purpose can be found at the bottom of a chain of overts, so can a confusion be found just prior to an evil purpose.

Once the first underlying prior confusion on that chain is located, it is only necessary to have the pc spot the **first moment** of it to cause it to blow.

END PHENOMENA

On the False Purpose Rundown, the auditor's aim is to pull an overt down its E/S chain, then get the underlying evil purpose, and run the purpose back to the prior confusion and earlier times he had that same purpose, getting the prior confusion each time, until the evil purpose blows.

The end phenomena the auditor is going for is finding and blowing the underlying evil purpose, accompanied by an F/N, cognition and VGIs.

Often the pc has a spectacular release on locating and blowing the evil purpose, and sometimes he has such a big win that there is a persistent F/N. but the EP is as above: F/N, cognition, VGIs and evil purpose blown.

AUDITOR REQUIREMENTS

A False Purpose RD auditor must be a graduate of the new HUBBARD FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN AUDITOR course and provenly competent in handling the high-precision tech of the rundown. A prerequisite to this course is the HUBBARD SENIOR SECURITY CHECKER COURSE, where one becomes a highly skilled sec checker. *No one* who has not successfully completed these two courses may audit the False Purpose Rundown.

INDOCTRINATING OF PC

Before starting False Purpose Rundown auditing on a pc, the auditor must first indoctrinate him on it. This is done as follows. Use the Scientology Tech Dictionary in addition to a good English dictionary in clearing words.

1. Clear the words: overt act, overt, withhold, missed withhold, motivator, overt of omission, overt of commission, justification.
2. Clear the basic Confessional procedure of pulling an overt or withhold.
3. Clear why justifications are gotten off as part of pulling an overt, using HCOB 8 June 84, FPRD Series 4, CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS.
4. Clear the words: purpose, intention, impulse, motive, goal, consideration, evil, bad, harmful, destructive, nonsurvival.
5. Clear „evil purpose” in the Tech Dictionary and get the person to give examples using fruit words (e.g. „to smash an apple”). Ensure that he understands the difference between an evil purpose or intention and a good purpose or intention, and that we do not want to run out good intentions.
6. Clear any previous uncleared words on the alphabetical word list for the False Purpose Rundown Correction List.
7. Have the person read HCOB 5 JUNE 84R, FPRD SERIES 1R, FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN, through the section „Research”.
8. Have the person read HCOB 9 JUNE 84RA, FPRD SERIES 5RA, AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN, through the section „NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH”.
9. Have the person read HCOB 7 JUNE 84, FPRD SERIES 3, THE PRIOR CONFUSION: NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH.
10. Clear the steps of False Purpose Rundown auditing procedure on the pc. Have the pc study the diagram of an FPRD chain that is attached to this HCOB.
11. Run through a nonsignificant question to demonstrate the procedure (e.g. „Have you ever smashed an apple?”).
12. Clear the words „computation” and „service facsimile”, as service facs can come up during FPRD auditing. Also clear HCOB 5 SEP 78, ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE, and the service fac brackets.

AUDITING PROCEDURE

STEP A: Auditor clears and asks the question from the False Purpose RD form.

Example: „Do you have an overt on cats?“

On each reading sec check question get the question answered fully and the overt pulled with time, place, form and event and pull any justifications of the overt as part of this. This is done with full sec checking tech).

Take the overt question E/S to F/N, per Confessional procedure.

Note: It is very important in running down these overt chains that the auditor keeps the pc **on** the same chain. Should the pc offer up some other overt or even an evil purpose disrelated to the chain being run, it is just noted in the worksheet for later reference. It would be an auditor error of magnitude to Q&A with such an origination and pursue it in the middle of handling the overt chain that was started with. (REF: HCOB 21 MAR 62, PREPCHECKING DATA, WHEN TO DO A WHAT)

Additional Note: In running an overt E/S, the pc may volunteer an evil purpose that he feels underlies the overt chain. If this occurs, i.e. the pc originates an evil purpose, the auditor should acknowledge the pc and note the item on the worksheet, along with any meter read that occurred. The auditor is to then continue pulling the overt chain, with full use of Sec Checking tech, earlier-similar to F/N.

STEP B: After running the overt E/S to F/N, the auditor asks:

„Was there some evil purpose or destructive intention that prompted you to commit that overt?“

and, if this reads, he pulls the evil purpose or destructive intention. The auditor is expected to put in „Suppress“, „Invalidate“ and other left-hand buttons if this question is not reading.

(If this question [„Was there an evil purpose...“] still does not read despite being thoroughly worked over with buttons, this puts one back at Step A. The original question one started with [e.g., „Do you have an overt on cats?“] is re-checked as per standard confessional procedure. Once that original question F/Ns on being checked, carry on with the next question listed on the False Purpose RD form.)

The purpose or intention should read when the pc gives it. *If there is no read when it is given and the pc is satisfied the wording is correct, the auditor puts in buttons on the item.*

In the event that the pc earlier volunteered the evil purpose that prompted the overt on that chain, and it read (or now reads), the auditor would not now ask this question („Was there some evil purpose...“) but would take the item previously given and run it with Steps C1, C2 and so on.

STEP C: Get the prior confusion which occurred just before that evil purpose. Then ask for and find the first moment of that prior confusion which led to that evil purpose.

This is done as follows:

- C1: The auditor asks:
„**Was there a confusion that occurred just before you had the purpose** _____
(the wording of the evil purpose given by the pc)?”
(Example: „Was there a confusion that occurred just before you had the purpose
‘to kill cats’?”)
and, by using the meter, the auditor finds this confusion.
- C2: The auditor then asks:
„**When was the first moment of that confusion?**“
and gets the pc to find this.
- STEP D: Ask the pc:
„**Was there an earlier time you had the purpose** _____ (the wording of the
evil purpose given by the pc)?”
(Example: „Was there an earlier time you had the purpose ‘to kill cats’?”)
and find this earlier time the pc had that purpose.
What is being looked for is **not** an earlier similar purpose, but an earlier time the
pc had **that same exact purpose**.
- STEP E: Find the **confusion prior to that time** as per steps C1 and C2 above, and proceed
to Step D.
- STEP F: The auditor continues going earlier as per steps D and E, until the pc has found
the first moment of the first confusion which led to **that** evil purpose. At that point
the evil purpose should blow, accompanied by F/N, cognition and VGIs.
- STEP G: If all steps A through F have been done yet there is still no EP, assess and handle
a False Purpose RD Correction List.
Once that question from the FPRD form has been taken to EP, the auditor re-
checks it and, if reading, repeats Steps A to G on it. Once that questions F/Ns on
checking, the next question on the form is taken up and handled with Steps A to
G.

FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN FORMS

The False Purpose Rundown procedure utilizes a form that consists of a series of Sec Check questions related to a specific subject or area. There are different False Purpose RD forms which the C/S may include in the pc’s program. Whatever form is used, the auditor does the whole form on the pc. Every question is cleared and checked on the meter as per basic sec checking tech.

Some of the questions on the form ask for overts (e.g., „Have you ever stolen materials from a school?”) and other questions ask directly for evil purposes and destructive intentions (e.g. „Have you had an evil purpose towards a school teacher?”).

On questions which ask for an overt, one pulls the overt fully and then takes the question E/S to F/N. Then the evil purpose is asked for (Step B).

On questions which ask directly for an evil purpose or destructive intention, the auditor must first get the question answered, pulling what the evil purpose is, and then pull the pc's overts of dramatizing that purpose. This is done regardless of what the evil purpose is. He may not have carried out that purpose fully, but he did something to dramatize it or committed some overt that is directly associated with that purpose. The auditor finds and pulls the overt, and gets any E/S overt by asking, „Is there an earlier time you (type of overt just pulled)?” (or a similarly worded question that keeps the pc on that chain). He pulls the overt chain E/S to F/N. Then the evil purpose is handled as per Step C.

For example, on the question „Have you had an evil purpose towards a school teacher?” the auditor pulls the reading evil purpose „to hit the teacher”. Having done that, the auditor must then pull the overts committed in dramatizing the purpose „to hit the teacher”. The auditor would first check to see if the pc did hit a teacher. In this example, the pc did not hit a teacher, but he did dramatize that purpose by slashing the tires of a teacher's car. That overt is pulled and taken E/S overt per Step A. Then the auditor runs the evil purpose „to hit the teacher” with Steps C1, C2 and so on.

The whole aim in doing this rundown is to locate overts and evil purposes on the case and fully blow them. These two types of sec check questions give two different approaches to getting off a person's overts, withholds and underlying evil intentions.

STYLE OF AUDITING

The style of auditing used on the False Purpose RD is Level II, Guiding Style. The auditor must be well drilled in this style of auditing to be successful with the rundown.

GOOD INTENTIONS

Only evil or destructive intentions are picked up and handled in this auditing. **Do not** run good intentions.

PAST TRACK

Do not limit the pc to this lifetime when going E/S on overts or when asking for an earlier time he had that evil purpose. *Almost all evil purposes are whole track.*

However, the FPRD auditor must be alert to any attempt by a pc to dive to a whole track overt when a question is asked, in an effort to avoid giving off a this-lifetime overt. One handles this as per standard Sec Checking tech as given in HCOB 30 Nov 78R CONFES-SIONAL PROCEDURE.

LISTING

By following the False Purpose RD procedure exactly, the auditor should be able to easily find and pull the pc's evil purposes. The pc is not asked listing questions, nor is L&N any part of the procedure. But it is possible that a pc *could* start listing and the auditor must be able to recognize and handle such a situation per standard listing tech.

The auditor would handle an out list per HCOB 11 APR 77, LIST ERRORS, CORRECTION OF, and HCOB 17 MAR 74, TWC, USING WRONG QUESTIONS.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON SERVICE FACS

Upon reviewing the session worksheets the C/S may find that a service fac was found and F/Ned, but not fully blown. In such an instance the C/S can order the service fac run in the R3SC brackets in a later session, to fully blow it. It is the auditors responsibility to ensure the item reads, if it isn't reading, it is not run.

However, *if one is doing a False Purpose RD Correction List* and in doing so locates a reading service fac, *the auditor should run it out with R3SC in that session.*

REPAIR

During a chain if the auditor hits an impasse, it is expected that he would apply the appropriate sec checking tools right then and there to handle: Murder routine, checking for a missed withhold, use of buttons, etc.

If there is some bog that the auditor is unable to rapidly handle using the routine sec check debug tools, a False Purpose Rundown Correction List should be assessed and handled.

SUMMARY

The importance of using this tech of purposes and considerations is immeasurable.


It can make the difference between complete failure and successful hatting; between a hell-bound existence and a pleasurable productive life.

This tech is for use. Use it well.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Compilation assisted by LRH
Technical Research and Compila-
tion

LRH:RTRC:amg



sgsdfg

afasdfasdfasdfasdf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 AUGUST 1974RA
RE-REVISED 9 APRIL 1977

Remimeo
Tech Secs
Auditors
Registrars

(Revisions in this type style)

Cancels
HCOB 30 Oct 71
Triple Grades vs Expanded

URGENT

C/S Series 93RA

NEW GRADE CHART

The “**New**” thing to do is the Grade Chart. Everything you are doing should contribute to getting the pc up the Bridge. **This** is the Bridge.

There is a new Grade Chart being prepared which has some changes in it, based on recent discoveries. It is urgent that you know of these in advance.

DRUG RUNDOWN

The effects of an omitted or incomplete Drug RD are severe enough to deny a person any lasting case gain.

This is covered in HCOB 31 May 74 “Unhandled Drugs and Ethics.” Some orgs have taken this HCOB so literally however, that they have taken pcs off Adv Cses Grades, refused to do assists on ill pcs and some showed pcs the HCOB and invaled their gains.

This was not the intention of the HCOB. The C/S Series remain valid.

The Drug RD belongs on the Grade Chart after Life Repair. A Drug RD cannot be done over out ruds and a Life Repair may be necessary to get in a pc’s ruds.

Life Repair is not a prerequisite for the Drug RD, however, and if done is not to be dragged out intensive after intensive. In some cases a pc could not complete Life Repair without a Drug RD.

Following the Drug RD is ARC S/W, then the rest of Dianetics to completion.

QUAD VS EXPANDED GRADES

Expanded Grades are **not** a prerequisite for Power. They may come anywhere on a pc's program as given in HCOB 5 April 77 "Expanded Grades" including after OT III. Quad Grades are a prerequisite for Power.

EXPANDED DIANETICS

Ex Dn by the way belongs ideally after Grade IV Expanded, but can be done after Dn, after Power but before Solo, and after OT III or any single OT Level above OT III.

Some pcs R/S and have evil purposes to do others in. But no Grade 0 or Grade I or Grade II. What others? Martians?

"Got to secretly do everybody in" probably applies to Apeville some long date ago and he's never come up to PT.

The best answer is to bring the pc up the Grade Chart to Grade IV *then* do his Ex Dn unless the pc would need XDN to make it at all. (See HCOB 15 Apr 72 "Expanded Dianetics Series 1R" and HCOB 29 Nov 70 "C/S Series 22.")

The prerequisites for Ex Dn are covered on HCOB 23 April 74R "Ex Dn Series 22R, Expanded Dianetics Requisites."

GRADE II

Some orgs specialize in Grade II, especially on org staff. The pc is always getting Confessionals or his O/Ws pulled on so and so.

If you look on the Grade Chart you will find withholds and overts are Grade **Two**.

Below Grade Two lies Grade I (Problems) and Grade Zero (Communications). And below that is Dianetics and at the bottom end of Dianetics is the drug handling.

Now how do you expect a fellow who has unhandled drugs (or omitted drug items because of "no interest") to even know (no Grade 0) that other people are around or that (Grade I) he is caved in with problems he's never cognited on?

And he's supposed to have enough responsibility to answer up on Grade II? With real overts and withholds?

This does not mean you must never Sec Check. It does mean that Sec Checks are no substitute for auditing or guarantee of innocence.

Grades are grades and the Grade Chart sequence is correct.

SOLO SET-UPS

Set-ups for Solo are fully covered on HCOB 8 Jan 72RC, Solo C/S Series 11RC.

This will be included as part of Solo on the Grade Chart as it is a vital step.

Pcs won't make it on Solo if they aren't set up.

FULL LIST

Here's the full list of grades showing where the various RDs now offered fit.

Group Processing – not mandatory or a prerequisite.

Life Repair – as needed but not prerequisite for Drug RD. To get ruds in on life.

Drug RD, means:

- TRs 0-4, 6-9 – mandatory for a druggie currently on drugs, **flat**.
- Full C/S-1 – where not done. To fully educate pc.
- Objectives – Full battery to full EPs per basic books and early HCOBs on them.
- Class VIII Drug Handling – list and rehab all drugs, 3 way recalls, secondaries and engrams of taking and giving drugs.
- AESPs on each reading drug – listed separately and handled with R3R, each drug to full F/N assessment of drug list.
- “No Interest” drug items – all reading ones run where they exist.
- Prior Assessment – AESPs listed separately and run R3R, prior to first drug or alcohol taken.

ARC S/W Quad.

Dianetics, means:

- C/S 54 – complete handling of Pc Assessment Form begun with Drug RD.
- Health Form – fully handled to full F/N assessment.

Quad Grade 0 – as issued.

Quad Grade I – as issued.

Quad Grade II – as issued.

Quad Grade III – as issued.

Quad Grade IV – as issued.

Ex Dn – not mandatory except where pc is a low OCA, an R/Ser (2%), chronically ill or psycho. Means:

- Set-ups – per HCOB 23 April 74R, “Ex Dn Series 22R.”
- OCA Left Side Handling – as issued.

- OCA Right Side Handling – as issued.
- All Ev Purps and R/Ses **fully** handled with no shortcuts.

Expanded Grades – Ideally can go after Ex Dn and before Power, but is not a prerequisite for Power (Quad Grades are a prerequisite). Can come after Drug RD, Full Dn RD, Quad Grades, Ex Dn, Power (but before Solo), after OT III or any single OT level on up.

Power Processing – Grade IV Quad and Drug RD required and as per the Power Checklist.

Solo Grade VI, means:

- Solo Set-ups – done at SH or AO per Solo C/S Series 11RC.
- Solo Auditor's Course.
- Solo Audit Grade VI materials.

Clearing Course

OT I

OT II

OT III

OT VII Processes

OT III Expanded

OT IV

OT V

OT VI

FULL OT VII Verification

OT VIII – when issued.

OT IX on up.

PROGRAMMING

The C/S Series, especially the early HCOBs, numbers 1-13RA, fully cover the use of the Grade Chart in programming.

The Grade Chart is the Basic Programme of a pc.

This datum has been neglected in some orgs, who have specialized in the new RDs developed since '71.

With refinement of repair and corrective actions and the release of new RDs, some may have forgotten that repair is only done to get off the overwhelm so that you can put the pc back on the Grade Chart.

SUMMARY

I thought I'd better fill you in on these changes and how the new Grade Chart lines up. Make full use of this Chart with C/S Series programming tech in and your pcs will fly. Here's to lots of case gain and rave success stories.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

As assisted by

CS-5

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

of the

CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:JE:nt.lf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

Expanded Dianetics Series 4

(Adds C/S Series 76 to HGDS checksheet)

SUPPRESSED PCS AND PTS TECH

(PTS means Potential Trouble Source which itself means a person connected to a Suppressive Person.)

As the Dianetic Specialist (HGDS) is often called upon to handle pcs who are not well, it is vital that he knows all about and can use "PTS Tech".

All sick persons are PTS.

All pcs who rollercoaster (regularly lose gains) are PTS.

Suppressive persons are themselves PTS to themselves.

If a Dianetic Specialist does not know this, have reality upon it and use it, he will have loses on pcs he need not have.

There is considerable *Administrative* Tech connected with this subject of PTS and there is a special Rundown which handles PTS people.

They get handled *if* the auditor knows his PTS tech, if he audits well and if he uses both the auditing and Administrative Tech to handle.

The Administrative Tech requires an interview, usually by the Director of Processing or Ethics Officer and the person is required to handle the PTS situation itself *before* being audited. A check for stability is also made after being audited on the PTS Rundown.

For this reason, HCO B 17 April 72 and all the checksheet of HCO P/L 31 May 71 must be fully known to the Dianetic Specialist.

HCO B 17 April 72 is also C/S Series 76 so as to be sure that Case Supervisors handle the Admin and C/Sing correctly.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 13 SEPTEMBER 1972
(Amended & Reissued 28 March 1974
– only change is Series No.)

Remimeo
All Dn & Ex Dn
Auditors
Class VIII
C/Ses

DIANETICS

Expanded Dianetics Series 7

C/S Series 85

**CATASTROPHES FROM AND REPAIR
OF “NO INTEREST” ITEMS**

I have done a review of several failed cases which blew or went bad after auditing.

The common factor in every one was case by-passed due to “no interest”.

The auditor finds a reading drug item or an evil purpose and proposes to run R3R on it. The auditor asks if the pc is interested in running it. The pc says, “No.” The auditor does not run it. **Bang**, we have a **By-Passed Case**.

The pc will blow or go sour or not recover.

One of these cases was unchanged after “a drug rundown”. He had a pair of eyes that looked like blank discs. Check of folder showed all major drug items “not run due to no interest”. The solution was to recover the lists, run the items that had read R3R triple and complete the case.

Another one blew. His folder was examined. Every evil purpose had been left unrun! Of the items from the “Wants Handled Rundown” the intentions were mislisted. The drug rundown failed due to “no interest”.

Each flubbed case I am finding has had his drug items and evil purposes left unrun on R3R due to “no interest”.

So don’t ask for interest on intentions, evil purposes and drug items.

If they read, run them!

REPAIR

1. On any stumbling case that has had a "drug rundown" or Expanded Dianetics get the Folder FESed to see if reading items were left unrun on R3R Triple. List them chronologically, early to late.
2. Get the case back, with an R factor of "Incomplete".
3. Run every one of those unrun drug items, intentions and Evil Purposes.
4. If the items don't now read, then get in Suppress and Invalidate on them.
5. If the case bogs do L3RD Method 5 and Handle on that chain only.
6. Go on with the action and complete it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.ntm.rd

THE HANDLING OF CASES – GREATEST OVERT

A lecture given on 26 November 1959

Thank you.

And here we are at the 28th lecture, Melbourne ACC.

Your progress at large is pretty fair thanks to your excellent Instructors in whom I have every confidence.

Good! Now with all due respect to that, now I want to tell you what I'm not satisfied with.

Aside from your case gains, which we won't worry about because there are no cases in this class, your general performance of the TRs which is pretty bad and your rather diffident approach – ARC breaks going all over the place – you're neither as clever nor as poised as I want to see you.

You're doing all right in these other categories, I'm just teasing you. But I'm not teasing you now, this could go for any Scientologist, but his cleverness and confidence, willingness to tackle cases and so forth, could *definitely*, definitely be improved. Hardly anybody here whose general approach and willingness just to tackle them head-on and so on couldn't be improved.

You go along the lines of improving your technical accuracy, your accuracy in giving acknowledgments and that sort of thing, actually some of these demonstrations I've given you here have technical errors in them. The last demonstration I gave you had an ARC break in it.

Not necessarily the best auditing I do by a long ways. I actually wasn't trying to audit, I was trying to show you something. I was trying to do something specific with a case which is just a little bit different – no alibi.

But you go in the direction of making sure that you get an acknowledgment in every time and making sure that you sit there every time and hold your E-Meter just right every time and go – all of your TRs every time and all of this every time, and so forth and you're not measuring up to my standards. It's something for you to think about. You're not measuring up to my standards.

We take all those things for granted. That's just something that you ought to be able to do or not do as the case may be. You understand? Because auditing, technically, is what you can get away with.

Now, let's take up your state of mind and general handling of cases and let's find fault with that, shall we? *Audience: Yes.*

I never saw such an incurious lot of people. I'm not trying to restimulate your curiosity but I'm just saying, "Well, I never!" You're not curious enough. You just aren't.

Now, listen to me. Every case is a story. A very long story. A very complicated story with tremendous plot twists. And not one single case you will ever face is an easy case. Just get over thinking they are or that you'll someday find one or that someday by some necromancy I conduct in a laboratory someplace, I will push a button, all cases will become easy cases and you simply stand off and chant at them with a small facsimile of an E-Meter in your hand, and they will all go Clear. They aren't! They aren't! That isn't the way cases are.

All cases are rough cases.

Now, you as auditors shouldn't be setting any example as a rough case. But, you'll find out that every case has its doglegs, and its zigs, and its zags, and its fantastic complications.

And if you're not interested or watching, and if you don't know what those cases are, you're going to miss! And miss! And miss! And miss! And then you're going to stick yourself on the track by blaming Ron! Now, auditing is your ability to read and straighten out a pc. How do you suppose anybody could ever fix a radio set without ever looking in the radio set? That would be pretty rough, wouldn't it? Well, now we could get around this by training a lot of blind mice to run on a certain pattern and then never wiring a radio set up in any other way but that.

Now, minds consist basically of postulates which, of course, are also considerations and agreements, matter, energy, space, time and forms. That's what minds are. That's all they are.

And a thetan is just a thetan. And the thing he does best and worst is create – postulates, considerations, agreements, matter, energy, space, time and forms and the significance and complications thereof. Now, that's all! But boy, the things he can do with that simple number of factors exceed anything any electronic brain will ever turn out as a number. That's for sure – the complications.

Now, basically, the only reason a case is a case, is because it's an overt act. That's simple enough, isn't it? And the basics you're operating with are simple enough. Well, for God sakes, learn *those* well, so the complications of these various basics that you get into in cases don't throw you for a loop! And you say, "Well, there must be something else." You've lost the second you say there must be something else.

Now the most basic overt act there is is to make somebody guilty of an overt act. That is the most fundamental overt act there is. It's to make somebody guilty of an overt act.

Hence we get victim with its tremendous power. Because victim is an effort to get the perpetrator to duplicate the horrible state of the victim.

But all a victim is trying to do is to make somebody else guilty of an overt act. So that you could run a whole case with this one command: “Think of someone you’ve made guilty of an overt act.” Or any variation thereof.

That’s very complicated. You see, that’s the apparent effect-point has flipped to a cause point.

But that’s the basic cause-point of aberration.

Causing somebody else to be guilty of an overt act is the most overt act one can overt.

And these cases sit in front of you as a demonstration of how to make other people guilty of an overt act. And that’s all a case is.

It’s a composite of efforts to make other people guilty of an overt act, culminating in the almost perfect combination of how to make people guilty of overt acts.

That sounds pretty horrible, doesn’t it? That’s what a case is. That’s what a reactive bank is built out of and that’s its basic postulates and considerations – is how to make somebody else guilty of an overt act.

Why do the police arrest people? That’s to show those people that their acts are overt acts.

That’s why police arrest people.

Why have you struck an animal or another human being? Why? Why have you struck this person? That’s to make him guilty. So much so that if you strike some people, they know they’ve done something. See? That’s just automatic. You hit them, they know they’ve done something. See? They feel guilty at once – *bing!* You say, “*Bang! Bang!*” They say not “What have I done?” but “I have done something.” See? So much stimulus-response.

Now, you bang at a case and he knows he’s done something. You bang at a case too hard and he assumes too hard that he’s done something. Right? *Audience: Yes.*

Now the reason they put people in prisons is to make them aware that they’ve done something. See? The reason they beat people, kick people and so forth is to make them realize they’ve done something.

Well, the reason people get sick is to make somebody else realize he’s done something.

And we get the old service facsimile. But let’s redefine service facsimile as that facsimile most used to make other people realize they are guilty of overt acts.

So therefore, a service facsimile is totally itself an overt act. You recognize it as such and when you start auditing it out of somebody, you realize you’re taking away from him the source of his overt acts and you’re removing one more overt act from the world, so you’ll think you’re doing a good thing – and by golly, you are! Get the idea? But it’s much better –

that was Dianetics style – now, it's much better Scientologically to get the person over doing this.

See, why is everybody running around trying to make everybody else guilty of having done an overt act? Well, you'd say this is a social discipline. It may be social discipline but it's pretty crazy.

Now every case that sits down in your auditing chair divides into two categories, two broad categories: Those who are obsessively going to make you guilty of an overt act, as a highly specialized case, this is what we call the ARC breaky case. All he's trying to do is make you guilty of an overt act. Your auditing of him makes you guilty of an overt act, see? And that's his total mission! And everything he does and puts up is to make you guilty of an overt act! That's the person who is ARC breaking at *you*. He's trying to make you guilty of an overt act.

So after a while, you begin to consider auditing an overt act and you stop auditing. Do you understand? Because these people have been sitting there convincing you that it was an overt act.

You get too many of these cases and the next thing you know, why, you fall for it, and you say, "Well, I'm guilty of an overt act. Auditing is an overt act and I shouldn't be plowing into minds this way. And I shouldn't be doing this because it is an overt act. And look what I did to poor Jehesubu. Smashed her, I did, ruined her completely. She went away from there and spun for 19 days. So, it's a hell of an overt act, see?" Why do you think she spun? Made you guilty of an overt act, right? Well, you get a *good* reality on that one and you'll never be fooled again along this line. It's the *pc*'s overts against the auditor that make the thing aberrated.

Now of course, an auditor can throw a bunch of overts against the *pc* in controlling the overts which the *pc* is throwing against the auditor and the auditor can play this game in reverse.

Every once in a while you'll find yourself doing Code breaks and you say, "Well, I didn't intend to do a Code break." Yet you did one! Well, how'd you Code break? Well, it was an ARC break as far as the *pc* was concerned, but your Code break was entirely prompted by an effort to handle the overts of the *pc*. And you tried to handle the overts of the *pc*, you became guilty of an overt yourself. So, you get this one sawing back and forth and it blows you out of auditing and blows people out of session, and gets everything going round and round because the only source of a blow is too many overts – by the *pc* – not the auditor.

And the next thing you know, you haven't got auditing in progress, you've got a contest in progress by which the auditor is trying to convince the *pc* that the *pc* is guilty of an overt act, and the *pc* is trying to convince the auditor that the auditor's guilty of an overt act. And nobody wins on this one. Nobody at all. Nobody would ever win on this one.

Now, let's be very factual about this. There was a good reason for man to begin this one.

He was actually trying to protect others more than himself.

You see, it's impossible for a thetan ever to get trapped on a theta trap. It's only possible for a thetan to believe that other thetans get trapped on a theta trap and then commit an overt act against people who plant theta traps which, of course, makes him then get caught on theta traps. You get the circuitous thing that it has to be.

There is no trap will ever be made, none could ever be constructed – the way the rationale goes of the mind – no trap could ever be made of any kind that would just plain, ordinary catch people. See? Or just ordinary, just plain catch thetans. A thetan wouldn't stick on one! There has to be this other rationale. You see, he has to believe thetans get stuck on it. And then he has to have overts against people that put them up or overts against traps, or he himself has to start this thing going so that he puts up traps and gets people to believe that people get stuck on them and then to get them to do overts against him, so that they get caught on the traps.

See, that's the only way a theta trap will operate. Take it from me. A person can never be trapped in anything that he has no overt act against. It just isn't possible to be trapped by something you have no overt act against. That's it.

A criminal is perpetually being arrested by the police. Perpetually, *snap-snap-snap!* We had one person who – we didn't have him but he was around – and one fine day he was standing on a street corner and son-of-a-gun if a couple of cops – he was just standing on a street corner, it was broad daylight and everything – a couple of cops come up, take him, put him in a squad car and take him down and interrogate him about something or other that they didn't even know what it was. They just knew the thing to do was to pick him up, and take him down to the jailhouse. They just knew that. They just looked at him. It wasn't even that he flinched or anything, he just – *bang!* Well now this fellow, of course, has tremendous overts against cops. And his overts against cops eventually add up to a total overtness against cops which make him stick anyplace cops say. See, that is the place to stick – jail.

You're never going to get a criminal in any other frame of mind than being a criminal by putting him in prison. You cannot put criminals in prison and have anything happen. They remain criminals. They are confirmed as criminals because now they know that it works.

It's a very, very dull thing, a very, very dull thing for police to put somebody in jail for two years and then let him out, and then put him in jail and let him out, and put him in jail – because they're going to put him in jail a second time. And they put him in jail again and again and again and again and again and again. Most fabulous thing you ever watched.

There are people who have never been arrested who are guilty of overt acts against the society but they kind of punish themselves. But this game called “cops and robbers” is a game which plays itself off in an exact way but it has to do not with the society at large. The criminal goes around, makes sure that there's some police handy and robs a store. See, he plots it all out.

He always leaves clues. Why, Sherlock Holmes never could have operated if it hadn't have been for this basic mechanism. The criminal always walks in carefully, looks all around, finds a nice, wide place on the glass showcase and takes his thumb and rolls a print off on it. *Always* does.

All a cop has to do is look for where the criminal wrote his name and address. And police work is as good as you can find the name and address on the crime. That's about all it is. It's fantastic.

People don't even commit crimes to get anything. They go in, they – they get five dollars or something like that off of somebody, or two pounds or something, and they – they get that and – but they don't use it for anything. They take it out and throw it away.

They go and rob a hock shop, something like that, they take all the clocks and junk they got – you'd think they'd sell them for money or something like that. They don't, they leave them in garbage cans and give them to girlfriends and break them up and pick their teeth with them. It's the most fantastic thing you ever saw.

And they'll steal some of the most unlikely objects. And they'll do some of the most unlikely things. It drives cops almost batty trying to outguess these super-unpredictable people.

And the cops still think that men steal money because they want money. That isn't true. Men steal money because they want to go to jail. Because those who steal money because they want money are never detected by cops.

Now, here is this oddity of overt acts versus a particular segment of the society. And if you were to take the police out of the society, then the people who – and just remove the police from the society totally, no police in the society at all. I know this would be pretty gruesome in the present state but you do that and you'd have an awful lot of criminals walking around trying to find out who they attack now.

See, they'd be very puzzled, and they'd be very upset, and they wouldn't know what to do. Because the fine course of human affairs has been totally interrupted. There's no jail to go to, there's no cop to spit at. See, here we go.

If you ever see a criminal, you face him with a cop, he'll go into one or two states: He'll absolutely go ravaging mad, or he'll totally succumb and go into utter propitiation and terror.

See, it's a violent reaction against law and order.

Now, similarly, if we put a great deal many more police in the society than we have, we have people all of a sudden going into criminal activities who weren't going in before. There's enough police around to make lots of overt acts against. See? It's this crazy game starts up. You get the idea? So that law and order shouldn't be this game. Law and order should actually be picking up the people in the society who are guilty of overt acts against it and rehabilitating them.

That's – would be the only effective police work that anybody ever did.

Similarly, similarly, insanity is based on this fact. You get people – will actually go to a psychiatrist and get an electric shock and go back the next day and get an electric shock and be told to report at ten thirty on next Tuesday and they will be right there to get another electric shock even though it busts their spine every time. It's the wildest thing you ever saw – the

repeater along this line. Guilty of an overt act in that direction and it just keeps on being guilty of overt acts in that direction one way or the other.

Now, insanity is the below death manifestation of “Look what you’ve done to me.” See? Insanity is below death. And you start curing up the insane or start bringing them up through the band, they start talking about dying, committing suicide and so on.

This was something that Freud knew nothing about and it almost wrecked him. They have carefully kept very, very secret the tremendous number of people who undergo psycho-analytic treatment who commit suicide in the first three months. It is an enormous number, big percentages.

The psychoanalyst always says, “He came to me too late.” Now, if he got any effect at all, he started bringing people up through death. Well, he has to bring them up through death rapidly enough so that the individual starts to live.

Insanity, however, is a manifestation or mechanism put up to show people they’ve been guilty of being cruel – being cruel, unreasonable, thoughtless and so forth.

You’ll find it manifesting itself in such a place as – well, more wealthy families are victimized by it, or political families are more victimized by it than poor families. Because a poor family, can – a boy can always come along and shuffle by in some terribly disreputable shoes. See? But how about the rich man’s son? He can’t drive by in his Cadillac convertible to show the old man that the old man is guilty of an overt act. See? He can’t show the old man is guilty of an overt act. It’s not possible. See, MESTwise he’s cared for in this way and that and they very often go into neurosis or psychosis or something of the sort to show how mean they were.

They’ve been out-succumbed, you might say, or something of the sort.

Now, this is a crazy thing about insanity, that it is as crazy in its rationale as it is. And there’s nothing to understand about insanity except that it *is* a method of convincing someone they have been guilty of an overt act – and that is *what* insanity is.

Now, oddly enough, and horribly enough, the person may be way, way, way back down the track, they’re trying to convince. The person they’re trying to convince, basically and originally may not be in PT at all. But there must be people in PT who are substitutes for those past people, otherwise the manifestation doesn’t come about.

So, you can always find somebody in present time that the person who is manifesting insanity *is* trying like mad to convince they’ve been guilty of an overt act. See, these would be the late locks on the same dramatization. But insanity can be a winning dramatization in this particular fashion since it carries with it no responsibility and so forth. Probably has its own ideas and payments, and so on, but you don’t have to understand its complications beyond just this one complication: that insanity is a demonstration to somebody else that they’ve been guilty of an overt act and is the basic mechanism that shows they have driven them to a point where they can’t even die. They’re really gone. They’ve lost their reason. See, they went! Now, to cure an insane person would sound then theoretically and technically very easy.

All you do is – have to locate those people. You just have to locate those people that the insane person was trying to convince somewhere on the track that those are the people were guilty of an overt act. See? It's a last protest. Let's say some fellow has been very fond of a doll body or something like this, and he has lots of overts against doll bodies so he can lose this doll body. And somebody starts zapping and pounding up this doll body and punching it and so forth, and it's getting beyond the state of repair. And this fellow starts to then act in an aberrated and protesting fashion of "Look at what you've done to me, you shouldn't have done it," sort of a situation, you see. And they keep on punishing the doll body, and they keep on mishmashing it up, and he's identified with the doll body, and he keeps showing them more and more and more.

He's gone past the point of dying. He can't die. He figures out that he can't exteriorize.

That wouldn't show anybody anything – that's the easy way out – so he just stays in there and goes mad. And this proves to those people conclusively that they're guilty of an overt act of great overtness.

Now, in view of the fact that that is a below death mechanism, an auditor is peculiarly susceptible to being dragged in with it. When the pc starts to look like he's spinning – or starts to look like he's dying first – why, the auditor's liable to feel that he's doing something too extreme and is guilty of an overt act. That's just the double mechanism, see, at work.

The auditor's restimulated in his former beliefs and convictions that he has driven somebody insane or killed them, you see? He – that's restimulated, so he believes he's doing something bad to the pc and you get this thing going back and forth.

If the pc has been driven below death – well below death too many times – why the pc will start to spin as a protest to auditing and that sort of thing. Therefore you have to take some care that the mechanism isn't accidentally or artificially turned on. The mechanism is best turned on by disobediences of the Auditor's Code one way or the other. Particularly those lines that have to do with eating and sleeping and times of auditing and that sort of thing. He'd have to have some line-up on that.

However – however, this person is trying to convince the other person, originally and early on the track just as a gag. See, a person was trying to convince other people just as a game, you see. But that goes into a (quote) real rationale (unquote) or a "reality," (unquote) and people actually feel, and hurt and so forth, and their pains and hurts and so forth are supposed to telegraph to the other people they've been guilty of an overt act.

As a matter of fact it's very funny what you can do to restimulate overts – you sometimes miss predicting them. A dog comes up to you and growls, you say, "Ow! Ow! Ow!" and start backing off and so forth. Why, if he's a friend of yours, why, he'll look at you very hurt, you know, like "I didn't mean to do that, I was just playing," you know, that sort of thing.

However, if he's a very low-scale dog, he will come up high enough to become very savage! And you start backing off and say, "Ow! Ow! Don't! Don't! Don't!" and so on, why, it just makes him as brave as brave can be. You know, he starts redramatizing overt acts against people. And he'll come over – all over the top of you. See? You can startle a little

baby half out of his wits. A little baby grabs hold of your finger or something like that, or is twisting your finger around and say, “Ow! Ow! Don’t!” you know? The baby is liable to look at you and say, “What, I’m guilty of an overt act! Here I am only this size and I’m guilty of an overt act!” Well, then he finds out you’re just playing a game with him, so he – well, he gets all right after a while but you have to keep it up for quite a while before he understands it’s a game. I mean you have to do it over periods of days. You can’t all do it in a minute, usually. After that it gets to be quite a game. And you pat him on the head and he’s liable to say, “Ow! Ow! Ow!” and grin at you, and so on.

But, this complication makes it necessary, even more necessary, for you to understand what a pc is all about as a complication. He’s a complicated case to that degree.

You know his mechanisms. His case state is that state of case best calculated to make somebody else, somewhere, feel guilty of an overt act.

Now, in view of the fact that it may be copied from another person, it could be a valence.

He’s copied another valence that had this as a successful convincer. And this successful convincer you see, is copied from somebody else – therefore he took the valence over – but that makes who guilty? Who now is to know that he or she has been guilty of an overt act, see? That’s complicated.

And don’t break loose until you as an auditor sort it out. You’ve got to find out *who* the pc has been guilty of overt acts against – that’s just an entering wedge, see, that’s a little light touch-off – followed by, “Who is the pc trying to convince is being guilty of overt acts?” See, that’s the more *fundamental* thing.

And you start sorting that out on an E-Meter, it takes a lot of cleverness, observation and curiosity on your part – lots of it. And you’re not going to find out that it was their schoolteacher in the seventh grade. That schoolteacher might have looked just like Messalina or somebody or other but it’s way back, or it’s upside down and backwards and all cockeyed and weird. And the pc doesn’t understand it but oddly enough, the pc wants to understand it, and the pc’s overt act of becoming stupid, you see is an effort to get back at the other person; and convince the other person they’ve committed an overt act to show them that they’ve made him stupid. See? And he hopes that their duplication (the communication formula enters in here – on the victim basis) that the duplication will bring about a state of stupidity in the other person.

It’s quite an overt act being a victim. It’s all covered under victim, see? Well, you look over these complications and unless you – sometimes the pc is so wound up and so upset, and so forth, and so grogged, and can’t make it out, that you just run Confront, Confront, Confront, and you just run lots of Confront, Confront, Confront, and it doesn’t start shaking out at all.

See.

Now, it will eventually shake out one way or the other, see, on a long haul. And as your Instructors – Dick was looking into and so forth – Continuous Confront will evidently run on a lower-scale case than we thought it would run on, see? It’ll run way down.

A person who isn't making progress on Confront evidently can make better progress – I don't know what the end view of this is – but can evidently make better progress on “What could you continue to confront?” See, Continuous Confronting as another thing. But that's beside the point.

This Confrontingness as it shakes out and so forth – undoubtedly you could shake it all out and just run Confrontingness and it'd eventually all unwind somehow.

Except for this one thing: The factor of your interest is so missing that the pc practically never gets the acknowledgments the way he should. He gets the idea the auditor doesn't care and it doesn't matter, and he runs kind of flat, and he runs with no enthusiasm or he – and he's not in there pitching. And furthermore, the auditor isn't looking at this too and – isn't looking it over – so you don't get the add up of minds over this material situation or series of significances. And not getting this add up of minds, of course, you don't get fast auditing.

And I tell you that it will work out if you just run Confront and Continuous Confront, things like that, see? It would work out eventually.

But works out much more rapidly if the auditor hunts it out and looks it over. Because this adds in the auditor's interest, which, of course, adds in a speed of running.

So, there are two more factors. The pc is now running on known factors instead of “What wall?” An auditor can always settle a set of facsimiles back on the track and get them out of the road and handle the immediate bundle. By just locating things accurately in time, he can always get rid of a patch of facsimiles.

And also the auditor's interest bearing on the thing speeds running. And your pc sits there and just grinds away and all of a sudden looks up and says, “I think I was Cromwell.” Ah, look, this is no time to say, “Yes, good,” and go on with the next command.

And it takes a nice piece of judgment. You mustn't go in and immediately audit, “What part of Cromwell would you be willing to confront?” But he's come up with something. And it's worth your while and his to just look this over.

Chances are you find out he wasn't Cromwell – he was Cromwell's executioner. That's usually how it goes on the track, see? He'll stay convinced he's Cromwell for some time. On the other hand, he might have been Cromwell! See? I know of a case that I'm absolutely certain was George III. This case doesn't suspect it.

And gives a rather different story for that same period. But it's very unreal and so forth. I think this guy is George III.

Every time he gets anywhere near England he starts to go crazy. You put him in a post of very high command and he goes stiff as a board. He's a tremendous guy. Quite an interesting thing. I've never looked it over on the case but I'm still interested.

Now, every pc is a story and not only one, you might say he's volume after volume of novels. And he has all kinds of complications and interweavings and so on.

And you start pushing a fellow for OT, you get him all cleaned up and he knows all the score, he knows everything he's doing and everyplace he's going, he's got it all straight

and the knowingness of his immediate past goes back for oh, three, four thousand years, and everything is fine and you get him all cleared up and he's feeling wonderful. Well, great! Great! That's just fine.

Now, all you've got to do is start moving around on the meter and get smart enough and run a little Create on anything that creaks and you'll throw into restimulation a whole new novel.

Now, of course, he'll be able to handle that novel much better than he handled the first one, you see. He'll be able to go much faster but, at the same time, you better look into it. See, now you restimulate, selectively restimulate some factor of an earlier period.

Now, to pass over a period without finding out much – most of everything there is to know about it that's really important – who was in it and what was it all about – is not, of course, to just let the pc run on automatic telling his life's histories over and over and over. Because he'll – all he'll do then – that isn't just bum auditing, it is itself an overt act because you let him as-is his havingness.

Something I've never told you, is when you're having difficulty with a pc's havingness reducing on a Confront or Communicate Process, you should run "Think." You shouldn't let the pc talk because communication has a tendency to as-is the havingness.

And you could sit right there and watch a pc who has just found out that he was Cromwell.

Only he wasn't Cromwell. Or was he a staff auditor of Cromwell's? You generally find out it's the fellow that killed Cromwell, or he's the guy that really dished in Cromwell's plans or something – it's all skidded sideways. The overt act-motivator sequence in the thing gets it mishmashed. Whatever you find, he just found this out, see? Now, it's all right to find out the rest of it selectively, as long as you're controlling the find out with this meter! You're controlling the find out with the meter.

But, just to let him run on, and on, and on, means that you must be acknowledging very weakly and he's still trying to make you interested. He doesn't feel you're interested because he's trying to interest you, see.

So, that's different than auditing. He must have felt originally that, you see – or maybe he feels you couldn't possibly be interested so he doesn't even tell you. See, and then you go by and you wonder what this is all about and it's kind of snarling up and he finally tells you, "Yes." You say, "Well how have you been making out for the last hour, since I asked you a question?" And he says, "Oh, I uh – I um – I've been looking at this same facsimile. I've been confronting parts and not confronting parts of this same . . ." The guy's been running an engram for an hour – same picture. Boy, if you find yourself guilty of that one, then remember what I'm telling you: Get interested. Get interested in the pc's case.

It must have been that you just didn't have a clue what was going on with the case and you sure better find out! Now, you'll get some wild, weird and wonderful stories from pcs. And remember this: some of them are true! And they're all based on some sort of a mishmash like this: He's in bad shape because he was a German in the Franco-Prussian War and fought against the French. And then became a Frenchman and fought against the Germans. See? And

you can find him in 1914 just having a terrible time fighting against the Germans – only he’s a Frenchman this time. Get the idea? Well, he can’t stand this situation anymore, so he becomes an Englishman. See? And he – he has terrible occlusion on the fact that the English were fighting the Germans in 1914–18. He just doesn’t seem to ever react on this one. Never thinks about that because that would put him back in the same condition he was in the life before, you see, when he was a Frenchman fighting the Germans, he said – so that’s bad.

So he’s just stepped out sideways. Somebody’ll tell him that most English kings have German ancestry. He’s liable to write great treatises demonstrating this is entirely incorrect.

See? He goes way off into the left field to prove this isn’t so, and so on.

In other words, he’s got various methods of not-ising or he just doesn’t notice it at all.

Well, when he goes along a long time and then he gets stupid or something and re – forgets his past and forgets it all, or runs into a lightning bolt or something happens and gets brainwashed and goes over and picks up a German body, everybody says, “What a sickly child.” See, he doesn’t know anything about being a German body but there he is being a German body but he isn’t being a German body and so forth.

And then we find out the house he was born in was the house that – he was the artillery captain that shelled it to bits. See, he shelled that chateau to pieces you see – when the Franco- Prussian War. But it got rebuilt and then he carelessly picks up a body in that same house.

Something stupid like this gets lashed up where your time and space is identified, overlapped, and your overt act-motivator sequence gets overlapped, so he doesn’t know who he is or where he is, and he’s a lost dog.

Well, you’re finding lost dogs. See? You got to fish him out of all this crisscross and he needs *lots* of help. And it’s quite a story; it’s always well worth listening to.

If you don’t get these things as stories, you get nothing. And he could just go on and it would all work out at some fabulously – it would work out – but at some fabulously slow rate, and so forth.

Now, if you’re auditing a machine case that is sitting right about in there, and never anywhere along the line touch, crack-up or have anything to do with knocking machines out of existence, why, you will have the pleasure sometime of finding that your pc has been confronting beautifully all the way along the line. He’s just been confronting beautifully. He is a machine and the machine has been confronting beautifully and the auditing command had nothing to do with him and nothing happened to the case. Apparently he was doing just dandy.

Now, when you find these machine cases, you want to crack them up. You crack up a machine case.

All you have to do is, “What part of a machine could you confront?” “What part of a machine would you rather not confront?” Even that, you just find the fellow sitting here at 2.5 and you decide he’s a machine case and you start running a machine, just as that, you know, no further research into the situation at all.

Naturally, you get more and more this way, and more and more that way, and all of a sudden *whirrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr – wham!* Something's going to happen somewhere along the line there.

Now, you just keep running the auditing command and saying, "Well, Ron will be responsible for anything happens. If anything bad happens, why it's Ron's auditing command, and therefore he's responsible for what happened here." You're probably in a comfortable frame of mind but you're not getting anything done.

No, it's got to be your auditing command and it's got to be your pc and you've got to know the story of this pc. You follow me? *Audience: Yes.*

Now, as I say, it's lots of novels. Now, that's purely a writer's simile – that pcs are storybooks. It's – but it fits quite well.

And if you've ever taken any interest whatsoever in reading storybooks, why go ahead and read them, and of course you always have taken such an interest.

I only feel sorry for those pcs who have auditors that are only interested in space opera, you see, as books. Because they'll inevitably grab ahold of space opera bits and pieces and start examining them and so forth. They'll wind up learning a lot about space opera but they may be auditing the wrong part of the track.

Maybe their pc, unfortunately, was the best minuet dancer in the French court and that's where he's stuck.

You've got to read the book that is there to read. You know, it's just like it's in print, you can't open a book up to the first chapter and read another book. Some people are able to do this in some way but it's pretty poor reading. You've got to read what's there, you've got to find out what's there and it's always rewarding both casewise and in interest.

Now, I berated you and I saw you all cringe and say, "What have I done wrong?" and so forth. And the only thing that I see broadly that you're doing wrong is being more interested, much more interested in keeping your – your E-Meter tone arm properly poised, or something of this sort, or keeping your confronting correct.

I love these people that are obsessively doing a TR 0, trying to use an E-Meter at the same time. I mean, it's the most gadgeous thing. They ask a question looking straight at the pc, you know, and so on. And then after the needle has ducked, they look down and they say, "Well, there's nothing there." No, you ask the question and watch the reaction and then look at the pc.

But going through these marionette type responses of the pc – they have their value, you understand. I mean there's a right to do this, nobody's downgrading that, but you're just expected to know how to do that. And it has nothing to do with you being able to lean over and find out what the ruddy hell is going on, pc? See? Every once in a while the pc says . . . And you say, "What was that all about?" Well, that isn't quite the auditing question, you understand, the auditing question, "What would you confront?" And the pc went this way, and then you got interested enough, you said – the pc went that way – and you said, "Let's see,

I'm supposed to acknowledge and I'm really interested in what that was about and so forth, and the proper procedure is that I acknowledge.

Good! Fine! Thank you! Fine! Good! Thank you! Thank you! Good! Fine! Thank – thank you! Thank you very much! Thank you very much! Now, what was that all about?" Of course, the pc's blown into the next county and wouldn't know on a bet. You just asised the whole works.

No, I'm afraid it had to be like this. The pc went like this, you know, and you say, "What's that all about?" Well, he hasn't answered the auditing question. The important thing is that you want to know! Get the idea? *You* want to know! And the only procedure about wanting to know is that you ask him in the current language you're speaking. See? That's it. You want to know. Now, you go on a discipline, well fine, a discipline is a discipline.

And I'll tell you that somebody who hasn't been through various disciplines ca – he'd play hell doing this. He just wouldn't be able to make it. You know? He wouldn't know whether he was supposed to hang the E-Meter this way or this way, or confront standing backwards to the pc, or lie 'down on the floor and look up at the pc. He wouldn't know anything about this. See? He'd be all thumbs and he – unaccustomness and so on, and falling all over himself.

Well, you're out of that now. I've just graduated you from that stage. Do you hear me? You're out of that.

I expect you know how to do that. And I can turn you in any day of the week a letter-perfect job of auditing. You'd be the envy of each – any Academy Instructor you ever saw.

But if I get interested in a pc, I am interested in the pc and I am not interested in him via TRs. The only via I use on the line is usually English. Get the idea? *Audience: Yeah.*

Even though sometimes I may ARC break a preclear slightly, or sometimes I may become much too emphatic and afterwards find I was being much too forceful, I – talking too loud, or something of the sort was wrong with all of this, you know? It's me that wants to know. You got that? See, it was me that wants to know.

And I don't think you'll find any pcs I've audited that will tell you I wasn't interested in what they were doing. They knew I was interested. They usually audit fairly smoothly.

Sometimes they balk! "You're too damned interested," you know.

And sometimes I begin to believe that a pc is not doing anything along the line and rightly and wrongly my interest will carry me over to putting the pc under a heavy control of one kind or another. And very often maybe the control is too heavy! But they sure did the next auditing command! And sometimes I think a pc's lying to me or something like that. Well, it's a Code break! But it's *I* that thinks he's lying.

Now, look, I didn't surrender my thetan just because I'm an auditor. I don't think the pc's with it, something like that.

The reality that you get in a session is because I don't counterfeit my own reactions ten times a minute. I can audit, I don't have to prove that to anybody.

In five hours I can get more done – any professional auditor in the business in 25 hours.

This is very well-known – been authenticated.

Well, how come *you're* still trying to prove you can do TRs? See? We're not interested – not this stage of the game. All we're interested in is you doing something with that pc. Get the idea? *Audience: Yes.*

I don't care whether you do it standing on your head. Do it! I don't care if at halfway through the thing you totally, wrong-headedly decided that you were being totally wrong-headed in the way you were going about the thing and do a flip.

Well, if I'm satisfied you didn't flip because you chickened but changed because you thought you ought to, to find out some more or to get a further progress and so forth, I'd be the last person on the world to chew your ears off.

But if I thought you just got scared and thought you were going to kill the pc or drive him insane or something if you kept on with the process – you'd hear from me. Pcs don't go insane on processes.

But about the only crime you could really commit as far as I'm concerned, *is not getting anything done!* And not being interested in the pc you are auditing and auditing that pc, not a textbook pc. Do you understand? So, auditing is auditing, and it facilitates getting something done. But ritual, for its own sake, should be left to the pope! Well, just get right in there and audit. You can't hear what the pc said, well put your ear over close to his face! And he seems to be trying to blow or something of the sort, or appears very nervous, well hold him in the chair! And you don't think he's listening to you very good, give him a solid comm line of an arm.

But you're an auditor, and as such you are not an unimportant person, and as such your interest in the case is essential. And that's first, paramount and foremost, and you're going to get the most auditing done by *auditing!* You understand? *Audience: Yes.*

Well, do it! Do it! Do it! Thank you.

COMMUNICATION, OVERTS AND RESPONSIBILITY

A lecture given on
16 June 1964

How are you today?

Audience: Fine, thank you, etc.

Good. This is the what?

Audience: The 16th.

The 16th of June in these stirring times. June 16, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, looks like we've got lots of people here; we'll be getting rid of them very shortly. Going out in all directions. I probably ought to start giving you some lectures of „Son, as you go forth into the world...“ „Men are not evil, they're just nutty. All is not good that glitters.“ You know, that sort of thing.

But in these high and stirring times, it is very easy to forget the fellow who is out there slugging in at Level III, trying to get a result in an HGC or private practice on somebody who is mainly concerned with the fact that every now and then he has goose bumps, you know. And this type of approach we're liable to forget, because it is still with us and frankly there is nothing you can do for that fellow in terms of GPMs or anything like this. You just got to get down and do a ground-level job of auditing. And it's a funny thing, but people don't realize how far that ground-level type auditing carries somebody. It's quite remarkable.

I've – ran into somebody's pc who was round the grounds here some little time ago and this was the height and level of his worries. It seemed like they only had auditing on the weekends and it really wasn't quite enough auditing to take care of all the problems he was having with his wife. And if he – he thought maybe if they could just have auditing a little faster or a little bit more, then he would have a chance maybe to catch up with his problems with his wife. This was his zone and horizon. This was as far as life extended. And during a session, toward the end of a session, he could suddenly begin to get an insight into the fact that there was something could happen to him that was better than had been happening in life,

you see. And he'd just about grasped this insight and then he would go home and have some more trouble with his wife, don't you see. And this was the sort of a treadmill he was on.

It's a hard thing for a person who has been in processing and has been processed for quite a while, to look directly and straight into the teeth of this factor, that individuals are so wrapped up and involved with their immediate environment that they have no time to think of themselves or case gain or anything like that. It's just an effort to control their immediate environment.

And they're in some fabulous contest with the immediate environment. And if you could remember this as an auditor, and if you can process at this level when you are handling such people, you will have remarkable – remarkable success.

Only thing I'm trying to tell you here is that the individual – that the individual that you process that isn't going to OT – he's just going to a sigh of relief see, I mean, that's about the highest level of gain which he could attain to – this fellow is in contest with his environment. It doesn't sound like much, don't you see? It doesn't sound like any more than their problems and cases sound like, don't you see? But nevertheless it is the key, the direct and immediate key, to the case.

Now, what's his environment? Well, this is your job as an auditor to find out. That's your first job. What is this bloke's environment?

Now, we will just take off from this point: The individual is in contest with his environment. We'll just take off from that point. Now, that's a very true observation. Particularly, if we qualify that observation just a little bit further and we say that a contest is not necessarily a battle of fisticuffs.

There are various ways to react to the environment. You can react to the environment by going into catatonic schizophrenia, complete immobility. And yet, do you know that that is a method of handling the environment? If you get down to rock bottom on this thing, anything your pc is doing at these lower levels is an effort to handle the environment. It is an effort to do that.

Once umpty-skillion years ago I got swatted, and sat there very, very immobile, being right. I went on being right for quite a little while. See, by permitting myself to be immobilized, it made the other fellow wrong. It didn't – wasn't really doing anything to him, taking no action, absolutely no forward thrust of any kind whatsoever, no outward motion, no outward flow of any kind, not even a thought of an outward flow and yet that was the method of handling the environment. So the way we qualify this is... The method is not necessarily smart.

And right down to the lowest rung of the ladder – to the lowest rung of the ladder, this individual is still in contest with his environment, is still reacting toward his environment and is still seeking to handle his environment. Those things are quite true. That's true of any case, see. A thetan never gives up.

Now, these methods are not clever. They are very often downright stupid. And the frailty of these methods is so great they're – you see, they're just solutions of one kind or another – and the frailty is so great that you can very easily unsettle the solution. You see, it

isn't a good method to begin with. And just by circulating a little mental energy around it, the slightest peek underneath the edge of the rug pulls the rug out. See, it's not hard to unsettle one of these things because they're not smart. See, it isn't a clever method to begin with.

All right, so I got swatted, see? Give you an idea. All right, I got swatted, you know, good – good blast, see. So I sit there immobilized, you see, being right, see. And this made the other fellow wrong but he'd left, see. Now, if anybody – now if anybody – if anybody had come along and had said to me at that particular time, „Well, just how does this straighten this situation up?“ I possibly would have said, „Well uh – mmmm – heh, it doesn't.“ And that would have been the end of that, see? Do you see? Very easy to unsettle these things.

Now, oddly enough the more irrational – the more irrational the solution or the handling of the situation, the more easily it is unsettled. You can unstabilize it as a solution in direct ratio to its uselessness as a solution.

Now, how in the name of common sense alienists and the witch doctor and the other blokes up and down the track have never run into this as a rule, I don't know – I don't know, it makes me ask some very searching questions. Did they want anybody to get better? It makes me ask mean questions like this, don't you see?

Because this rule here is perfectly visible. It's a very visible rule. You start fooling around with this very long and you will find out that the more irrational the solution, the easier it is to unsettle, the harder it is to maintain.

Well now, let's give you an example out of life. Let's say that this fellow has a solution of keeping the hind wheels of his car off the road as a method of safe driving. That's a good irrational solution, see – good and irrational, see. He wants to drive safely so he's going to keep the hind wheels of his car off the road. Well man, look at what he's got to do to put this solution into action, see. He's either got to run along behind it – if it's a Mini Morris or something – and hold it off the road, you see; or he's got to get a wrecking truck to follow him with the hind wheels pulled up, don't you see; or he's got to hire a helicopter, see; or he's got to put on some kid's roller skates on a platform with a building jack on top of them, you know. This thing is – this thing is crazy, see?

Well, look at the number of frailties in any solution that he gets there, see. You get an irrational solution, it is very difficult to maintain.

So the helicopter pilot has a cold, you see, and can't come that day, don't you see? Any one of these points – because we've added more points to the solution, so therefore, we have added more points of frailty to the solution and it is harder and harder to maintain.

So the rule is: The more irrational a solution is, the harder it is to maintain. And this would not be – this would not be legitimate as a comment unless it were borne out in actual practice and application. And it is borne out in actual practice and application.

The way a madman works at staying mad is absolutely fabulous. He sweats over it, man. He's in there twenty-four hours a day keeping himself good and mad, see. It's marvelous. He works at it. He'll once in a while catch himself out being slightly sane about something and you'll just see him grab for it and put it all back in the madness range, see, clank!

You can observe this in action. Now, that's – let's take a psychosis – using a dirty word, the slight – slighter manifestation of it, a neurosis, they're very hard to maintain, it's irrational.

And the only requisite to unsettle it is of course communication. If you're trying to pull a pole out from underneath a skylight to close the skylight, you had better have an adequate means of grasping the pole to give it a pull. In other words, there has got to be contact here of some kind or another.

Probably one of the reasons why they were incapable of observing this – they're mad themselves, of course – one of the reasons why the observation was never made may have been that they got all involved in trying to make the first contact – trying to get a communication through or in, in order to begin an unsettling process. And you would very easily have so much trouble with this one point, you'd just have so much trouble with this one point of trying to communicate on this subject or about this thing, that you might then entirely forget the fact that, if you could, unsettling the neurosis or psychosis or loopiness or worries of the individual was dead simple.

See, you could have so much trouble trying to talk to Joe that you'd totally lose grasp of the simplicity of what was wrong with Joe, see. So you'd skip – you'd skip that, and you'd put all of your – all of your time and energy here on this basis of trying to contact Joe, see?

Now, you could become so frantic, you see, given the fact that, „Well, he thinks there's alligators in the corners of the room,“ don't you see. And you know that if you could just ask him what this was – what this solved or something like this, it'd all fall down like a house of cards and the alligators would fall out of the corners of the room and that would be the end of that, see. Given that, see.

The reason you don't observe this is because you seldom get to such a person with a communication in order to disabuse him of this idea, see, and pull the props out from underneath this idea. So you could get so frantic over here trying to communicate to Joe, you could get so driven through your own skull, that you become frantic on the subject of communication.

And psychotherapy would then park on this basis of communication. And the franticness of trying to communicate would bring about more and more brutal means of communication. Until you get modern psychiatry. See?

They take an operation developed by Adolf Hitler, no less, and his very expert medicos of the Third Reich – the prefrontal lobotomy which was developed to make slaves – make farm slaves. Take undesirable nationalities who were not the super race, you know – he did eight hundred thousand of them, interesting round figure, had himself a lot of farm slave labor.

Now, how this ever got to be a psychotherapy I myself am absolutely gasping about and I pursued this one day and I asked very searching questions on how it did. And it turns out that there was a blacksmith's assistant in Bavaria. This always happens in Bavaria, if you know there are ghosts or werewolves, they always put it somewhere over there. And old American weekly, if you want to go back a half a century and look at its files everything always happened in that corner of the world. Well, this one happened there too. And it seems

like this blacksmith's assistant was standing by the forge when the forge blew up. Now, the fellow was a kind of an idiot, and the forge blew up and a crowbar about an inch in diameter and very long was driven through his skull from one temple to the other temple and completely severed his prefrontal lobes.

Now, you can go on and wait for the rest of the story just like I did. The – only rest of the story is he didn't die. He didn't suddenly become sane. This is not part of the clinical record, see? He didn't become sane, he didn't regain speech, he didn't become president, nothing happened here that was astonishing and marvelous. And that's the end of the clinical history.

And you can actually delve deep and endlessly trying to find the rest of this and how this brought about a reasoning whereby if you give somebody a prefrontal lobotomy he turns sane. And you know, that's your assumption as to why they're giving a prefrontal lobotomy. That's not the psychiatric assumption. That's an interesting view, isn't it?

A legislature will assume this in passing laws. And everybody assumes this, we usually say, „Well“ immediately, „Oh, so.“ „So,“ you say to yourself, writing scripts, see, like mad, „Oh, I understand. He was a – he was an idiot and the crowbar went through his skull and immediately he was totally sane and an acceptable member of the society and that's why the...“ You're writing script, boy, that's no part of the – that's no part of the clinical record at all. It isn't even *inferred* in the clinical record. So, as far as they've gotten is just this rationale: That if you cut somebody's prefrontal lobes up, he doesn't die right then. You think I'm joking, but it's true. That's where the rationale goes. I'm just giving you – I'm not berating psychiatry. Heh, who has to?

The point here is just this: that that is an anxiety of communication the like of which nobody ever thought of. See, these boys have been totally educated into believing to reach the brain. They don't know what they're talking to, that's how far back they've gotten, see. So they got to reach this fellow, so that means his brain or his thinkingness, you see? And their irrationality is simply and totally evolved around the one point of „We weren't able to contact him,“ so we get into this total frenzy of contact. „We finally reached him, *huh!* We finally made a result on this blankety-blank-blank-blank, see? It's against the law to shoot him, see, but we finally recorded from A to his brain B, and we produced a result. He hasn't said anything for days, *huh-huh-huh!*“ You see, it's as insane a solution as insanity.

But now, this is just not for the pleasure of berating psychiatry. This is solely and totally to this point. I want to bring about to you and give – give you this clarity of understanding of this one point: That regardless of the frailty of the neurosis or psychosis, the quicksand on which it is built will very fast go away – regardless of that. The effort to communicate to the person can assume such baffling forms and shapes, can give you so many barriers, so many insurmountable barriers that you never do get around to studying what's wrong with the pc. You never do get around to there, see. You're so involved with the outworks of the castle that you never even find out what the shape of the donjon keep is. You don't get within arrowshot of the walls actually. You're out there with the chevaux-de-frise, and you never get near it. Your communication effort is where you wind up.

So just remember that to do anything for an individual requires, as its first and primary action, communication to that individual and communication from that individual. Don't then, because that is true, immediately assume that communication to the individual solves all. This is merely a step. It is the necessary step.

And you will find, where Scientology breaks down in the lower levels, that it breaks down in the vicinity of effort to communicate to the being. That's where it breaks down. And that's why you'll get some weird and fantastic notions of what you should do for or with somebody. That's the zone and area where those appear. An inability to communicate to the individual, an inability to get the individual to communicate, results in a frenzy of effort. Then we get the Auditor's Code being broken, we get the pc being overwhelmed, we get various actions that are not really capable of bringing about any result at all. Now, we get these things in almost a standard practice, you see.

You – in other words, the whole subject could break down right at that point. Because that's where every psychotherapy breaks down. So there's no reason why a study such as Scientology – even though it is not a psychotherapy – there is no reason why it shouldn't break down there, too.

And in the individual practitioner, there's where it breaks down. And that's what you're not able to quite get across to the HAS, the HQS, the early HCA. That's what's hard to get across. That's why you have to keep telling them, „Acknowledge, acknowledge, acknowledge. He said something, acknowledge.“ That's why you sweat it out keeping those parts of the comm cycle in. That's why you work on it. Because when that disappears then your ability to do anything about the case vanishes. See, so that one, that one is the point of concentration.

Now, we know the formulas of communication. We know how communication can be built up. We know about gradient scales, and we know other things in this particular line. You should know those things for what they are. They're something you're working with in order to do something with or about the individual. And you must continuously and repeatedly follow that particular channel and work along that particular channel, see. And you mustn't spoil that channel. Because the moment the channel is spoiled – such as, well, you don't give another auditing command. You've gotten one accepted and answered, maybe you even acknowledged it but then you didn't give the next auditing command, see? See.

Yet these are really goofy errors, see. But yet they happen, yet they happen. Because the individual himself in an effort to do something for other people has long since thrown in the sponge a few times on the subject of communication. „Well, you can't talk to him anyway. Well, there's no reasoning with him. Well, there's a...“ Round, round, round, round, see?

So that actually doing something for an individual at the lower levels is dependent upon what degree of communication can be entered upon with the individual. And if you want to know what makes a level, that's what makes a level, see. It's just the gradient scale of what communication can be entered upon with the individual. And the individual who can't have much communication entered in upon, of course would be in a lower level of activity; he'd be

down there in Grade 0. He hadn't been talked to yet, see? That's in actual fact what makes grades, what makes pcs, what's the difference of cases and that sort of thing.

Now, once you get this first series of shafts through very nicely, and you're reaching the individual now, the individual is responding to you, ah, well these other things are a house of cards. First thing you've got to take up is the goofiest solutions he has for his environment. That's about the first thing you've got to find. And then we get to what you're trying to do for the individual.

What you're trying to do for the individual is alleviate his contest with his environment. Now that he is in contest with his environment, of course, barriers communication from his environment. And you'll find he will eventually solve the fact that he is being communicated to by his environment by moving you out of the environment as his auditor. That is to say you are no longer part of his normal environment. And he solves this very, very well. He says, „Well, there are human beings and there are auditors. And I won't let a human being talk to me, but I will let an auditor talk to me.“ See? He starts solving it at a rather early stage in his processing.

This is why any group that has ever been able to help anybody or do anything for them at all eventually assumes an ethereal, a spiritual height of some kind or another and takes on a special status in the society, see. Because the individual is in contest with his environment and if the group communicating to him were part of the environment he'd feel like he was being driven around the bend. So he just solves the whole problem by moving the group up into a very esoteric level. See, very simple.

So that you take on – to some of your pcs you take on almost holy proportions. They'll credit you with all kinds of various facilities and abilities and all of this sort of thing. What they're doing is solving this one point. They can't bear to communicate with the environment and you're communicating with them, so therefore you can't possibly be part of the environment and then they prove it to themselves by saying these other things, you see.

It's interesting that the Melbourne inquiry tracks along this way rather consistently, and so forth. And the people who are attacking the organization the hardest are actually hanging around the neck of the organization a rather supernatural atmosphere... I told Mary Sue here some months ago, the one thing that's going to come out of the Melbourne activity, we will be unnatural beings, we will be supernatural beings of some kind. And yes, it's gone further and further. Of course, as they run up overts against us – knowing very well they shouldn't be running up overts of this particular character, see – why, they're having to remove us further and further out of the real environment, you see. So the other day a very serious discussion took place in the hah! court down there on the subject of... You see, it isn't even a trial, it's just a bunch of guys shooting their face off and – at vast expense. They – they took it up, as they were – now you'd say, „Well, would a Clear be – could you see through a Clear?“ you know.

You'd say, „Well, people could understand a discussion along that line.“ But no, no. The discussion had gone much further than that, much further than that. It's, „Why did I appear sometimes tall and sometimes short and sometimes broad and sometimes thin?“ And,

„Why did Clears in general appear this way?“ It was no longer a question that they appeared this way, you see. That was not the case in point. It was wondering why they did. Marvelous!

Therefore, if you can reach or talk to people when other people can't, you immediately will assume some status with the person which is quite different than from any other status he has any knowledge of. He will put you into some status or another which is quite pedestaled and quite out of this world, you might say. Because it proves itself. He's in contest with his environment. He's having trouble with his environment all over the place, and he's not having trouble with you, so therefore, you can't be part of the environment. I mean that's all there is to that, see?

He solves the problem very nicely. This is the common solution to that. Well, it isn't even worth doing anything about. That's the way the thing rides, you see? I would never ponder to it or aid and abet it particularly. But at the same time if your communication line depends upon his ideas of you, I would not sit around now and use the fact that I could talk to him to clarify his opinion of me. See, I would use the time and ability to talk to him to pull the props out from underneath a few of these flimsy structures that are called neuroses or oddball ideas or something, see. That's the time I would use. I wouldn't get into an endless discussion with him about whether I were sometimes large or sometimes small, or had come to him in the middle of the night and given him an auditing command. I wouldn't – wouldn't bother. I just would not discuss it. I'd say, „Well, all right. That's fine.“

I wouldn't even jump in and say, „Do you think other people come to you in the middle of the night.“ I'd understand what he was trying to communicate to me. He's trying to communicate to me that he was in communication with me, was not in communication with other people, so therefore I wasn't other people. That was all he was trying to communicate to me, see. I wouldn't use this as a symptom at all, or wouldn't even rack it up as part of his symptoms, see? I'd get very much more interested in those things he was in contest with. And that's what you've got to handle. That's what you've got to handle. What is he in contest with that's real to him?

Now, get your communication line in and then handle that. Now, just getting your communication line in is more of a trick than any field of mental healing, psychotherapy, spiritualism or religion has ever been able to uniformly accomplish. You see that? They can't uniformly accomplish that. Some priest walking around in circles talking about these heretics, and so forth, is simply saying, „There are some Joes around that I can't get next to. I can't communicate to them,“ see. His failures of communication are what weigh him down.

Now, we've pretty well solved this business of the communication to the individual. Given half a chance at all we can communicate to the individual, see. There are various... Well, we've developed many methods which we no longer talk about anymore. There's communication by mimicry. By knowing the communication formula in full, you can, of course, introduce the various factors of the communication formula into your communication with the individual. So your communication with the individual is not dependent on merely saying something to the individual, see.

You ever want to put a kid in a good humor, and so forth – he accidentally wiggles his nose, wiggle your nose and he bobs his head and you bob your head. And the next thing you

know, why he's in a high old time, man. He's in a marvelous state. You haven't said a word. It's mimicry, just nothing but mimicry all the way through. Well, you can even talk to a raving madman along this particular subject line.

So you're using various parts of the communication formula as they exist in *The Creation of Human Ability* and in other places in the early works. Taking those parts apart and understanding what those parts consist of. And then realizing that you can use any of those parts or any variation of those parts to bring about a communication with the individual. And then by using any – gradient scales – by using any communication which you've established with the individual to increase your ability to communicate with the individual, see – more and more communication, better and better, see – you can then get around to doing something for the individual.

Now, what fools you is that by your communicating with the individual, he gets better. There's some part of the environment that he's in communication with and this will of course make him better. And so this other thing has this other liability. That by doing a communication with the individual, and by building a communication, getting the individual into better communication only with you, you see, you could of course increase his ability to handle his environment and you can bring about a better state of mind in the individual. And the reason that's a fooler is you're still back there in the first step. And it's almost as much a mistake to stop there, don't you see, or to use that, as it would be to go into a frantic state trying to communicate with the individual.

In other words, say – be frantic about trying to communicate with the individual, „So, I finally communicated with him, I hit him with a club,“ see? „See, I finally... I communicated with him, I hit him, see.“ Well, it's just as – just almost as much a mistake as just saying, „Well, I've done something for him because I now communicated with him.“ Don't you see, you're now using communication as the end-all. It's just a channel. And what the fooler there is, he really is better, see. He's really a bit better off, don't you see?

And he is so much better off when he is with you or around you that you eventually won't believe he's still daffy around other people. And therefore, you become very hard to convince along this particular line. And you lay in a big problem for yourself here. You can no longer see that this fellow is showing any nuttiness and you say, „Well, we've cured his oddball battinenses, and so forth.“ Yes. He doesn't exhibit any of them around you, just around other people as before, see. You can get into an odd ridge here. Well, just recognize where you sit with relationship to the case and it solves the thing, see.

Now, here you are, communicating to this individual, see, you've got past the frantic point and you built it up and that sort of thing, and you're not going to make the mistake of saying, „I've cured him because I can now talk to him.“ You've got yourself merely set up to do something for the case. That's as far as you've gone. You haven't gone any further than that. And don't kid yourself that you have or you will have some singular losses in processing.

You will have some very singular losses in processing. Sooner or later you will get into some kind of a state of beautiful comfort with regard to some bird and he goes home and slaughters the whole family, see? You say, „But what happened? You – he seemed so calm!“

Yeah, around you. In the first place because you could communicate it to him, you weren't part of the environment, therefore, you were some special type of being. You were in an esoteric relationship to him. You probably didn't use this on a command basis or an overwhelm. And he wasn't any saner elsewhere than he ever had been. But in your vicinity he manifested sanity.

See, a sort of a Christ manifestation occurs, you know? You appear; all is calm, see. Well, don't forget, after you disappear all goes to pieces, too, see. That can also happen. So that will happen to you and you will say, „What in the name of common sense occurred?“ You end the fellow's intensive and he was just fine at the end of the intensive and a week later, you see, he shoots a cop or something. Something wild occurred here. Well, just recognize your relationship to the individual is special, and communication with the individual is not an end-all of processing. That is simply the beginning. That is all. There is nothing more to that.

So, all right.

Given communication with the individual, now what? Now what? We say, „Oh well, that was – that's been such a big psychotherapy problem, 'How do you communicate to the individual?' and that sort of thing. 'You mean you do something with it? I mean – you mean, you go some – from here?'" Yeah, there's where you start, see. Now, you start to do something for the individual, see.

Now, this requires this next piece of understanding, which I've already given you, that the individual is in contest with his environment and he is using very, very nutty solutions indeed with regard to his environment, and he is using these – he is using these nutty solutions for just one particular and continuous reason: because he's in contest with his environment and therefore his environment looks very, very dangerous to him. And that's the whole lot.

Well, how do you enter on upon all this? How do you start this? How does this occur? How do you undermine all of these nutty solutions and let them fall down? How do you go about it?

Well, of course you can't go about it at all if you don't have a communication channel. You must have a communication channel. Now go to work. You've got to find out now the dangerous things that are in his environment, the menacing things that are in his environment, and the solutions he's using to combat and contest these various things.

And in actual fact, you shouldn't really use to too great a degree problems and solutions. This is something that's very okay for the very, very beginning of the case. But you go too long along this direction, you're going to get in trouble because these are GPMs – problems-solutions. Solutions are GPMs. That's a part of the reactive bank. And that's restimulable. All of that is restimulable. And as a sober fact, that isn't the basis of his activities with his environment at all. It's not problems and his solutions to them. It's what *he does* to solve them that keeps him obsessed and pinned in against them.

You must immediately and directly assume, of course, that if an individual has a problem, he's going to do something about it. How do you know that you haven't gotten a present

time problem of a pc? Now, that's the oldest one you know of. That's the oldest one you know of. How do you know that you haven't done anything for the pc? Present time problem, you're processing a present time problem, how do you know right away that you haven't handled a present time problem? There's one there – just like that. He's going to do something about it.

The pc who leans back suddenly in the session and says, „All right. Well, I understand that now, I really haven't got a problem with the dentist. I'm going to so-and-so, and so-and-so and see Dr. Jones. All right. I have that all settled now and we can go on with...“ Oh, bull! You haven't settled the present time problem. You haven't handled the present time problem. And that's something auditors have known for years and years and years and years and years. That's an old, old, old one, see. If you haven't handled the PTP at the beginning of session, the pc is going to do, something about it. And that's the biggest index that you have. That is the biggest index that you have: He's going to do something about it, so there it is.

Now, the whole contest then that you are up against is to find out what is the individual continuously and perpetually doing as in his environment. And it falls under the heading of O/W. It doesn't fall under the heading of problems and solutions at all. It'd fall under the heading of O/W. Because the more he does about this thing he's obsessed about, the more he's going to get stuck in it, and the more he's going to get obsessed with it.

What brings about – what brings about undue concentration upon a subject? What brings about his absolute conviction that he has this tremendous contest with this environment? What brings about this absolute conviction? It's because he's doing something about it all the time.

How do you unpin somebody from worrying about the United Nations? Guy goes around all the time, he's worrying about the United Nations. You finally find out that the reason he wears a green hat is because the United Nations' flag is blue or something, see, something wild here. And this is the genus of all this. Well, how come he's so pinned in to the United Nations?

Well, he must be doing something, odd as it may seem, he must be doing something to the United Nations or about the United Nations every few time intervals. And it must be something real or actual. It might dwindle down to the level of a critical thought, don't you see. But he's been active in this particular direction. And you don't have to go into other lifetimes – it's this one. The real problems exist in this lifetime. You don't have to go very far adrift to unpin these things. Actually, they're so simple to unpin that it's a wonder to me that anybody had any trouble unpinning them. They're quite laughable. But the secret of it is O/W.

You see, he himself is mucking up his communication with the environment because his communication is a series of overts. So therefore, he better not communicate with his environment because it's an overt against the environment. So therefore he better have some kind of a wild solution so that he won't have to communicate with his environment. And it isn't that it all comes down to communication, it just happens to be riding on the communication channel which is what broke down his communication with his environment. See?

He can no longer recognize what part of his environment he's in communication with. He can't tell. He doesn't know what's there. He put up a screen, long time ago, against tigers, and he's never been brave enough to take the screen down since, and he's now forgotten what's behind it. But he's fighting something in that direction. He knows he has to keep fighting in that direction. He's not sure why he has to keep fighting in that direction but he just knows he has to.

And his method of fighting in that direction may take innumerable forms, such as: never looking in that direction, never looking in that direction. Oh, let's find a fellow whose head is swiveled over to the side and he has chronic arthritis of the neck, and he can't look to the left. How come his neck is swiveled over this way, see? That seems to be an odd way to carry a body. And particularly and peculiarly odd, you see, because he's even used calcium deposits to cement in the vertebrae so that he can't turn it over. How come he's doing this?

Now, if you're in communication with the individual you have the possibility of finding out. You can hunt and punch around, you eventually will find out on various channels, and so forth, that he's liable to commit some other solution, some other action. He's liable to do some other overt if he looked to the left.

I would eventually recognize that somebody who was never paying any attention to the left side of anything had something there that he was doing something to *or* about. You may even find out it's his wife. He's stuck in the marriage ceremony or something, see? That's right! You may find some weird things. May find he's got a ghost relative in the room, or may find all kinds of odd things about this fellow. But he's doing something.

Now, the reason he does low-level overts on various dynamics is because he's afraid he'll do high-level overts on the various dynamics. And his reactive bank is so manufactured that the one thing a thetan gets in trouble doing is committing overts. And the whole – well, I'd say, better than fifty percent of the reactive bank is tailor-made to force him to commit overts. See?

So here is a being whose sanity depends actually on not committing overts, who has a reactive bank which forces him to commit overts. And I think this is probably the basic mechanism of enslavement of the thetan. Pinning him down, trapping him and so on, is probably the – I would say, not positively but probably – the grander plan of the trap. See. You're just continuously a – these people, just people must – every piece of their reactivity is driving them to commit overts. And they mustn't – they just mustn't. And the broader angle is, is even if he didn't have a bank, he'd get into trouble committing overts because it violates the communication formula, and communication formula is above the reactive bank.

So this gives us two mechanisms which are above the reactive bank. One is the communication formula and the other is O/W.

Now, that puts somebody who is early on in processing in the driver's seat, because he's got two things that are superior to all the aberration the pc packs. In one fell swoop he's got all of it.

O/W is one of the frail spots of auditors. I must say that with some regret, but it is true. It's a frailty in a lot of auditors.

Well, you'd naturally get the perpetrators of any given trap spreading around a lot of propaganda about the invasion of privacy and about the this and about how it wasn't nice, and how people were entitled to hold their withholds and you get all kinds of wild propaganda going on, on this particular line, see? If people are crazy along this line in general, then you can be sure there's a lot of crazy propaganda on the same subject. So, you get men that ought to know better leaping about talking about lie detectors and all of this kind of thing.

You get a whole government rising up and seizing an organization's E-Meters, see. It's a nuttiness, see.

If you don't think they're nutty, why look at the facts of the case, you see? Well, they turn them right over to the War Department and they investigate them up at Walter Reed and they're very grateful for the thing, but they're not even sane enough to pat us on the back, you see, and give us a couple of quick bucks for the patent rights, you see? But if they've seized them, you see, this makes it somehow all right. This is craziness, see. It's craziness at work.

Where would you expect to find the most craziness? At the door to sanity. You'd find out that the greatest amount of barricade would be along that chain, that channel, see. And if you – if you look over any group of auditors, a great many of them unfortunately will fringe by, not very positively, but they'll sort of fringe by this invasion of privacy, and so forth. They won't really sit there and clean that needle. You know, they just won't sweat at it, you know?

Well, their reticence along this line comes from their fear quite naturally of breaking their communication channel with the pc. And they're afraid they'll break this communication channel so therefore, they don't press home the therapy. In other words, they preserve the communication channel but arrive at nowhere because of its preservation. So anxious to preserve it that they never do anything with it. So they, well, very often – I'm not running down all auditors – I've just noticed in training auditors that this is a point we have to get them over. And there are many right here that we've gotten over this point. But it's a point that people hit and that they have to be gotten over.

That's where it breaks down. They say, „All right. This individual is worry, worry, worry, worry, figure, figure, figure, think, think, think, think, think, obsess, obsess, obsess.“

„Is he?“

I don't know. He's just *ruh-ruh-thuh-thuh-thuh* on this one subject, you know. Green horses or something, I don't know. Instructors, something else unreal, see? And the individual just goes on, on, on, on, on, on, on, over the rest of this thing, see.

And the auditor says, „All right, have you done anything.“ Well, obviously the guy must have done something or he wouldn't be pinned in, see. That's the part of the equation you may not – some people have not totally looked at: That in order to be pinned in on something, he must have done something to it, see. Because there isn't any way anything could get in communication with a thetan in the first place. You want to solve a problem, man, there's a nice problem for you. How does anybody ever get in communication with a thetan? Of course, it's impossible. The origination must have been original with the thetan. Why, he's

invisible, you couldn't even find him, he doesn't even really natively have any location in space – nothing.

So he must have originated, and that must be the basis of the do. And that's how he gets pinned into anything. And he can get it all disguised so that it's impossible for him to understand how he's pinned in, which is – which is quite remarkable. And he tries to unpin himself with obsessive do. He's got to do, do, do, do, do, do to unpin himself. And boy, anybody will fall for this.

I catch myself by the scruff of the neck every once in a while. „Well, if I just wrote up a couple of letters, it would straighten it all out.“ Then, of course, I know, I'll go ahead, write a couple letters, straighten this out. This point's worrying me one way or the other, I'll write the couple letters. Then I find out I have to write another letter, see. You know, I have to write another letter to straighten that out. And then I think, well, maybe it'll be a good idea if I just wrote four or five more, you see, and straighten that out, and that particular... Then I suddenly realize what I am doing. This is why I'm worrying about it. It's because I'm writing letters about it, see? Simple, see? Realize that and all of a sudden cease to worry about it. Bang! It's gone, see.

So anybody, even when he knows the mechanism, can be caught in the same mechanism because it's the basic mechanism of entrapment. There is no more subtle mechanism of entrapment than that. That's the lot. So this is what you must realize about this thetan. That it isn't – we sit down with the thetan and we're processing him and we say, „Oh well, what have you – what have you done to an Instructor?“

And, „Well, nothing really.“

Audience: God!

„I-I-I listened impertinently when he said, 'Good morning.'“ See?

„All right. Good. Now, what have you done to an Instructor?“ you see.

„Nothing really, nothing really, but I thought they were awfully wrong when they chopped me all up and they did this and they did that and they did the *rurur, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator*.“

And the auditor says, „Fine,“ and asks the next question, not having gotten his question answered. Now, right there, in the mechanism of the session, you see, he's pinned him in tighter. He bought a motivator, he pinned him in tighter. Do you see that?

It isn't whether or not it's social or not social, it isn't anything else, it's just good sense technically, see. And they don't want to break their communication channel or their feeling of rapport, being *simpatico* with the pc, you see, by being challenging. Where as a matter of fact they'd be a far better friend of the pc, it'd be a much more honest thing: „All right. That's all very well, but now what the hell have you done to an Instructor that's got you this worried?“

„Oh, well, you put it that way, I well, well, backing out of the parking lot and hit his car the other night. Didn't tell him about it. He hasn't found out the fender's dented yet.“ See? Right away, bang! The guy's unpinned, see?

Because he goes through – he goes through the action of. He does something, not necessarily intentional, he does something and then he does something to justify having done this thing. And then he does something to justify what he has done. By this time he's getting pretty pinned in and he keeps on trying to do this thing. And then he eventually will be physically batting away from this thing as though he's trying to push himself off a wall, see, and the next thing he does, he does the only thing left to him – he blows. He has to leave physically, or he has to do something else physically.

Well, if he can't leave physically, he has a dwindling gradient of the things he can leave physically by not leaving physically. You know? You can leave physically, all right. But how do you leave without leaving physically?

Well, one of the ways – you could become groggy, see? You could become less alert. You could show people that it was wrong of them to have you there, see. You could show that you were pinned from leaving, you see, by developing a bad spine so that you couldn't walk. See, all kinds of wild solutions.

Now, these are the solutions that I'm talking about. The individual can't leave the universe physically so he tends to pile up all these solutions. You get married and you can't part company easily, and stay in the marriage but then leave the marriage, but not physically, see. Can't leave the marriage physically because that'd be too irresponsible, see, so you leave the marriage!

Now, if you want to see something complicated, it's the number of ways a thetan can leave without shoving off physically. And practically, psychotherapy is just a study of that. You can go down into making people sorry that they didn't let you leave, don't you see. You can make them guilty of having put you in a situation where you couldn't leave, by in your turn, appearing so nasty – that's a wild pitch, isn't it; well, they all have a wild curve on them like this, you see – by appearing so nasty to everybody when you were so happy before.

See, it's not necessarily an unimaginative set of factors, see. But the basis on which they're based is very, very simple. There's very – very little to this basis. Basis is: the individual commits an overt, intentionally or unintentionally, he commits some other overts and he goes a whole gamut of commission of actions. He never really stops committing actions but now he commits them with a negative reason. He commits them in order to get out of there. If he can't leave at all, now he has a whole bunch of solutions that go downhill from that point. I mean, you just get the wildest things. And it's really a study of assertive thereness right on down to not-thereness, and a sort of a gradient scale of these two factors involved.

And all of this – all of this being on communication channels and being like a communication channel requires communication of some kind or another to resolve. But we've got this factor of the regretted action or the regretted reach or something like this; we got this factor, and we've got the factor of the communication formula, both of them superior to the reactive bank.

Now, the reactive bank booby – traps this to some degree. Communication is mirrored in the reactive bank. There isn't any word „overt“ in the reactive bank that I know of at this time. But the whole thing is just a study of overts, from beginning to end. The word „withhold“ is definitely in there and it's in there so often that we must really cease to use it. Too

restimulable. Too restimulated, the pc would get if you continued to use it. Substitute for it and you'll find out it actually works better, „What he didn't say.“ See. „What have you done?“ „What haven't you said?“ „What have you done?“ „What haven't you thought?“ „What have you d – “ see. „What action have you taken?“ and „What action haven't you done?“ Don't you see? Just play both sides of the coin. Understand the principle rather than get the parrot rating, see.

And the word „withhold,“ although we have it around and although we wouldn't be able to root it out of our technology, actually couldn't – can remain in the technology but not in an auditing command. Because it restimulates the pc and you get false TA. You're moving banks around and you're getting false TA on the thing. It's just bank discharge is all you're getting. You're actually not doing anything. And it's really not bank discharge, it's tone arm action being occasioned by a GPM coming in and it eventually will freeze up.

I know that makes it sound grim but you're perfectly safe as long as you just don't use that word „withhold.“ It won't happen.

You can say, „What haven't you said?“ You'll find out that you'll have a ball with that. That's gorgeous. You could even sort out the thing: said, thought, acted, not acted. „What action haven't you taken?“ You could sort the thing out, see, and get the fellow right where he lived and by building up from that point, free him on innumerable points and knock out a whole bunch of these weird nonsenses. But of course, you realize that you can't do that easily unless you're in good communication with the individual.

Now, one of the principal factors that you bat your head against, then, in a case, is the inability of a case to admit any action or take any responsibility for action. If a case can take no responsibility of any kind for any action ever committed, that case is committed forever to the deep. There isn't anything you could ever do for that case. He's just buried in the five-mile Philippine Deep and that is the end of that.

But you understand, I've said take no responsibility for any action he has ever done. I'm not now talking about an overt act. See, don't interpret it from that line and you've got it pretty well won. But that's the lost soul. The lost soul who is being shredded between the worlds with a soundless wail is the person who can take no responsibility for any action he has ever done. And that is a statement of exactly where a case ceases to be within range of assistance.

This makes those things you can't talk to pretty irresponsible, doesn't it. Well, they are.

I can imagine a conversation, if you could achieve one, with a spider. The tremendous importance of the spider, the fantastic put-uponness of the spider, and the utter irresponsibility of every action the spider takes and undertakes, would be something that would drop your jaw. The inability to communicate goes along with the irresponsibility for actions. See, that's an index. Those two things go straight together.

As the ability to communicate drops out, responsibility for actions, as a factor, falls. As responsibility for actions, as a factor, falls, ability to communicate falls. Now, don't come around and write me a despatch sometime and ask me how to cure a stutterer.

That's a deteriorated zone of communications. It doesn't mean that there's anything fabulously in error about this individual. It does mean that there is some zone or area of an irresponsibility. Because those two factors rise and fall alongside of each other. They don't go on a scale, like the scale of justice; they go up in a pair of elevators. Responsibility for one's own actions rise, ability to communicate rises. Responsibility for one's own actions fall, communication falls. There they are. They ride side by side.

And Joe Spider out here in the garden, an examination of his responsibility for why he's in the garden and for what he's doing, and if you could get a heart-to-heart talk with him, which of course you can't because of this other factor – I won't say that you can't, maybe some of you someday will – this bird's not talking. Doesn't even make noise. But yet his concept of responsibility would be utterly fantastic.

Everything is all done. Actually, the reason he spins webs – he can actually see himself spinning webs and has very detached viewpoint, if he can see himself at all. And it's a mechanism that was laid into him by God. And he does this because of a compulsion that was handed him, you see, at this time. And the flies that get into the web are driven in there by some guardian spirit of spiders, you see, that had a battle in Valhalla with the *wahf-wahf*. And that's why they are destroyed. And the reason they are consumed is to keep the garden clean for *Jub-bub*. „Who's that?“ Well, I don't know.

You find out that spider is not doing a confounded blasted thing. He doesn't spin, he doesn't eat, he doesn't do anything. He's a model of nothing. And he can't talk, see? He can't deliver any lectures on the subject of spiders. You see this? You see this as a factor?

Now, think of this – think of this when you see madman X leaping about in a padded cell, covered with his own filth and that sort of thing, and gibbering and yapping. And somebody says to you, „Well, if you really knew anything about the mind...“ I don't know why they put this up, see. Well, that's the same mechanism at work in another line, see? „If you really knew anything about the mind, why, you could do something for that madman in there.“ Take a look at it.

Of course, they want you, if possible, to commit an overt against that madman. Then they've got you, see. But there you are looking at – here you're looking at the factor, „How mad is this man?“ This is the first question you would ask, „How mad is this man?“ Well, this man happens to be as mad as you can get into communication with him – as you can't get into communication with him. It's an inverse ratio, of course, in that particular instance. He can't – he can't make any sense, he doesn't pay any attention to you, and so forth. Well, he's pretty mad.

First thing you'd have to do would be to build up a communication factor across the fact of no responsibility at all. That's quite a trick. But you could build it up with mimicry, you could build it up in various ways. You could build it up by a timed hello: every day you come by and say, „Hello.“ That's all, just one. He'd eventually be over at the bars saying, „Hello.“ Might be six months, you see, but he'd eventually get at this. And providing of course that somebody else didn't do something gruesome to him in the meantime, why he would – he would eventually be able to recognize that you were different from the rest of the

environment. You see, he'd work it out here somehow or another and he'd eventually start responding to you and that sort of thing.

And then, you'd have to find something that he did, something that he had done, something he really knew he'd done, something he could take responsibility for. And just expand that perimeter and you would return his sanity. There is no more complication in the basic theory than that. There aren't exceptions to this basic theory. Where the exceptions come in is how in the name of God you eventually bring this fellow about to talk to you. The gradient you have to run in order to get this individual into communication with you. How you put it to him – how you put it to him, that you want to find out what he has taken responsibility for in his environment.

These are the factors that require genius. See, there's a bit of genius mixed up in this, man. You've got to think on your feet. This individual starts to go that way, you got to round him up and head him off and bring him back again, you see.

You say, „All right, now what part of your life did you like best? Oh, your early teens. All right, all right. Now, what did you most enjoy doing in your early teens?“ See, you got it right there, see. He can answer that question. If you can find that question to ask, answer that question, up she starts going, see?

And then some nuttinesses start chipping off because his ability to observe what his environment is, and so forth, will again pick up. He's less in contest with that environment, you see? You've made an inroad on it even though he considers you a plaster angel that has descended just to assist him. Regardless of that, he has nevertheless made a crack in the environment.

So responsibility for own actions doesn't then merely mean overt actions. It just means actions of any kind. What can he do that he'd take responsibility for? The worse off an individual is the less responsibility he can take for anything. But the genius required is: Where do we hit this case to pick up its zone of responsibility? And those cases that are having a rough time... Of course, we hit them around here at a very high level with, such as, something like this, „Well, now what have you done that you know confounded cottonpicking well you shouldn't ought of been doing that you can take responsibility for?“ See, that's more or less in that line. „What have you done around here that you really know you've done, Bud?“

„Ah well, *awa-wawa-wawa*.“ And then all of a sudden the guy will hit something and it breaks, you see. He starts to straighten out in this direction. But recognize that is a fairly high level of action. It pays you the compliment of considering you're sane – can take responsibility, but that your wheels were slipping for a while, see. That's the – but that's a high level of action.

„Have you done anything today that you know you yourself did?“ Let's get this level of action now. Oh, that's another level of action, isn't it? All right. Now, there's an undercut, „Where have you been today that you know you have been?“ That's done by reason of placement. Let's work up a gradient scale to where the guy decided to be someplace and was there. See, let's work it up on the basis of responsibility for placement of self, not even contest with the environment.

You see, there are various ramifications here that you can work on. There's various gradients. But this is not really the principle of this lecture. It's just this, you've got these two factors: Communication – and even though that's in the bank, the formulas of communication are superior to the reactive bank – and you've got the idea of responsibility for own action. And responsibility may or may not be part of the reactive bank; and it just wouldn't matter, if it was or wasn't. The truth of the matter is it exists as superior to the bank.

Responsibility for own actions, which is the very woof and warp of being a thetan. Can you decide to do something and do it? Can you be somewhere? Can you be out of somewhere at will? These are the abilities of a thetan. And if you can't do those things then you're slipping.

So where do you start somebody in to get those things done? And that's a very important question. So you've got two factors here which are superior to the reactive bank, which are superior to this universe and which are native to a thetan.

Now, I've always said that the overt act-motivator sequence was not necessarily true. No, it isn't necessarily true. It isn't true, but it fades out in terms of consideration higher than any other consideration. It goes higher and is still a truth after other things have become lies, before it becomes a lie. Do you understand? It's pretty high. These two factors ride right together. And it gives you all levels of processing from IV on down. And it gives you all levels of cases.

Now, how many ways you can go about doing this, how many processes you can adapt into this, how many systems as they exist in Scientology right this minute to achieve communication with the individual, how many systems exist after you get through to pull the rocks out from underneath some daffy consideration... Daffy consideration – that's obviously married up to the fact that it's the individual's doing something that is daffy, see. Those things will fall apart very easily to the degree that the individual can accept doing something.

And if you've got those two factors, however many ways there are of getting at those things, you have all these lower levels of processing, you have all these lower levels of case. And there in actual fact is no real excuse – no real excuse at all, for you to be in the dark about why you're not making progress with a case. Because whatever other factors are present, see, what other factors are present, these factors are more present.

See, it may be true that this fellow is so harassed in his marriage that he can't put his mind on anything of the... „What's he stuck in like that for?“ is your first question. Not how terrible his environment is. Well, look at how he's stuck into his environment. All right, where is he stuck into his environment? Let's get a pc just talking one way or the other. We're asking him in effect, „Hey, Bud, where are you stuck in?“ See, „What tank trap have you run into that you're still treading your wheels in,“ see, „you're skidding your treads in?“ See, „Where are you?“ is what we're asking.

Now, this individual is at his job, or he's at home, or he's here, or he's there, but he's being there all the time while he's elsewhere, see. He's really stuck in, you see. He's Rommel stuck in at Tobruk. He's so frightened on this front that he never has a chance to fight the war, see.

He's stuck in someplace. And just with general it'sa and that sort of thing, you, very soon, very shortly, find out where this individual's stuck in. Now, the burning question is: Is what responsibility can he take in that zone or area – for his own actions in that zone or area?

Now, you frankly don't care at a lower level of case whether this individual is answering overts or unsaids or withholds or anything else. You just don't care about any of those factors. All you're interested in, really, is responsibility for own actions or responsibility for lack of actions. What is he certain he hasn't said? That would be a very gentle entrance point. But of course you couldn't play that out question after question because it's an out of ARC process. You'd have to quickly shift on over to the other side of the picture.

You just get his responsibility for action in that zone or area and all of a sudden that house of cards will fall down. Sometimes it takes quite a little while to steer it around, steer it around, get it more real, you know, and get a better view of the situation. All of a sudden one will fall out of the hamper and you'll find out this individual is not now as obsessively worried about something as he was before.

Now, there's one thing that gets in your road as you go over this ground. And I will admit to this, that there's one thing that gets in your road. An individual can have a piece of the GPM keyed in to such a degree that it's driving him half around the bend, see. At the lower levels you'd just better leave it alone, at this particular time.

But I have done something by reading off a short list of words that possibly were authoring the condition and seeing if one read, and then telling him that was an integral part of the reactive bank that was influencing him, and it discharged at that particular moment and he ceased to become obsessively worried. That's another root on the same basis, see. But is not one that you would commonly care to practice. And probably is a little more dangerous than it is safe.

If you follow the other one around, you'll find out it'll apply very generally to all cases.

That's how you crack one of these cases, that's how you go about this sort of thing. And that's what in essence auditing is about.

One of the ways you can badger somebody into finally getting off of a certain merry-go-round is a very interesting one too. Of – I'd say there's lots of methodology about this, very interesting one too. You say to him, „All right. What have you done that you really know you have done ...“ in that particular zone or area that he's worried about, see – “What have you done that you really know you've done?“ in that particular zone and so forth.

And he tells you. „Wow, I know I've done this,“ you see. And he comes up, and you know, the glibness with which he comes up with this thing, he really has taken no responsibility for it. This is – the responsibility factor is lying there like a sleeping dog. The fellow might tell you glibly, but there's no responsibility.

The rebuttal on such a thing is to get him to explain to you for some time how he has not really done that. Can't play it too long because it's a cut comm line type of approach, don't you see. But you can actually get him to explain this. „Oh, I-I-I busted up the old man's car and ran it off a cliff, ha-ha.“

„All right, very good. Well, how didn't you really do that?“

Oh, well, he'll let you in on it now. And boy, there's the most tortuous logic you ever heard of in your life as how he never really did that. He took the car, he didn't have permission. He was at the wheel of the car. He ran it down over the concrete abutment and into the arroyo. But somehow or another... No responsibility, see. It's a some kind of a solution to this situation, you see. The responsibility factor – you'll just see it. You can sit there with your jaw dropped sometimes. He didn't really do it. He wasn't really in the car. The car just sort of whistled him over and made him sit down in the seat and... And then it's the old man's fault because the old man never had a restraining-from-the-curb thing put on the car that made the wheels turn away from the curb, don't you see. And it's actually the fault of Newton for pointing out gravity that made the car go down the arroyo, and...

It's pretty wild, pretty wild. But you get him to explain all this and all of a sudden it begins to dawn on him gently that he had something to do with this action. And you play around the perimeter of this thing, and all of a sudden it breaks and the case does a tremendous send.

The reason why you can't run straight O/W and get this tremendous send, because they're not really overts. The individual has no responsibility with them, you see? You get him to explain how he never did them, and we enter a lower level of responsibility factor. We all used to have it, „What part of that action could you have been responsible for?“ or „could you be responsible for?“ Don't you see, as a direct approach process. There's another indirect approach process, „How didn't you really do it?“

Little higher level, „What reasons did you have for doing that?“ Get him to as – is all of these things.

And then don't let him get into a state where he's running up more, because you are the auditor and he's trying to look good to you.

A certain amount of genius is involved here on the part of the auditor. But knowing these factors and playing them one against the other and back and forth, and so forth, you could bust almost anybody out of these immediate environmental situations which have him doing such weird and wonderful things, and so forth and you had to have auditing actually below Level IV. Because you're using two principles which are senior to the mind – to all other considerations – for those lower levels, and you'll make it.

And I wish you some success when you're using it.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

O/W MODERNIZED AND REVIEWED

A lecture given on
2 July 1964

Thank you.

All right. What have we got here? Have we got a date?

Audience: Second of July.

Second of July. There is a date. All right.

And this is the subject of O/W Modernized and Reviewed.

Now this lecture is given into the teeth of the fact that it is notorious that very few Scientologists would ever inquire very deeply as to just exactly "*what* was did." This is given into the teeth of that knowledge. And there's a good reason for that: In order to do something for somebody, you have to have a communication line to that person.

Communication lines depend upon reality and communication and affinity. And where an individual is too demanding, the affinity tends to break down slightly. And the Scientologist is very afraid of breaking that affinity line with his pc and so he doesn't want to break that affinity line with his pc so he never, then, gets to the second stage of processing.

Processing goes in two stages: One is to get into communication with that or which you are trying to process. That's number one. And number two is do something for them. And there's many – many a pc will go around raving about his auditor, whose auditor has not done anything for the pc. All that has happened is a tremendous communication line has been established with the pc. And this is so new and so novel and so strange to the pc that he then considers that something miraculous has occurred. Well, yes, something miraculous has occurred, but in this particular instance the auditor has totally neglected *why* he formed that communication line in the first place.

He formed the communication line in the first place to do something for the pc. And he very often mistakes the fact that he has formed a communication line and the reaction on the pc for having formed one with having done something for the pc.

There are two stages here – is

- 1) form a communication line and
- 2) do something for the pc.

Those are two distinct stages. That is something like walking up to the bus and driving off. Do you see? There's two stages: You walk up to the bus and then you drive off. If you don't drive off, you never go anyplace.

So many an auditor bogs down at this one point of walking up to the bus which is putting in a communication line with the pc, and then they never go anyplace. Do you see that? And where auditing broadly breaks down, and you say, "Well, Mamie Glutz had lumbosis and" – we're going to have to make a list of Scientology diseases; that's one of them – "Mamie Glutz has lumbosis and she loves her auditor but she's still got lumbosis."

Now, exactly, what has happened is the auditor has formed his communication line to the pc – has actually done this heroic thing of getting in communication with the pc – and that is very tricky and that is no small shakes. That's something: to be able to communicate to a human being who has never been communicated to before. This is quite remarkable. And that is such a remarkable feat that it appears to be the end-all of Scientology to some. But you see, that's just walking up to the bus. Now we've got to go someplace.

Now, how do we go someplace? Well, actually, any upset that the individual has is so poised; it is so delicately balanced; it is so difficult to maintain. You know, you look at this fellow. He's in a wheelchair, you know? And you say to yourself, "How is he keeping himself in a wheelchair?" And you think, "Well, it'd be very difficult to get him out of that wheelchair." Oh, no, no! It's very difficult to stay in that wheelchair. That is what's difficult. Unless you learn this reverse look, you'll have trouble with psychosomatics and things like this, particularly battinesses more than psychosomatics. Psychosomatics are not a good example. A battiness of some kind or another is a much better example because they surrender so easily.

This individual is very sure that "horses sleep in beds." Now, you don't look at what it takes to maintain that. That is based on such slippery logic that the least little cogwheel goes adrift in it, it'll collapse. In other words, it's very hard to remain batty. It's not difficult to get well but it's hard to remain batty. A fellow has to work at it. You'll see an odd look coming into somebody's eyes, sometime or another, when you're getting right close to, and you'll see a pc suddenly start veering sideways from you when you start approaching too closely to a piece of battiness.

Let's supposing that having formed a communication line, we merely and only did this – we just did this and we didn't worry about these vast complications and this terrific sea of aberration. We didn't do anything like that. We just said, "Now, what are you doing that's sensible?" and "Why is it sensible?" And you know, a guy's case will just fall to pieces right in front of your eyes. This is a zone to which I invite your attention because it's untrodden. It's virgin. It's native. It's the bush in a completely unspoiled condition.

You see, this communication line is only valuable to the degree that you can walk around in your big muddy feet in the midst of all this morass. And if your communication line is very good and very smooth, and if your auditing discipline is perfect so that – you see, your auditing discipline is perfect so you don't upset this communication line – then you can walk around in this wild jungle that he calls his ideas.

And if you just made a foray of no more importance and no more breadth than "What are you doing that's sensible?" and "Why is it sensible?" and kept your communication line

up the while and kept your affinity up with the pc the while – did it with perfect discipline – you would see more aberration fall to pieces per square inch than you ever thought could exist. See? Now, that's what I mean when I'm saying to you *do something for the pc*.

See, I tell you, "Audit well. Get perfect discipline. Get your comm cycle in. Don't ARC break the pc. Let the cycles of action complete." Don't you see? All of that. Well, that is simply an entrance to the... You see, the discipline of Scientology makes it possible to do this. And one of the reasons why other fields of the mind never got anyplace and never could get near anybody because they couldn't communicate to anybody, see?

So that discipline is important. That is the ladder which goes up to the door. And if you can't get to the door, you can't do anything. You see? So there's two stages here, two stages. And you're busy completing communication cycles and so forth. And I will admit sometimes I get impatient with you, you see, because I'm merely trying to teach you how to communicate to somebody so that you can do something for him, you see? And I sometimes believe that your whole attention gets tremendously absorbed in merely communicating with somebody – see, that – and use that as an end-all. See, and I get a little upset.

Because it's something on the order of – well, let's say you're trying to make an actor, you see? It's something like this, and you get him all set on the subject of makeup, you know, but he keeps standing in the wings made-up and thinks he's acting and he isn't. He's standing in the wings, see?

So this perfect discipline of which we speak: The perfect communication cycle; the perfect auditor presence; perfect meter reading; all of these various things are just to get you in a state where you can do something for somebody. And because this is so new, strange and novel, and is so unheard of in this universe, it looks so startling that you can say, "Well, that's auditing, that's processing, that's it. That's the end product."

Man, that's no more the end product than a can of dog food, see? I mean, it's still there in the can. It's supposed to be eaten, you know? It's the difference between reading a recipe book and dining.

So when you're real slow picking up the discipline, when you're – when you're real slow picking up keeping in a communication cycle, when you're poky on this subject and so forth, you see, you just – still nine miles from the ball, you know? You're not even attending yet. See?

So what you want to be able to do is audit perfectly. By that we mean keep in a communication cycle: be able to approach the pc; be able to talk to the pc; be able to maintain the ARC; get the pc to give you answers to your questions; be able to read a meter; get the reactions; be able to do this; be able to do that; all of those little things, you see? They've all got to be awfully good because it's very difficult to get a communication line in to somebody anyway. And they all have to be present and they all have to be perfect. But if they're all present and they're all perfect, *then we can start to process somebody. Then we can start to process somebody*. And all of that looks so beneficial that you could mistake it for processing.

Now, I'm giving you some kind of an entrance point here of – if all of your cycles were perfect, if you were able to sit there and confront that pc and meter that pc and keep

your auditing reports and do all these other multiple various things and keep a pleasant smile on your face and not chop his communication and – if you can do those various things, now let's find out what do you do. Because there is something you do with those things.

Well, at Level VI this is very easy. You run GPMs. But that's doing something for somebody. And try to run GPMs sometimes without all these other factors near perfect. It's not possible. But let's take it down to a lower level. What could you do for somebody if you were a perfect auditor from the basis of your auditing technique and presence and handling somebody? Now, what could you do? That's the burning question: What could you do?

Now, we used to have this all on backwards. We used to try to teach people what they could do for somebody but they could never get in communication with him to do it. See, so therefore you had failures in processing.

Well, the most elementary procedure – the most elementary procedure, "What are you doing that you think is sensible?" and "Why is it sensible?" That's a perfectly elementary procedure and the guy would all of a sudden gawp at you.

And he'd say, "Oh, no!" you know? Because these things are very difficult to maintain as an insensibility. You have to work hard to have something in crosswise. "Horses sleep in beds."

All right, you say, "Well, what are you doing – what do you think is sensible?" or "What are you doing that's sensible?" or anything of this sort.

And the fellow says, "Well, I think horses sleep in beds. That's sensible."

"All right, now why is that sensible?"

"Well... that's nuts!" See?

You actually wouldn't have to do anything more than that, see? See? Now, one of the things that's horrible about all this is it's so easy to do but you keep looking for some magic. Well, your magic was getting into communication with the person. The rest of it is very easy to do. All you had to do is remain in communication with the person while you're doing this and realize that these huge boulders that he's got in his skull are poised with the most fantastically delicate balance on little pinheads, see, little pinpoint balance. And all you have to do is go *phooh*, like that, and this thing goes *Brrooomm*, crash! Now, if you're not in communication with this person, he takes it as an accusative action; he tries to justify thinking that way; he tries to make himself look good to you; he tries to put on a public front of some kind or another sitting in the pc's chair; he tries to hold up his status. And any time I see a bunch of pcs around jumping happily to something else because it's "Only sane people can run on that," you see, "and crazy ones run on something else."

Well, everybody immediately will have the same computation, so they never have to be run on the crazy one. I right away know their auditors are not in communication with them and that auditing discipline itself has broken down because the pc is trying to justify himself and trying to hold – uphold his own status. So he must be defending himself against the auditor. So the auditor couldn't possibly be in communication with him, could he?

So right back – we're right back to the fundamental of, "Why didn't the auditor get into communication with the pc in the first place?" Well, you get into communication with the pc in the first place by doing the proper Scientology discipline. That is not any trick. It is – goes off one, two, three, four. You sit down and you start the session and you start talking to somebody and you start handling the pc and you start handling his problems, and that sort of thing; and you do it by completing your communication cycles and not cutting his communication and by this and by that – the very things you're taught in the TRs. And you'll find you're in communication with the person. And where you fail and why he maintains his status is you've gotten into communication with the person and then you've never done anything for the person.

Unless having gotten into communication you now do something for the person, you lose, of course, your communication line, because the R-factor breaks down. He doesn't think you're so good and you go out of communication with the person. Do you understand? You can get into communication with the person, then not do anything for the person; the R-factor of why you are in communication with the person can break down and break down with you. You say, "Well, here I am in communication with the person. What am I supposed to do now?" You'll go out of communication with the person and you've somehow taken a little circular trip which was in toward the person and then away from the person, see?

All right, that having happened, now the person will be in sort of defensive and status and wonder why he's being processed and – you see, he could wonder all these questions.

It takes a process now. Now you've got to do something for the person and it takes a process. But it takes an understanding of what a process is. And a process is simply a combination of mental mechanisms which by – which when inspected will pass away. All auditing is negative gain, you never add anything to the case. All auditing is subtractive, you're as-ising things on the case and that's all you're doing. So you say, "All right, what do you think is sensible?"

The guy says, "Horses sleep in beds. Ah – ! Hey, that isn't sensible." Cognition. Total duration of process, see, was that.

You actually will get a – probably get a big blowdown or something like that on your E-meter – be a huge blowdown on your E-meter. Now, you try to get more tone arm action out of the fact that "horses sleep in beds." You don't get there. You flattened the process.

So it requires a sensitivity to know when the process is flat. You can over-audit and under-audit. You can try to run that tone arm action out of things which have no tone arm action left in them and you can walk off and leave things which have a ton of tone arm action left in them. You can do one or the other of these things. But this requires observation of the pc, and it only answers this question: Have you done anything for the pc? Once more, you only have to answer that question: Have you done something for the pc?

Well, if you've done something for the pc, you are not likely to get any more tone arm action out of it. Now, this is – becomes elementary, you see? We're breaking this down into 1) and 2). So, 1) there's the auditing discipline, and 2) there's doing something for the pc. If you've done something for the pc, you've gotten the tone arm action out of it. It isn't that you really even do anything for the pc by having the tone... getting the tone arm action out of it,

you see? That's simply an indicator of whether you're doing anything or not. This becomes – I'm beating a dead horse to death, now, don't you see, because this is not – it's not that complicated. That's – it's less complicated than anybody imagines.

You say to the pc, "What's sensible?"

"Well," he says, "Oh, well, so – well, yes psychiatry and psychoanalysis and congressmen and elections and governments. They're all sensible and something is sensible, and something else is sensible, and so on and so on, and they're all sensible." Well, let's observe the pc. Have you done anything for the pc yet? Well, the funny part of it is that your tone arm is going to be moving during this period. See, we haven't done anything, really, for the pc yet. And he goes on and he says, "Well, my old teacher was sensible. My old teacher used to tell me, well, I'd never succeed in the world, and he was right. And he was sensible."

And you're still getting tone arm action, see? "And he was – I don't know."

"Was he sensible or wasn't he sensible?"

"I don't know. You know, I have done some things in life. You don't suppose I could be failing all the time because he was so sure I would? *Uhghh*, this doesn't make any sense. You know, I think that man was a blithering ass! I think he was a complete fool. How would he know that I would never succeed in life? He's silly. I don't think he was sensible. No, we'll forget about that being sensible. Well, that – that wasn't sensible. That – you know, that's why I failed in life! Because he was so sure I would. And I always thought he was so sensi... Well, I'll be a son of a gun!"

Right about that moment your TA action goes *bzzp, bzzp, zzp, thup-bup* there's no more TA action, see?

Now you, knucklehead, not having noticed... I should be polite, I laid down a maxim "Always be polite to somebody who is trying to learn something," you see? You don't notice this one answer has come your way. You have done something for him. So now you start beating up the brush to do something for him. This is very bad timing, don't you see?

Now, you could go on with the process in some other way and some other field or some other channel, but you've handled something and you've done something. And if you keep him working on that one thing that he has now – you've now done something for him on, your TA action will disappear and your pc will get resentful. And not only will your TA action disappear, but you'll lose your comm line.

Now, let's try to press him. "What about this old teacher?" see? He's already had the cognition, see? Wow! See, "What about this old teacher? When did you know him? Did you have any overts against him?" and so forth. Notice your TA. TA is not moving. You're now restimulating the pc. You've gotten your key-out – destimulation factor has occurred right before your eyes. You've done something for the pc.

Now, hear me now, it's just a matter of. "Have you done anything for the pc or not?" And on any given subject, when you have done something for the pc, your TA action in that zone and area will cease. If there's any TA action to be gained in that area while you are doing something for the pc, you will get tone arm action. But sooner or later it is going to run up

to having done something for the pc, see? Your TA action is about to do something for the pc, you see? That tells you that something there that can be done for the pc, and your TA action will go on toward the point where you have done something for the pc, and now this is past tense. Now, you're going to get more TA action on his dear, old teacher. In a pig's eye you are! That is a went proposition, now. So! It requires of the auditor discipline to keep in his communication line. He's got to stay in communication with his pc. Those cycles have got to be perfect. He can't be distracting the pc's attention onto the TA. "I'm not getting any tone arm action now." That's not staying in communication with the pc, see? Has nothing much to do with it. You're distracting the pc from his own zones and areas. So don't keep his attention out of session, you know? Keep him going on this; keep that communication line in. And the next requirement is do something for the pc: do something productive; use the communication line. Now that you've got the telephone in your hands, for God sakes, talk! See? There's nothing quite as silly as receiving a transatlantic telephone call where the other person then doesn't talk.

They phoned you – I got one not – not a month or two ago, and the person actually at the other end of the line stood there with the live phone in their hand with nothing to say. Undoubtedly, they had something to say but they just couldn't think of it at the time it finally got through.

And many an auditor who isn't getting a result with a pc is sitting there with the telephone in his hand not saying anything, see? He's got all the lines in, "Hello, hello. Are you there?"

"Oh, yes, I'm here," bright and cheerful.

"Oh – oh." See? Now, too much astonishment to say anything to the pc, see? So we go back to putting a communication line in, see? Best thing to do is to call back central and find out if we really do have a call to the pc, see? Find out if it was the correct number after all. Call up the rate operator and find out how much it's costing.

Do you see? You see, you can walk right up – you can walk right up to this crucial point and then die on the vine. You can start getting tone arm action on the pc and then never press it home. This thing all of a sudden there's – big drop. He says something about – you said – well, just – let's take this weird little process: "What's sensible?" see?

And he says, "Well, the most sensible person I ever knew was my old instructor."

Wiff. You know, you've got some tone arm. You make a note over here. "Instructor," it gave a tone arm action, and so on and so on. And "What's the question again? Sensible. Sensible. What does sensible mean? Is *sensible* a sensible word?" And so forth. No tone arm action there, you see?

And you say, "(Well, look, there was a bit of a tone arm motion there when he said 'the old instructor.')

You said something about this old instructor being sensible."

"Oh, yeah! Oh, terrifically sensible man." More TA, see?

"Well, have you adopted any of his views or anything like that?"

"Oh, yes, my whole life has been monitoring by the views," you see? See, big TA going on. And we'll go on this way and all of a sudden he's – he knew the pc was going to fail. Pc suddenly gets that in crosswise, you see? You'll see a big reaction and then the more reaction, more reaction and then all of a sudden the pc suddenly cognites, "Maybe that's why I'm failing all the time. I am *blaug-ow-ow-oh*," see? "Yeah! That guy is a fool. I didn't – he wasn't sensible at all. Ha! What do you know about that!" See? Big TA action occurs right before that moment. And if you're riding right up on your toes, you won't expect another whisper to come out of that old man. You won't ask for another whisper to come out of it, nothing. That's gone. That is dead. That's as dead as yesterday's newspaper.

You see, that's where the tone arm leads you into this. And if I was trying to teach you, totally mechanically, I'd say you go ahead and make sure there is nothing flat in there, but actually your communication line is at risk all the time you're trying to find out if anything else is in that. Your communication line is at risk. You're liable to get – unplug the whole switchboard.

"Well, hell, I told you! I had the cognition, you know? I told you already! I have – how many times do I have to...?"

See, there goes your communication line, you see? And after awhile, you'll get the point. You'll say, "Look, we're pulling switches out of the switchboard here. We're messing things up." And come off of it.

Actually, if you're very, very clever, you'll run a process that cyclically produces this sort of thing by a general question so that you don't make that particular goof. You don't have to make the piece of judgment, which I just gave you, all the time, see?

It took me a long time – and really, it took me as an auditor a long time – to learn when to give up on somebody. You know, learn when to give up on a subject. And I finally got clever and tuned my antenna up on a Martian wavelength and got it up to a point where that thing was flat. I could see that was flat, see? And where, if I pursued it any further, I would now get into trouble: Where I had done something for the pc and, in trying to do anything further along that particular line, would put my communication line at risk. And I got to a point where I could judge that just like that, you know? Pc happy, tone arm increasing every session, everything going along swingingly.

But let me tell you that it is a very interesting point. It'd be something I would be very happy to be able to teach you. But I'm afraid it's something that you learn on the basis of observation. Now, in Level VI you're learning that; there is nothing deader than a dead item. When it has give up its ghost, there is no more tone arm action there. If there is any more cognition in it, any more read in it, yes, yes, you could get it out. But you develop a sensitivity after a while as an auditor. You know when it has given up its ghost. And you know that just mentioning it or referring to it one more time is practically fatal. Your pc just feels like he's being ground into the dirt. See, just one more mention of that item and you've had it, see?

And you'll start to get a tick-tocky needle, and other undesirable phenomena sets in, and if you keep it up – "Yeah, well, I'm not sure whether the item has read or not. I didn't have my eye on the meter at the time." (Calling pc's attention to the meter, always, if you

want ARC breaks.) "I didn't have my eye on the meter and I don't really know whether it read or not. And, of course, I must – I must have seen it read before I can go on, but maybe I missed it." That's the – one of the most marvelous ARC breaky situations that I could possibly set up, and yet it's one of the commonest ones.

Now let's take this same situation. There was only so much charge, see, on this old instructor or something like that. See, there is only that much charge on it. You've got it! He wasn't an item. He was a lock of some kind or another. But boy, you blew it. You've seen it blow; you've seen the pc change before your very eyes. Now that's the time to unload; that's the time to swing off that freight train and hit the gravel and grab another one. Not necessarily change the process but certainly don't press that guy any further in the direction of what has just given TA.

You could now ask him – but there's ways of asking auditing questions that are part of a communication line. There is a way of dismissing everything you have been talking about while asking the same question as you did before. You know? Sort of like, "Well all right, we've taken care of that. You've gotten all of that. Good. Good, I'm glad we've got – we've finished off with that. All right, now let's get back to the original process now. What's sensible?"

You get an idea? There is a thing an auditor can do. He doesn't have to say all those things I just said, but that is the way he is building the atmosphere. You know, he acknowledges on the idea, "Oh, that old tutor you had. Yeah. All right, well, we got that, good. We got that. Let's..." so on. You even do a little business here about crossing it all off, you know? And, "All right, now we're getting back in the original process. Okay."

Here, you see? Now, we say same auditing question, we say, "What's sensible?" But he obviously knows that it's now being addressed to some entirely different zone of the mind and as such you shift that. You're still doing something for the pc. You follow this?

So there's getting up to the bus and then there's getting in it and going someplace. And you could become a past master at auditing discipline and motions and so forth – and actually have to be a past master at it anyhow before you can carry on the rest of it – never carry it another sixteenth of an inch, have a lot of pcs that absolutely loved you and swore by you who went right on having lumbosis. And you would say, "What in the name of heaven has happened to me? What terrible catastrophe am I looking at here?"

Well, everything is fine, except you're not doing anything for the pc. You got right up to there and got on the bus but you never drove off anyplace and you never did anything. That's the whole secret of auditing. It's in two sections.

Of course, Level VI, you do it so fast that you hardly get a chance to you call this, and boom it goes, and that's the end of it. And of course, there it's predicted where the charge is going to be, and you know what's going to fire and all that sort of thing. So you say, "Well, this is something different." No, it isn't any different at all. Cleverer auditing is below – is below IV. See, you've got to be clever. There's ways of asking auditing questions, which is the same question, which could make the pc believe implicitly that his answer had not been accepted.

I'm sure we've all had at one time or another this trouble. We've repeated the auditing question and the pc thinks his cognition has been invalidated. So then, to prove to him that his cognition has not been invalidated, we preserve our communication line by wildly changing a process that is not flat as a general process. And that is one of the most flagrant examples and that is the most general reason why auditors run lots of processes. They haven't mastered the trick of convincing the pc that his cognition has been accepted and that they're all done with that particular zone or area of the process and that the process that is being run is now expected to go into some other zone or area. Direction of attention this comes under.

You can do some pretty wild things with direction of attention. You can exaggerate this up like mad. Pc says, "Oh, oh, yes! Yes. Yes, yes, yes. See, you're asking me sensible. Oh, yeah. Textbooks. Yeah. Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho!" Big blowdown, see?

And you say, "What's with textbooks?"

"Oh, well, good God, you know, they pretend they're sensible and nobody can make any sense out of them at all. Ha-ha!"

Gone, that TA now is gone. You understand it, that's as far as you're permitted to pursue it. You've now done something for the pc. It isn't manifested in any degree that you will notice right there at that moment. But how do you now convince the pc that your next same auditing question is not actually going to be addressed to textbooks? Well, there are crude mechanisms for doing it.

"All right. We've taken care of textbooks. Now, in some other zone or area, what's sensible?" That's doing it with an axe. "We got your communication. We consider that that particular zone or area is complete and we're not asking you to do anything more in that zone or area because you've already gotten the tone arm action out of *that*. Now, asking exactly the same auditing question, but addressing it to some *other* zone or area of the mind, what's sensible?" See, this is the message which you're putting across in the middle of your communication line.

Now, you can make – you could do some weird, weird, weird things with cases. You – it's quite, quite unbelievable what you can do with a case, steering him around in this particular zone on some general process. Now, this is not running an alternate process; this is really not running itsa. This is merely a finished method of handing a process to a pc: Is run him to cognition; run him to cognition. And that's actually not new. It's running the pc to cognition, but it's on the same thing.

And nearly everybody has understood "running to cognition" – change the process when the pc has cognited. Well, that is very far from true. You change the sub-subject of the process on the cognition. You don't change the process.

Your process can be far too specific. It can be a sub-process. "Right around the vicinity of this rug, you see, have you ever made a footprint?" See? Well, it's so circumscribed as an auditing question that it's really a subquestion anyhow. So what you really want to run on a pc is a broad question which you've already established, and running to cognition is knocking off these sub-cognitions on it. Now, you take something as broad as "What's sensible?" Ooooh, that's broad.

Now, of course, "Putting footprints on this rug, see, that's sensible. I don't know why it's sensible," he suddenly says, "but it doesn't seem to be any reason at all why I should put footprints... Do you know, I see a rug of this particular type and I always have to put a footprint on it. That's real crazy. That's real crazy. I think that's Wadsworth, or somebody, 'Footprints on the sands of time,' yeah. It already – yeah. Yes, I learned the poem when I had scarlet fever. Yeah. Yeah, there was a rug in the room the same as the rug in this room. Oh, that's what that's all about."

"All right, good." You've had your blowdown. "All right, that – that's fine. Now, aside from that and footprints and that sort of thing, which we've got, and so forth. What's sensible?"

See, that's just parking it. That's how to really, smartly run by cognition. You can be smarter than a tack if you pursue this particular course. But I'm warning you that that particular approach requires some sensitivity on the part of the auditor. He has to ask himself this question continually: "What have I done for the pc?"

I used to run an auditing session until I had done something for the pc. You take a short-attention pc, particularly. The session was exactly as long as it took me to do something for the pc. And horribly enough, some of those sessions would go four or five hours, and I had thought they would run as long as fifteen minutes. But that's because we never got into the communication cycle necessary to do something for the pc. And it'd take maybe that long to establish a communication line before we could start to ask the pc what's cooking. See?

You'll sometimes start asking an alternate question of a pc, back and forth, and notice that the answers are dodgy. These are dodgy answers. Well, merely and completely recognize out of that dodginess just one thing: that your communication line to the pc has failed in some particular way.

I'll give you an example. You start to process a child – you start to process a child on the idea of "What problems do you have?" You're going to you're going to process this child, you see? And the child is sitting there very dodgily answering this question. And they appear to be very reluctant to answer the question. You realize that this reluctance isn't really any withhold or anything, it's just that the child cannot talk to you. Then you suddenly realize that the process you should have started in on was "What could you say to me?"

You maybe process the child on something very fundamental, like "What problems do you have?" and get no place because you aren't doing anything for the pc; so therefore, you get minimum tone arm action and so forth. Well, you haven't established a communication line to the pc. You shift your gears and ask something that has nothing to do – well, the child has been sick, let us say, and the child feels badly and there's a lot of things wrong with this child. And you shift off onto a process such as "What could you say to me?" and "What would you rather not say to me?" And the – you say, "Well, there's lots of mechanisms in this such as withholds coming off and all that sort of thing." But the surprising thing about it is you now have tone arm action, you now have a session running because you're getting in your communication line. At the same time, you're incidentally getting off a few withholds, which is doing something for the pc, too, at the same time you're getting in a communication line.

A process like that tends to confuse you. You see why it'd be confusing? Because it's putting in the communication line and it's doing something for the pc at the same time.

Well, there are a great many of these processes in Scientology which get in the communication line and do something for the pc at the same time. So, therefore, this breakdown of getting into communication with the pc and then doing something for the pc becomes obscured because you're doing them both at once. And then you begin to become confirmed in the idea that getting in the communication line is what's doing something for the pc. See, so the whole subject now gets lost all over again. Even though you do, then, use a combination that accomplishes both at once, don't lose sight of the fact that there are two actions and you won't make very many mistakes along this line.

Now, all of this is really a prelude to O/W because O/W is just about the greatest, handy-jim-dandy little communication wrecker that an auditor ever had very much to do with. And an auditor loses the ARC he has with the pc a time or two and he becomes very timid. And he starts asking, "Do you have any overts? Have you committed any overts?"

And the pc says, "Yes. Well, I thought people were mean to me, and it was really an overt to think that against myself."

And the auditor says, "Well, he got off a big overt," and so forth. And they will go on this way and on this way and on this way and on this way, a sort of a motivatorish, critical think, you know? And the auditor never tags it and never nails it and never does anything about it and never corrects it; and nothing happens with the pc and the communication line doesn't improve because the pc is actually running a falsity. And it just winds up in a pile of garbage. You see, we really never get anyplace. So we're really adventuring on something that is very, very intricate when we're adventuring on O/W.

It's not a simple mechanism, because although handled rightly, it would put in the communication line at the same time it was doing something for the pc. The auditor protects his communication line to the pc – he protects his communication line to the pc by not asking anything embarrassing. And he permits his pc to sit there with withholds in the session half-ARC broke with the communication line flying out the window. And he never presses home to find one of these things out. He can even get a read on the meter that exists and never really ask for it because he doesn't want to risk his communication line. So this makes O/W dicey.

Now, another thing that made it dicey in the old days is the fact that *withhold* occurs in the bank. And you should not use the word *withhold*.

Of course, withhold is an out of ARC condition and it's an out of ARC process and, actually, cannot be run solo. You can take an out of ARC process and run it in combinations with an ARC process. You can say, "What have you done? What have you not done?" You could say, "What have you said? What have you not said?" You could say, "What have you thought? What have you not thought?" or something like that. But again, *thought* is a risky one because that also occurs in the bank. But done, fortunately, really doesn't occur in the bank.

Now, I've told you that O/W is senior to the bank. Now, this might lead you to believe that once you'd got the bank gone you'd still have O/W. No, this is not the case. It is senior in that it will key out the bank.

Now, let's look at this a little more intimately and find why it keys out the bank: Because the whole common denominator of the bank would be "done." That's the common denominator of the whole reactive bank. In other words, a high order of lock. And anybody who knows the constituency of the bank could look those things over and he'd certainly say, "Heh-heh! Yeah, that's true." It's just a high order of lock, don't you see?

So it's a lock on all parts of reactivity. Now, when we specify what things have been done to, we err, because we might run into another piece of the bank, you see? So the generalized statement, or a common or the proper name of somebody, is quite allowable.

We find our pc has a present time problem with Oswald. Perfectly proper to say "What have you done to Oswald?" We're not running into any bank because he hasn't got Oswald as part of the basic reactive mind. "Men," that might be different. That might be too close in. But this guy, Oswald; what have we done to Oswald?

Now, we'd find, weirdly enough, that the communication line to Oswald will have been interrupted because of an overt to Oswald, so therefore, one couldn't communicate to Oswald.

A present time problem is also produced by failing to complete a communication. There is really one for the book. That's something I don't think I've told you. I've known it for a long time but I just think I've omitted mentioning it. I might have, I might have mentioned it, but I doubt it. A present time problem can be created by a failure to complete a communication cycle. This is so much the case that if your pc, coming into session, were asked – you were to ask your pc coming into session, "Is there any communication you haven't completed?" the pc would rattle off several and the pc would not register on present time problem. This is another method of handling PTPs. They tend to vanish under this.

Now, you're not trying to erase the PTPs anyway. All you're trying to do with these PTPs is get them out of the road so that you can audit somebody. You never erase, in rudiments, anyway. Actually, you never erase in anything below Level VI, now. So your action here is a destimulative action and that question all by itself will adequately destimulate the pc so the pc can be audited. You'll find it very seldom that you will fail to get around a present time problem with that question. Of course, the problem can still be there but the pressure is gone on it.

Now, "I got PTPs," the pc says.

You say, "Well, what communication have you failed to complete or haven't you completed with regard to these?"

And the pc says, "*Brrow, brrow, brrrow, brrow, brrrow, brrow,*" and that's the end, and you don't get none that will register on PTP. That would be a common experience.

Now, the reason he has PTPs with these people and hasn't completed the communication is because he's got overts. So we get the secondary consideration on PTPs. You never

have a PTP with anything you don't have an overt on. Of course that's primary, really. Your PTPs stem from overts. If you have an overt against a telephone pole, you will have a PTP with a telephone pole, see, something like this. Psychosomatics go back to PTPs which go back to overts. So you can actually run out psychosomatics on this but it's a rather adventurous undertaking. You're liable to get the pc into more than you can easily get him out of. But you can, in *extremis*, handle a psychosomatic illness on the basis that it must be a present time problem. See? The guy has got lumbosis. All right. There, then, you immediately – you have two approaches.

The least adventurous of these approaches, and the swiftest one to handle, is the guy has got lumbosis of the – of the blumjum. And you say, "Well, what communication haven't you completed to or about the blumjum?"

"Oh, well, that's simple. I had an appointment at the hospital, and *waf-waf-saf-saf-naf*, and I had an appointment there. And I was supposed to go to the drugstore and then get some stuff, and so forth. And I actually, I was telling my Aunt Maisy the other day about the blumjum was a very obstructive mechanism as far as I was concerned. And I didn't finish the letter and – what? The somatic is gone. What happened?" The pc is liable to be very startled at this point because they are apparently not talking about anything that had anything to do with doing something for the blumjum. That's what I mean by it's very, very difficult to keep lumbosis around. It is. It takes a lot of doing.

So we have these two approaches, not just one. The unfinished cycle of communication to or about the "it"; the unfinished cycle of communication to or about the object that you're trying to handle, which is a PTP. Guy has a present time problem with Internal Revenue. Well, we don't much care about wondering and settling this problem but we certainly want him less obsessively concerned with it. So let's do something to get rid of this problem.

All right, the easiest pitch is an unfinished cycle of communication, and the second one is a done.

And let me call to your attention, you have now followed out the exact one-two that I gave you for the auditor to a pc. See, this is the way the mind stacks up.

Now, it's quite sensational just getting a communication line straightened out to something. This is quite sensational. It doesn't really finish off everything there is to finish off. It is merely sensational. So the best thing to ask a pc who has a PTP – the best thing to ask this pc to get rid of his PTP is "What cycle of communication have you failed to complete with regard to this?" "To it" or "about it?"

See, he's given you a present time problem. "Present time problem with my wife."

"All right. What cycle of communication have you failed to complete or have you not completed (better wording) to your wife or about your wife? Hm?" And it all sort of goes *bzz-bzz-bzz*, and an awful lot of the time this problem evaporates as a problem. But you haven't taken very much care of this problem yet because you've approximated the one-two of the auditor, you see? You've really not done anything about the problem. You've just eased it off. See? You've gotten in there so that you could do something about it.

But you will very often find out quite magically that for the purposes of destimulation and getting on with the session on what you were doing yesterday, and so forth, that it's quite adequate. And you'll very often find that in the field of psychosomatic auditing that it's quite adequate.

The severity of the illness has *nothing whatsoever* to do with the ease or difficulty of its release. These two things are not comparable. You'll find some guy with some sniffing, little sinus condition that merely nags him, that takes a thousand hours of itsa before it finally surrenders. And this other bird has got a busted back and can't even move his feet, and you might cure the whole thing up in five minutes. Don't ever measure – don't ever measure the length of auditing by the violence of the condition because they are not necessarily in keeping one after the other; they're not.

So anyway, there's your first chance just with an auditor. An auditor can sometimes sit down and audit a pc for a few minutes. He just gets in his communication line, you see? The other fellow finds out there's somebody he can talk to, the auditor, with his good discipline and everything. And all of a sudden, the guy feels wonderful, see? And he says, "Well, it's all settled now."

And the auditor says, "Wait a minute that can't be. I didn't do anything, you know?" Well, that's true, but as far as this guy is concerned it's all settled. He's found one human being out of the whole sun, moon or stars he could talk to and this was enough to momentarily key him out and make him feel better. Perfectly adequate action. And then you go around waiting for this miracle to happen again, don't you see? Well the miracle, maybe, won't happen for many a pc because, of course, what the missing thing was is you didn't do anything for this first pc and you knew it. So you get lazy and you expect to go on through auditing not doing anything for people and have them feel marvelous.

I think that's the one-shot Clear and so on. You see, if that existed, we'd all be out of work. So you can bless your stars it doesn't.

But you occasionally get this type of a reaction. You'll get somebody reading, just reading a book on Scientology and all of a sudden going well all over the place, you see? Well, that's because somebody understands them or somebody knows what it's all about or somebody has put his finger on what the score is with life. And just the fact that this data could exist all of a sudden gives a guy a resurgence and he gets out of his sick bed. This has happened many, many times. But that's just the first step, see? That's the communication step.

Now, this other step, when it doesn't occur automatically, you want to be able to do something about it. You don't go around expecting the accident to happen all the time, you see? So you ask this – let me take it up in the most elementary session form possible, terribly elementary session form and that is, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Oh, well, yeah. Oh, yo – boy, do I have a – oh, oh, man! Ha-ha. You should ask."

"All right, well, is there any communication you have not completed with regard to those problems?"

"Oh, *brr, brrzz, brzzzz, brzzzz, brzzz, brzzz, brzzz, brzzz, brrzzz, brzzz.*" Problem is all gone.

You say, "What magic! How marvelous!" All right. That's fine. That's fine, but remember what you have just done is the lick and the promise. See, you have not gone any more fundamentally into it than that.

Now supposing you were in the horrible condition of having said, "What communication have you failed to complete about those present time problems?"

And the pc says, "Oh, well, none of that would do any good. Nothing. One couldn't, you know? That's it." Now what do you do? Your favorite card trick has laid an egg. Now where do we go?

Well, there's number two. You see, you should realize that up to this point you haven't done number two. You haven't done anything for the pc so this second one is "done." You see, "doing something" is mostly "done." See, they rhyme; they go together very nicely.

Now, why? Because it's the highest common lock of the whole reactive mind. If he has a present time problem with something, he has overts against it. And if you really want to do something about these things now, you had better get off those overts. And if this has been getting in your way consistently and continuously, you'd jolly well better get off of those overts. You better get them off of that case, man, because they are big and they are flagrant and they are mad.

If your card trick won't work of "What communication have you failed to complete?" (I keep saying "failed to complete." You should never use "fail" as an auditing command, it's an old habit. "What communication have you not completed?" or "haven't you completed?") You got the other one – the other one. Now that's doing something for a pc. And there's such a vast difference between the amount of skill required between saying to somebody "What communication hasn't been completed?" See, *brrrr-dada, da, da.* It doesn't upset him; it's not embarrassing, there's no social status challenged here. You're improving his communication so your communication with him improves. It requires nothing of your auditing discipline. See, that's the lazy, long sleep. Why? Because it's really just step one again.

Now you're going to have to "done." And man, that takes auditing – that takes some auditing. I know of seventeen different ways that you might have to approach a case in order to get off its series of overts to actually throw out of the existence all of the pc's upset about it. And you might have to use every single one of them.

There are lots of them. There's overts in chains; there is the subject of recurring withholds; there's the subject of the recurring overt; there's the subject of the – getting the basic-basic of something; the formulation of the proper question to ask so that – this can get pretty complicated. We've had all that technology here over a period of time. A lot of you are here who have been here before, and so forth, have sweat it out. But it's very valuable technology.

Some individual keeps telling you that he threw mud at a car when he was sixteen, and this is an overt. And he gives you this overt and he gives you this overt and he gives you this overt, nothing happens. But he keeps telling you this overt. Well, now, you have to know

what is happening here and know what to do about it. Otherwise, he'll just keep on giving you the overt. This is part of a chain of overts. This is what's known as a recurring overt.

And the trouble with it is, is you're nowhere near its basic. And now you have to be able to codify the question necessary to get the basic of the chain and you have to be able to audit this sort of thing by chains. And this can become very interesting indeed. And then you have to be prepared to find no overt as the bottom of the chain. And that is one of the more mysterious things. The guy has *always* believed that he had an overt there and none was there. There's that phenomenon which can hold a chain in. Another is – there's plenty to know about this.

But man is basically good despite his reactive bank. The reactive bank is only composed to make a man commit overts, which is against his better nature. If he commits these overts, therefore, he'll trap himself because he won't go on communicating, having committed them. So it's the perfect trap. You do not want to talk to people you have wronged. I very – I'm very shy of letting anybody wrong me, not because they will do me any damage, because they can sure cut themselves up. They commit an overt act, don't you see, and then they will try to withhold and sever the communication line for fear that they will commit another overt act. That actually is the fundamental think of man.

After awhile he goes out of control and he just starts dramatizing. And then you have the murderer and the thief and the rest of the fellow who has no responsibility or anything. He's actually left the human race at this – by this time. But along some line, that individual will still have a sensibility: He will still be sensible in his responsibility in some zone or quarter. And, in handling such a person, an auditor has to be terrifically good. He has to find some zone in that person's existence that that person could commit an overt on.

Oh, the person has slain cities full of people, don't you see, and he's done this and he's done that. Put any – put any crime on the book; this person has done this crime without the least qualms. Ah, well, the auditor contest there is to find *what!* You see, he's totally out of communication with everything, that's why he can commit the crimes. He's gone. He's just dramatizing. He's not even there, he's *woof!* All right. You've got to find, as an auditor, some zone he can still commit an overt against. What overt would be real to this individual? And you'll find *some* little corner of his existence is still an overt.

Now, there's other ways to build up overts in an individual. You say, "All right. What have you done? What have you done?" And the individual will give you perhaps something which is a rather banal statement. You can ask him, "Well, why was it all right to do that?" And he will give you a lot of justifications and so forth. There's that approach.

Now "What terrible, vicious, mean thing..." This is another thing, you see? Just "done" is just "done." You know, "What have you done?"

"Well, I've eaten breakfast." That's a perfectly adequate answer to the question, see?

But "What mean vicious thing have you done?" Now, this would be another branch that we call overts. See, just "What have you done?" that can be used – that can be used all by itself as an auditing question. "What have you done?" But you wouldn't, really, except if you were – educated your pc into answering the question under some special connotation, you

really wouldn't get nothing but overts, you see? But it's perfectly valid to do that – to get such answers and so forth. The only modification which you require are "What are you absolutely sure you have done?"

Now, let me tell you why that is vitally necessary that you understand these two branches of "done." One of – "What have you done that is socially reprehensible that will prevent you from communicating and doing something else?" That's what we call an overt. And the other one is just having taken an action in the direction of. That's just "done" see? It means just that. It means having taken an action in the direction of, see, nothing, no significance with regard to it at all.

Now if we run just plain "done" on the individual, we could be totally knuckleheaded as an auditor and not guide the individual in any way, and he would immediately start doing something else. Now, what would he start doing? He would start looking for the explanation. He's running a process – you're running – you're saying, "What have you done? What have you done? What have you done?" And the pc is no longer running that process. Now, hear me now. This is the big liability of this "done." The pc now starts looking for an explanation for what has happened to him. And he's now running the process "Explain what has happened – maybe this will explain what has happened to me."

You might as well be asking, "Explain what has happened to you. Explain what has happened to you. Explain what has happened to you." That's the process he's running. He's running "Explain what has happened to you," but you're running "What have you done?" Now, unless you're aware of the fact that almost any pc under the sun will convert the process "done" to "Explain what has happened to you," you will never be able to run a pure "done" on a pc. If you don't know this, then you can't run "done" on a pc. He'll convert it. He starts looking for the explanation, and he will start inventing things he has not done in order to get rid of the consequences which he is experiencing. He's trying to find a good enough overt to explain what is occurring in his life.

Now there, there is your considerable difference in these processes. And what an auditor has trouble with there, then – we'll recapitulate very rapidly – an auditor then has trouble differentiating between communicating with the pc and doing something for a pc. And then when he gets into running "done," he doesn't want to sacrifice his communication line in order to press home any nasty personal little facts, you see? So he never really presses home his question. And the next action is he runs into the square brick wall of the pc doesn't run the process. The pc runs "Explain what has happened."

Well, a fellow is subject to continuous headaches. So he will actually, in a desperate condition, start giving you fictitious deeds – fictitious deeds. He'll very often go on to the far backtrack to give you a fictitious deed. You always want to beware of that because you know at once that this happens, that the individual has done this to you. "I shot fifteen Praetorian guards in Rome." *Ah-ugh-hoo-oh*, no, no, no, no, that is not an answer to the auditing question because the auditing question is, understand, "What do you jolly-well, damn-well know you've done?" But what auditor is going to sacrifice his communication line by cutting up a pc down in – shooting him down in flames to that degree? No, you'll listen to a couple of these, but all right, steer it back to where it belongs because he's looking for an explanation.

He isn't trying to find what he'd done. All you want is "What are you certain you've done, bud?" That's all the answer you want. "What are you – what are you real certain – what do you know, absolutely, that you have done?"

You could work a gradient scale up from "I know I've eaten breakfast. In fact, I know that sometime during the last year I've eaten. Yes, what have I done? What am I absolutely certain I know? I know I've spent some money. I know I must have spent some money in the last few days. I don't really have any exact recollection of any money, but I have less money now than then, so therefore I must have spent some money in the last few days."

"All right. Well, do you know you've spent some money in the last few days?"

"Well that – ." This is an actual auditing sequence, you see? "Do you know you've spent some money in the last few?"

"Well, I must have because I have less money now."

"Well, that is, you're just computing that you spent some money in the last few days. Do you know that you spent any money in the last few days? Come on. What – where did you spend some money in the last few days?"

"Oh, my God, you ask me a question like that, I *o-o-o-oh-ooo. Hum-m-mm-m-m. Hmmmm. Done. Hum-m-m. Ha-ha-ha. Sixpence. I spent a sixpence for a lolly.*"

"All right. Good enough. Here's the next question. What have you done?"

"Well, well, well, let's see. What have I done? What have I done? Let's see. Let's see." Starts squeezing his head a little bit. "What have I done – so on. Well, I was a headsman once that worked up in the Tower and I missed Ann Boleyn's head and hit her with the flat of the head with an axe." You know what he's – what he's figured out? He tried to answer the question, he got a headache, so he tried to explain why he had the headache, so he reaches back into the past and he gets some uncertain piece of something. So he tries to offer you something that is enough overt to give him that much headache. And that's why it's very difficult.

Now, you'll find that people who answer the question that way – the test is do they ever get well? No, they have an awful time. They have a pretty bad time.

Now, it isn't, actually, whether they did do it or didn't do it. It's their degree of certainty on having done it. See? And I can very easily go 500 years ago back into France and give you the name, rank and serial number of a lot of things, see? And I can give these things to you, but after I've run a few of them, I start running into "Let's see, was her name Mary? or was it Marie? or was it...? And did that happen at Agincourt? or was that at Poitiers?" And next thing you know I'm in a fog. And if I go on this way very long, I'll start wondering whether I even was alive yesterday because I haven't entered it from a zone of certainty. See? I've entered it from a zone of dim recollection or something like this, you know?

So "done" is built up on a gradient of certainty, not built up on a gradient of explanations of what is happening to the pc or has happened to the pc. You might even convert the question so that it's "What are you quite positive that you have done?" You want to be careful about saying "absolutely certain."

See, it's no criticism of the pc or even the pc's memory, but that pc is actually trying to explain something or they wouldn't be shooting back on the backtrack trying to give you an explanation. See, that's the thing you've got to watch. That's the thing you've got to be awful careful of because they're going to dig themselves in in an awful hurry.

So, again, you wouldn't be doing anything for the pc by running "done." So, again, it comes under the heading of doing something for the pc. Well, there's a lot of things you could do with a pc without doing anything for the pc. There's a lot of phenomena that you can achieve without achieving anything for the pc. You can turn on some very, very handsome somatics at one time or another on a pc without turning them off, too.

So, anyway, you've got a problem here in doing something for the pc because you're liable to be doing A and the pc is doing B. And then you go on doing A while the pc is doing B, and then somewhere down the line you wind up in a hell of a mess. And you say, "Well, what happened?" Well, the pc never did what you said, so you didn't do anything for the pc. There was in actual fact no barrier to your willingness to do something for the pc but there must have been a tremendous barrier to your understanding of what was going on. That you could ask A and the pc answered B, in itself showed the auditor observation was very poor. So, therefore, the auditor wasn't in communication with the pc so again the communication factor was out so once more we weren't doing anything for the pc.

Now this is where the thing adds up. Now, if you're going to communicate with the pc – if you're going to communicate with the pc – it's to the end of doing something for the pc. Now, if your communication with the pc is good, you'll wind up then in a position to do something. But having gotten in a position to do something, for heaven sakes, now do something. See? Don't halfway do something or partially do something. This isn't difficult, what I'm talking to you about. It's just putting things in their right boxes in their right compartments.

Don't ever think, because the pc likes you and everything is going along fine and you get along together so well, that you're doing something for the pc. No, you're communicating well to the pc. So, in communicating very well to the pc, you now have an opportunity to do something for the pc. But then your own communication channel to the pc could go out, and you could be asking the pc A and be getting answers for B. And then, again, you wouldn't do anything for the pc if there was a second place where it can break down.

Now, you're just – the gist of the situation then is that O/W is liable to be the most productive zone or area for big recovery on the part of the pc, providing the auditor knows how to steer it, and *will* steer it, and isn't being too tender about it. There's dozens of ways to run this sort of thing. You can get in there and you can say, "All right. What big overt have you committed in this lifetime?" That was to take O/W from the version of *overt*, you know, so on.

All right. "What overt have you committed? What big overt have you committed in this lifetime?" Think, think, think, think, think, think, think, think, think. "Well, I upset Joe. Yes, yes, that was about the biggest overt in this lifetime. I really upset Joe."

"All right. Fine." You think you've gotten someplace now. Of course, you haven't gotten anyplace: Your tone arm hasn't moved; there's been no cognition; there's been nothing

like this. This thing is in a situation where there can be set up in a dozen different ways. You haven't gotten anyplace yet but you've gotten a big overt.

Now, you think perhaps that his having told you, now, should somehow or another magically discharge this thing. No, why should it magically discharge it? He hasn't answered the auditing question for one thing. He doesn't think it *was* an overt. "What *big overt* have you committed in this lifetime?"

"Well, this horrible thing I did to Joe." And he tells you what it is, rather proudly. And you say, "Well, O/W doesn't work because nothing happened." Man, you didn't even get your big toenail wet on the side of the Pacific. The sixty-four dollar question now is, "Well, why wasn't it an overt?"

"Oh, well, it wasn't an overt, because Joe is a heel and because of this and because of that, and so forth. And he deserved it, and it's the common thing to do in those circumstances; everybody expected me to do it. And, of course, it was natural that I would because I have a reactive bank and it forced me to do it." [laughter] And a guy can go on for some time on the justification of this overt. And you'll start to get tone arm action, tone arm action, tone arm action. Now, you're watching the increase of responsibility along certain zones or lines. And this person has not flattened the process because he has not come up to a cognition or a recognition of anything yet, but he's sure working on it. And that tone arm is a-moving and it's a-moving and it's a-moving and so forth, and we're going along on this. "And after all, Joe really was a heel. And he wrote me a nasty letter once which was a *greh-tajub-a rub* and it was absolutely inevitable and impossible that I would have done anything else but this because everybody expected me to do this, don't you see? And if I hadn't done this, it would have committed an overt against a great many other people." "Now, on this overt against Joe, is it really an overt after all?" and so on.

All of a sudden a – the guy is liable to get this little sensation of the glee of insanity, or something like that, as far as it goes. I'm not kidding you. It's a sort of glee of insanity that starts coming off the surface, and so forth. And some little corner of him is taking a look at this thing, "You know," he says, "that there was some part of that that was an overt, mostly against myself, of course, because..." [laughter]

And a guy will actually worry that and worry that and worry that. Now I'm not – I'm not prepared to tell you how many hours he could go on worrying this, producing tone arm action all the way. I don't know. It might be a twenty-five hour intensive on one overt, don't you see? Until you get the thing worn down and eventually, all of a sudden, he says, "Well, even though it could have been explained, you know, that was a hell of a thing to do to Joe. I shouldn't have done that to Joe. I'd completely forgotten. I'd completely forgotten. I had it completely in my choice whether I did it or didn't do it. And I did it. *Whoo!* Yes. Yeah, I committed an overt against Joe. Yeah." Boom! *PSWWWWW*. You see it blow. And you won't get another scrap of TA out of that whole thing.

You got one "done," see, one "done" off the pc. See, there are numerous ways to handle these things. Now, while you have him going through all of this, and so forth particularly as his being a Scientologist, he may know all the ropes, keep him guided into this channel and keep him going right on down the line and keep your communication channel, and so forth,

open to the pc during this period of time. That's all a trick; that's all takes some doing. But in the final analysis you will have done something for the pc, *for* the pc, not to him.

Now, there is – there is the auditing of O/W. Now, a lot of this lecture, I apparently have not been talking to you much about the process of O/W, I've been talking to you about the version and guises of auditing. But unless these things are understood in their proper relationship, one to another, you will never run any O/W and never get any overts off anybody and really never get any withholds off anybody. You know? You have to know the technology, you have to know how to audit and you have to, yourself, be in communication with the pc to know how to handle this situation.

Now, all the way along the line of what I've been talking to you about, you are raising the cause level of the pc. All the way along the line you are raising the cause level of the pc. You do these things, fairly slippily, fairly expertly; you're raising the cause level of the pc. And he's walking right up and he'll be able to as-is more and more and more and more and more and more and more and more. Your pc will be changing under your eyes; your pc doesn't come into session with so many PTPs; your pc is much more able to get the show on the road. The pc is this and the pc is that. And you're seeing this – this thing progress, don't you see? Now, you could go into "done" in numerous other categories. I'd swear, I don't know, if you piled up all the bulletins on the subject of O/W and running withholds and chains and all of this kind of thing; man, if you stacked those all up together, you wouldn't be able to hardly look over the desk. There's lots of technology. You don't need all that technology perhaps, but it's very nice to have it. If you're going to be very expert along these lines, why, there it is. Because the mind is quite funny in the various ways that it works.

Very often you get a tremendous failure in this particular field in trying to direct somebody to do something in this field. They don't understand some of these ramifications I've been pointing out to you. I've asked somebody – a girl is lying dying in a hospital for no apparent reason or something of this sort. And somebody asks me frantically, frantically! They'll say, you know, over a long distance line or something of this sort, "What can we *do* to bring this girl back to *life*?" and so forth. And frankly, it's not with any hope at all that I tell them what they can do, because I know that ordinarily they won't consider it heroic enough. I'd tell them the exact fact of what to do. In such a case as that, the exact thing to do was find out what her family doesn't know about. That actually was enough – they were in sufficient communication with the girl in this particular case – that was enough to have gotten her out of that bed and back on her feet again.

It wasn't that I knew anything she had done, but I just knew from the sudden discussion of it that having retreated from home to this and then gone to that point and then suddenly gone to a hospital with an exclamation point and fireworks and lying there dying from no apparent reasons or causes and so forth, that obviously there was a withhold there. And that would have taken enough off the edge of it, don't you see? Because I knew that any situation like that, no matter how heroic it appears, must have been terribly hard to maintain. That – situation like that is so unnatural, you see? Well, look at how hard somebody'd have to work at it to put it all together this way. And it's just like any other complex situation, you touch one corner of the house of cards and down it'll come. Well, that's the good point to touch.

Some stranger saying to the person, you know, "What doesn't your family know about?"

The girl might have opened up, "Well, they don't know I had this affair with Bill," and so forth, "and that I'm enceinte." And then all of a sudden it felt much better, don't you see? And says, "What am I lying here dying for?" you know, and got out of bed. [laughter]

Because people – people look at the heroicness of the condition, they always add it up that it must be an heroic comparable action, and it's not. It might be very complex, the reasons they're there, but the very complexity makes it untenably hard to hold on to. No! It – a madman down here in an asylum, he has a hell of a time. Poor fellow must work day and night, staying in there. He just must work overtime! You can see him, "Now I will be ferocious," you know? The point of entrance on the thing. It's just, actually, the same points I've been talking to you about. You get into communication with him and you ask him what's sensible, see, or you ask him what he's done or ask him what he's withholding. And you'll just see it crack up in front of your eyes.

And that's actually the magic of the world of auditing. That's the magic that can be done with auditing. And you get the long grind situation. It looks like a long grind to you, because you say, "What have you done?"

"I've murdered the local vicar." [laughter]

And you're stopped right there; where do you go from there? You have no responsibility, you have no nothing, and so forth. So, recently, we have developed ways of handling these "no-responsibility." It's actually a new development, and compartmented them out so they're much more easily handled.

Well, I wish you lots of luck with it, but when I ask you to get some withholds off somebody or get some overts off somebody or raise somebody's cause level, now, at least, you know what I am talking about.

Thank you.

Male voice: Thank you.

THE PRIOR CONFUSION

A lecture given on 3 October 1961

Thank you.

Okay. This is one of those days. What's the date? Third of October?

Audience: That's right. Yes.

And my watch stopped last night. How would I know? And 1961. Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Now, Suzie's been giving you an explanation up here as to the prior confusion. And I'd better give you some material on this and some other things. I could give you a lecture on a brand-new series of discoveries, but you haven't caught up with these. [laughter] I'll mention these in passing just to get them as a matter of record, however. There is a great deal to be known about mutual motion. Mutual motion is a terribly interesting subject. It's the motion of two generating sources. This has something to do with problems. And mutual motion runs with great rapidity, and so on. There's a lot more about that, but I just wanted to get this little slight note on record.

You're interested in the prior confusion, the hidden standard, because this puts into your hands what the hakim, the witch doctor, the bone rattler, the medical doctor, and all such ilk have been trying to do something with here, now, for a good many thousands of years. This puts something into your hands. And if you grasp this, you've grasped something. And if you haven't grasped it, you're stuck in one. [laughter]

Chronic somatic is a stuck moment on a time track which is the stable datum of a prior confusion. A hidden standard is the stable datum of a prior confusion. Prior confusion. Now, in trying to explain this to you, you take a look at a chronic somatic, you try to look at the prior confusion and you swing back up into the chronic somatic again, and you don't even know that you looked at the prior confusion. This is a very, very easy one to forget. It's a very easy one to slip on because it is, actually, the basic anatomy of how pictures and illnesses and concepts of one kind or another get very, very stuck.

Now, the way they get stuck is the confusion and the stable datum. Now, that confusion and the stable datum has been known to us for many, many years. And what we've done to it is add time to the span. The confusion is in one place and the stable datum at a later place. So in all time track plotting, you get the confusion, and then you get, after that, the stable datum. So actually, they're linear in time. In other words, you don't have the stable datum and the confusion occurring necessarily – and certainly not very aberratedly – you don't have these two things occurring simultaneously in time. In other words, the stable datum and the

confusion do not occur in time, if they're going to become aberrative, which is the same time – you don't have the stable datum and the confusion in the same instant of time.

Now, by that we mean twelve o'clock, second of October 1961: There's a confusion while a person is sitting at a table. Well, the confusion doesn't make the person necessarily sit more solidly at the table. That's not the kind of stuck that we're mixed up with. This is the way we get the person if the person is going to be stuck at the table: At eleven o'clock there was a hell of a confusion, and the person had an upset and had an upset stomach and so on at twelve o'clock, and sat down in the table – at the table to ease their upset stomach, and somehow or another it didn't ease.

Well, there was no confusion at twelve o'clock. The confusion was at eleven o'clock, just an hour before. Do you see this now?

In other words, the confusion is at an earlier instant of time than the stable datum that the person adopted afterwards. But we find that the stable datum which is adopted afterwards is the sticker. Of course, you can always adopt a stable datum in the middle of a confusion. This is, er... it. But that isn't the one that sticks. The one that sticks is where you have a stable datum adopted after the fact of the confusion.

The United States goes to war with Japan; nothing much occurs as a result of the war – perhaps. And then we all of a sudden have President Eisenhower talking about loss of face. Well, it's very interesting to have an American president use a Japanese term. [laughter] We give the Wehrmacht a hell of a shellacking, and during the war nobody is being the Wehrmacht, that's for sure. The 88s are going on one side and the 22s are going on the other side, and we have a good, solid, flat-out, knockdown-drag-out war. And nothing happens during this period of time that is at all upsetting, except people getting killed and buildings blown down, and so forth. But everybody is too interested to have any stable data to amount to anything.

And then after the war, there's a discussion about "should American troops goose-step?" There was, you know? Now, we add in World War I to it and we find American troops wearing German helmets. It's fascinating. This gets more and more fascinating.

Now, we can understand the Confederacy all wearing Federal uniforms during the Civil War, because they didn't have any, but there were lots of Federal dead to take them off of. That wasn't much of a stable datum. But today we find the Confederacy is very stuck in the Confederacy.

Now, we think that something happened, like the assassination of Lincoln or something, and all of this. Well, we certainly know all about Lincoln's assassination. Well, how about a lot of the other people who got assassinated by bullets in that war? You see, we're not worried about them. That stable datum isn't sticking, but something that happened after the action is sticking like mad.

This is a peculiarity, and it's not necessarily sensible. It doesn't necessarily follow any logic; this is an empirical fact. By empirical fact I mean one that is established by observation, not established by theory or reason. This is true only because it's observed to be true.

Now, you can develop a lot of theories about why water doesn't flow uphill. There could be lots of theories developed about it, but you stand alongside of a river, and then you go find another river, and then you go find another river, and then you go find another river, and you observe all of these rivers, and you find out finally that the common denominator of all rivers was that water was flowing downhill. The points downstream are at less altitude than the points upstream. And we establish the fact, then, that water flows downhill. We don't have to have the theory of gravity; we don't have to have any other theory connected with it at all. All we have to have is the observation that all rivers we are able to contact are flowing downhill. That's an empirical datum.

All right. Now, this "prior confusion" is an empirical datum, and that is all it is. It's empirical. It's just observed that this is the case: that the person is not stuck in the marriage that they are complaining about but are stuck in the marriage because of the confusion that existed before the marriage; they're not stuck in the marriage because of the confusion of the marriage.

Now, you've always been assuming that the marriage got stuck because of the confusion of the marriage. All right. Now let's get down to workability – solid, sound workability. How many marriages have you squared up by knocking all the confusion out of the marriage? Well, it's sort of a lot of little failed lines on that. We've straightened up a lot about marriages, and so forth, by knocking out their confusion. We've done a lot about marriages by knocking out the confusion of the marriage. But the reason we couldn't do it rapidly, and the reason we got bored stiff trying to do something about it, is if a person is stuck on the subject of a marriage, the reason they are stuck has nothing to do with that period of time but has to do with the prior period of time that predated the marriage. And if you free up that prior period of time to the marriage, the difficulties of the marriage blow. Now, this is an empirical oddity, an oddity of magnitude.

We've got somebody who has got to have their liver operated on, something wrong with their liver. We find them stuck in an operation on a liver. They've got to have another operation on a liver. They know it's their liver. Their attention is stuck solidly on the liver, and so we go ahead and process the liver, but we never find the basic-basic on the chain of when their attention got stuck on the liver.

When did their attention get stuck on the liver? Actually, it got stuck on the liver immediately after a confusion. Immediately after a confusion. So the way to blow this operation on the liver is to blow the confusion which preceded the difficulty with the liver. It's so peculiar. It's sufficiently peculiar that this occurs when you try to learn it: You immediately think of your own chronic somatic. You try to swing your attention before you had the chronic somatic, and you wind up with the chronic somatic. And you say, "Well, there is the chronic somatic, and of course, that is all there is to it."

And then one tells you again right away, "Now look. Let's look before you had that chronic somatic."

And you say, "Yes. Chronic somatic." It's just as though we're trying to put your attention on top of a spring. And as you put your attention on the spring, it rebounds, and blows

you back into the chronic somatic, do you see? And your attention just doesn't go on to the prior confusion. It's quite remarkable.

You say to somebody, "All right" – you'll do this as an auditor, now, many times. You'll say, "Put your attention now on the period" – or "What happened" – you say in some other fashion – "What happened just before you got all upset with this marriage?"

And they say, "Well, I got all upset with the marriage."

And you say, "Well, what happened just before you met this person and so forth?"

"Oh, well, just before I met this person, um... uh... yeah, well, we certainly had a hell of a time in that marriage."

And you say, "Well now, look-a-here. We're talking about just before you met the person. What was the date before you met the person?"

Well, they're liable to do something like "Well, I had an awful lot of trouble when I was a little child."

And you say, "Yeah. But just before this marriage. Just before the marriage."

And they say, "Yeah. Well, I had an awful lot of trouble in that marriage."

What's happening is, is the pc's attention bounces to later periods of time. Chronic somatics are always the result and solution of an unconfontable disturbance which occurred immediately before them. Hidden standards and present time problems are always the result of a confusion which immediately preceded the difficulty. And when you get the pc to put his attention on the confusion, you are asking him to do what he couldn't do, and why he pinned his attention just after the confusion. You see? He looks at the confusion, and then his attention, without his recognizing anything, bounces straight into the stable datum.

Man has a broken leg. And this broken leg has just been going on and on and on for years and years and years. He doesn't recognize it as a broken leg. The medicos say it's a "tibiobiosis of the filamoriasis," and that he's suffering from a decay of the tendon.

Well, he busted his leg sometime or another. Let's get it down to simple language us folks can understand, and – you see, if you don't know anything about a subject, you can get awfully fancy. As a matter of fact, the more fanciness and the more oddball opinion and crosscurrent of opinion you find in a subject, you can assume that that is in direct relation to the amount known about the subject.

The more confusion in the subject, the more crisscross, the more learnedness, the more pretended knowingness there is in the subject, the less is actually known about it. You can get a terribly complicated idea about life and the mind from fields where it isn't known. You understand? There's a lot of invented, pretended knowingness on the thing. For instance, I don't know how many medical terms there are for a leg, and yet this leg won't heal, and they can't make it heal fast, but they can sure call it by lots of names and have lots of opinions on it, don't you see?

Well, they're sort of bouncing off the confusion. All right. So the person's got a busted leg. Well, the leg should have healed up in five or six weeks and that should have been

all there was to it, and that's it – finished. But it isn't. Seven years later, like the children's doctor, the fellow is still limping – I think two years ago. He kids me every time he sees me. You know, he comes in limp, limp, masking the limp very consciously as soon as he's on the premises, trying very hard not to limp. He was in a skiing accident a couple of years ago, and I told him I was going to process him, and it scared him within an inch of his life. And so he always has some kidding remark to make to me when he comes in to look at the children's tongues, about whether or not I'm going to process him. But look, it's been two years and he's still limping. Ah, well, then this isn't just a skiing accident, because there's nothing really in bad shape about the bones. They were all put together by the very best orthopedic surgeons. He had the best of care; he's a doctor.

So what must have happened? Well, he busted his leg in a skiing accident. And two years later it has yet to heal, really. Oh, well, the bones are grown together and it isn't bleeding anymore, but it isn't operating. All right. Now let's take a look at that.

Was it the instant of the accident? Ah, well, we know more about the mind than they do. We know very well that before some fellow does a practiced action, if he's in a smooth frame of mind – he's used to doing this action – he goes down the slope and slaloms like mad, and everything is just dandy, and he winds up at the bottom upright and saying "Whee!"

But if a fellow is in a disturbed frame of mind, and his attention is on many other things – he just received a letter from his wife or his girl saying, "Well, I've just gone out again with Pete," don't you see? And there's nothing he can do anything to but himself. He can't do anything to anybody but himself. There's nobody else around or he's powerless or something like that. Then this practiced skier starts at the top of the slope, and he goes half-way down and he says, "This is a good place," and wraps himself around a tree.

Then they put him pathetically in the hospital and bring him home by ambulance plane and so on, and it goes on for years, don't you see?

So the high probability is that the accident had nothing to do with the motions of skiing. Skiing probably has nothing to do with the confusion which resulted in a broken leg, mentally. Because we have to ask the question, how did he get himself bunged up, and why?

Now, a fellow doesn't get himself bunged up by accident. See, it's not by accident. That's the first thing you have to recognize. That there's some kind of a postulate in there to bung himself up. And he'll manage it every time.

All right. So this medico, all right, we ask him, "Now, what happened just before you broke your leg?"

And he'll say, "Well, the snow was flying all around, and the wind was going whee, and so forth. And then there was this condemned Switzerland pine tree, and it pulled itself up by the roots and moved over in the middle of the ski track."

And you say, "Good."

And we keep on running this. And at the end of many hours, we actually do get the thing to remove to a marked degree. We get an abatement of the chronic somatic. Yes, we can do that. We have done that many times.

Well, how would you like to see that chronic somatic vanish? Well, that would be a much better procedure and much faster than that. Ah, well, we'd have to find out what went on before he went skiing that day.

Well, he was on vacation, we know, and we know that he felt he needed a vacation. Why did he feel he needed a vacation? An odd thing to need – me particularly, I never get one so I don't dare need one. [laughter] He needed a vacation. Well, what was the randomness that preceded that? What was his mail like while he was on vacation? Let's search in this area. Let's find out anywhere in the last six months what had been going on. And all of a sudden we wind up with the damndest, knock-down, drag-out confusion. If it was enough to make him break his leg, it will be sufficient to bar out his inspection of it. And at first he won't be able to inspect the prior confusion.

It takes an auditor sitting across from him to *chunk* his attention into that period and do an assessment of it. And all of a sudden he finds out that he thought the broken leg happened last year, when it happened two years ago. And he's completely forgotten that he broke the same leg when he was five; and all kinds of oddball forgettingnesses turn up.

Now, what causes forgettingness? It's the inability to confront a motion. The inability to confront a motion brings about an occlusion of that area of time. Now, you've got postulate – the first-, second-, third-, fourth-postulate theory. The first postulate is not-know. The second postulate is know.

All right. So you've got a big not-know, you see? He had a big lot of mysteries and a lot of confusions he couldn't confront, and nothing he could do anything about of any kind whatsoever, and he got himself a know which immediately succeeded it in time. In other words, this not-know area, this confusion area, is followed by a know area later in time. Now, this is quite interesting because he follows a not-know by a know, and the know might be quite stupid, and it might be quite painful, and it might be quite destructive, but nevertheless it's a knowingness. Some fellow who is limping around with a bad leg certainly knows something: He knows he's got a bad leg.

You might say all psychosomatics and hidden standards are cures for mystery. They give themselves a knowingness, following a period of not-knowingness.

Now, people can get stuck in relief, and very often when your pc feels better, he will feel better momentarily and quite artificially and not feel better at all. Now, for instance, supposing we were all sitting here and we heard a high whine and a dull thud out in the park, and an airplane full of screaming passengers had apparently just crashed, you know, and we could hear the whole works, sitting here. And so we in a big flurry crowd out the door and rush outside to see this airplane that's crashed, and so on. And it's just Peter left one of his record players on. [laughter]

See? Quite a feeling of relief, but the relief followed a period of confusion. Now, I'm not saying this is very aberrative. This would be so light that it's very easy to face indeed. Then, you see, we'd have a little period of relief, and it actually would stick slightly on the track. See, it's a period of relief. It's a period of *know*. Now, you see, at the moment we heard it crash, we didn't know what was happening, so we've got a not-know. And then we go out and we find out what happened, we find out nothing happened and that it's all all right, so we

know. You get this. This is just in vignette. What I'm talking about is not at all aberrative. It takes much greater volume of magnitude to make one of these things.

All right. Now, let's go into what Mary Sue was showing you here just before I came in. And we have ourselves a period there, which we see as a big, white chalk mark up at the top, and then there's a little chalk mark down the line and we've got a vertical time track here; and it's got a big blob of white chalk at the up part, and a little blob, and then below that a big blob, and then below that a little blob, and some more little blobs. All right. [laughter] Now, I'm not making fun of her cartooning here. But anyway, taking a look at this now, we see the time track plots linearly. Now, she's got herself plotted from a zero at the top to 1961 at the bottom. Well, all right. We'll take it that way because time tracks don't run in any direction. All right.

Now, we take that little tiny, last, bottom white blob, and that's a chronic somatic. The person has a chest wheeze, and every time you process them, they look at their chest to find out if they're still wheezing. And they know the auditing command worked because the wheeze is less, or they think the auditing command didn't work because the wheeze is more. This is how they know, you see? This is how they *know*. Well, isn't it interesting that this *know* would occur in connection with a chronic somatic?

Now, a person must have a hell of an avidity for knowingness if they have to find out if their back's still broke or their chest is still caved in or if their rib cage is squashed. What kind of knowingness is this? Well, it must have followed one God-awful confusion, man! If that's the acceptable level of knowingness, wow! What must have happened before that? So we take this pc, and we say to this pc, pointing to that last white blob there, "Well, what was going on in your life immediately before you noticed this difficulty with your chest?"

And your first, usual, immediate response, if this is a hot subject, is "Well, my chest has always hurt me." It'll be something intelligible like this.

They haven't answered the question at all. You say, "No, no, no. Just before you noticed this – before you noticed this – what happened in your life?"

And they say, "Well, um... I don't know."

That's right. There you got it hot. That's hot and heavy. And, boy, they never, they never spake more sooth than that. They were spaking sooth with all front teeth. They didn't know, that's for sure, or they wouldn't have this chest difficulty. All right. So we punch it a little harder – you see, it's the auditor compelling the pc's attention into that area – and we say, "Well, when did it turn on? What period of time was it when it turned on?"

"Well," he said, "well, it must have been – must have been the summer of '59 or something like that. I know I had it then."

You see, they haven't said anything "before" yet, you see? They know they had it in the summer of '59. You say, "Now, that's good. Now, just what happened just *before* the summer of '59?"

"Well, I had it in the spring of '59, too."

See, they haven't answered your question yet, you know? All right. But you see what's happening here? You're plowing their attention back toward an unconfrontable area. So you say, "Well, all right. What happened before that? Well, what was going on before you noticed this chest somatic and so forth?"

And they say, "Well. Oh, well, uh – yeah, well, it uh..." (And we notice this little upper white blob here, see?) They say, "Yeah, well, it turned off for a long time." Haven't answered your question yet. See, it's off from the first white blob to the second white blob, see? Well, it's off.

"Yeah. Well, I wasn't troubled with it then, and uh... I remember – oh, yes! Yes, that's right. I recall in '56, I had medical treatment for this." See, they've told you *nothing* about "before" yet. But they've got it stretched back in time. And then all of a sudden they'll come up and say, "Well, let's see, '56." (And we'll call that earlier blob there 1956.) They'll say, "Well, let's see."

You say, "What were you doing in '55?"

"Well, I... '55. That was when I was down at camp in Cornwall. No. No, no, no. Come to think about it, that was '52." And they're liable to come up with the adjudication that they don't know what happened from 1952 to 1956. This is a curious blank period. And they figure it all out, and they say, well, it must have been this and it must have been that, and it might have been this and might have been that. And then all of a sudden they say, "Well, the truth of the matter is, I was... Well, I'm not sure. I'm not sure. But do you know, I had this when I was a child?"

See, way back now. Way, way back. Boom!

"Yes, I had this when I was a child. They thought that I had consumption and so forth, and I... actually I hadn't remembered that, but I had a lot of consumption, and I remember I was living with my grandmother, and so forth. And they – they had me to the doctor a lot of times, and that sort of thing. And I just had overlooked this fact."

Now we're up at the first white blob up there, see?

You say, "Well, what happened just before you were living with your grandmother?"

"Well, I wouldn't know. I was awfully young. I was eleven."

"Well, yeah. Well... where were your parents at that time?"

"Well, let's see."

And brother, we've got another blank spot, and we've got a nice, big, juicy blank spot. Now, we keep plowing into this blank spot, and we finally find out that Mother and Father had agreed to separate just before this, and there had been a lot of domestic difficulties, and we think we've got it now, and we're trying to really pin it down – we think we've got it. And they were trying to separate, and this was happening, and that was happening; it was all very clouded up, and it was all very this and that. And we're just about to get a touching short story about this whole thing, when suddenly the pc remembers that he burned down the house. [laughter]

And that will be the end of that chronic somatic. Just by assessment only. See? That's just by assessment. But your assessment is, doggedly, to find out what happened before they noticed this.

Now, perhaps it's a bad thing to say "for the first time" because this is always a lie. One of the stable data of auditing is always make your auditing question as truthful and as factual as possible. Don't make auditing questions that are nonfactual. So you say, "Well, what is the first time you remembered this?" or "What is the first time you noticed this?" Of course the pc cannot answer this because he's going to give you fifty more first times after he's given you the first time. So it's much cleverer to say, "What is a time that you noticed this? When did you notice this? What happened before you noticed this?" And then just keep chugging it in.

Now, it's not a repetitive command, and this is actually getting rid of chronic somatics by assessment. If you are very clever at assessing, you can just go on and assess and assess and assess, and you finally find out the confusion; and you pin the confusion down to such a degree that you've made the pc confront the confusion, the confusion will as-is. Right there. Bang! And everything else will blow after it, and that is it. You can do it by assessment only with an E-Meter. That requires a rather clever auditor to do the whole job by assessment only.

Now, here's an easier way to do it. We finally spot the area of confusion by assessment, and then we put together Security Checks to fit that area. We find out that this person had this when they were eleven: Well, it's some kind of a childhood activity that is all messed up. Well, you can actually take the child's Security Check, and bend it around one way or the other, question by question, and add your own questions to it, and so on; and you're going to get yourself some interesting data that this pc has never seen before.

And you're going to blow out those zones of confusion, and you're going to find the dissipation of the hidden standard of the chronic somatic. That is a more standardized method of going about one of these things.

All right. Let's take another example. This girl finds that she has headaches. She finds she has lots of headaches. And in auditing, she's always sort of aware of this headache, and she knows the auditing process is working because the headache turns on or turns off, and if nothing affects the headache, she of course doesn't think the auditing process is working. That's her hidden standard. That's by which she finds out whether or not auditing is working. That is the definition of a hidden standard.

Well, naturally, your rudiments are out as long as the pc has this condition. Why? Well, the pc is viaing the auditing command.

Now, in all cases where a pc is not making progress on Routine 3, you can bet your bottom peseta that the pc has not and is not doing the auditing command. They might be doing the auditing command plus, plus, plus, see, or they might not be doing it at all.

I do remember back in Wichita, long, long ago, a pc coming around to me after a twenty-five hour intensive and bragging to me that they had succeeded in not answering an auditing command once, and they thought this was awfully clever of them. Yes sir, the pc was really bragging about it. What was the matter with the auditor that he didn't find it out?

Now, here is the more usual thing: The pc does the auditing command and applies it to a certain area of the mind or body in order to find out if it has affected something else. And they do the auditing command by applying the auditing command to something in the mind, and then they look over here to see what is going on and if anything happened. And they do this continually. They're not just doing the auditing command. They are doing something else. Now, they know they did the auditing command right or they know they did it wrong, or they know the command is right or wrong, in direct comparison to how much happens to alleviate this difficulty.

You are auditing a pc who has an attention fixed, not on the bank in general but on some particular, peculiar activity. And they're doing something peculiar with every auditing command. You feed them the auditing command, they do something peculiar with it. Even though they verbally answer it and so on, and apparently have executed it, they do something else with it.

And when a pc is not making progress, you can say his attention is stuck someplace. Well, that's a shortened form of saying the rudiments are out. One of the rudiments are out. The pc is not really in-session. The pc is on auto. The pc is not under the auditing control, the pc is under his own control. He's under his own control to this degree: You say something, then the pc takes over as auditor and executes the auditing command, and then gives the session back to you. And you ask the next question, and when you ask the question, then the pc takes the auditing command, goes on auto, audits the auditing command on himself and then gives the auditing session back to you. Have you got the idea? And the pc, during the entire period of execution of the auditing command, is not in-session. Any pc who hasn't gone Clear in 150 hours is doing it. Pc has got a hidden standard.

What is this hidden standard? Maybe he's got six hidden standards. Well, every one of those hidden standards is totally this stable datum *stuck* after the fact of the confusion. They all have the same anatomy. Pc takes the session away from you, does the auditing command, finds out whether or not it moves this electronic, then sees whether or not the electronic is affecting whether or not he's a boy or a girl. That's right. That was how we moved into this, with just that action on the part of a pc. We knew about this for a long time, but we've never really seen it in action to this flagrant degree.

This pc had been audited for about a thousand hours, and had applied every single auditing command ever given to the pc to the resolution of an electronic incident which the pc was convinced, if it were run out, he would turn from a man to a woman. Thousand hours – no progress. Well, why? The pc was never in-session.

So the rudiments are out. The basic rudiment that is out is present time problem of long duration, where you have a hidden standard.

All right. Very good. Now if we take ourselves a pc, and we audit along with Routine 3, we can find the pc's goal, we can find the pc's terminal; oh, yes, with some difficulty, but we can find them in relatively short order, certainly under twenty-five hours of auditing, if we're really in there. We'll keep the most flagrant rudiments in, don't you see? But we haven't noticed this hidden standard yet. And then we assess the pc on the Prehav Scale, and we

run the pc on the Prehav Scale, and we run the pc and we run the pc and we run the pc and nothing happens. Well, there's where it'll show up.

See, we can do the action of finding a goal, because the pc's attentions are very, very solidly on goals. We can certainly find the action of a terminal, we can find this terminal, because we actually haven't really asked the pc to do an auditing command. It's all between you and the meter, see? We can find the assessed level of the Prehav Scale very easily, but now we go into the repetitive auditing command and the pc goes on auto.

Why does the pc go on auto? Well, the pc's got a hidden standard. The pc is auditing himself on making his nose well. Pc is not running – *not at all* running the terminal of a railroad engineer. He's running a nose. And so he doesn't go Clear.

Now, very often, in worse cases, the pc will be very resistive toward an auditor's inquiring questions. The auditor says, "What are you doing? What did you do with that auditing command?" You've all of a sudden got a knock-down, drag-out fight on your hands. Pc does not like you inquiring into it. The first time you ever notice anything like that, you say to yourself, "This pc has a hidden standard. Let's find out what it is."

Now, although you can find the person's goal, terminal and level, you actually can't *run* the pc on that in the presence of hidden standards. It is a waste of time.

Now, there's one earlier action that can be taken with the pc, that the pc *will* do and that will produce results. But there is *only* one earlier action can be taken before a Routine 3 assessment, and that is a Security Check. This can be done without knowing the pc's terminal and will produce lasting, excellent results. There is no other process – now we have all the facts in over the years – will produce easy and lasting gains on a pc. No other process will produce easy, good, solid, lasting, positive gains on a pc. You have a Security Check and you've got the assessment and you've got the running of the assessment.

So, this leaves us with a Security Check as a very powerful auditing weapon, because it will operate whether you're running the goals terminal or not. The Security Check will operate, and those gains you make with a Security Check will be lasting gains.

Hence, we divide up auditors into: Class I – run any process on which they have a certainty. This will probably be some kind of a control process, by the way. It'll be some cousin to the CCHs, if the auditor is wise, because that at least works out the control factors of the pc, and you do make a sort of gain. You're running in order, and something is going to happen with this pc, and it doesn't come under the heading, however, of a fast, easy gain. It is not a fast, easy gain. It is a lasting gain, but it is a hard, long gain, and that's all you can say for it. That's the CCHs, SCS – all these various things. They are long, hard, arduous things to handle, and they do produce a lasting gain, but at what cost! So it doesn't come under the heading of a nice, easy, stable gain achieved by the auditor at all.

But Class I Auditors had better be employed, even though it is very hard to achieve a long, lasting proposition. No matter how arduously, they had better be put to work doing some auditing, because any auditing is better than no auditing, and this type of gain will be quite beneficial in the long run, and so forth. And this argues that a Class I Auditor is doing something, as long as he's doing one of these types of processes.

All right. We move up to Class II Auditor, and a Class II Auditor can security check. All right. Security Checking produces a lasting gain, and it is very easy. It is very easy to do. It is very nice. It is very – very *fast*, and it is a lasting result. So we have the Class II Auditor doing Security Checks. And actually when we're talking about the hidden standard, and that sort of thing, we can envision that a Class II Auditor would have set up a pc on the basis of having gotten rid of all of his hidden standards. And that's what we look to a Class II Auditor to do – not just to sit there and prate off a Sec Check 3.

We're asking him to do something else. We're asking him to sec check in the direction of getting rid of all of the stuck points in this lifetime. We're asking him to get rid of the confusions of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth marriages. We're asking all of the... We're asking him to get rid of that crooked neck. We're asking him to get rid of the odd habit he has that every time you say something to him he goes *drvvvvkh!* It seems rather odd this person would do that, you know? Because you haven't asked him to smell a thing. In other words, these things all surrender to Security Checking. All of them, now, the lot. But what kind of Security Checking does it take? Well, it takes a standard Security Check. That is always a good thing to bang into a case. The first and foremost thing you do. That's a good thing – just go on and pick out the probable Security Check.

Let's take an old-time auditor, he's been knocking around and into God knows what. Well, the first Security Check we want to shove into him is the last two pages of a Sec 3, plus Sec Check 6. There's no reason to do the first many, many pages of 3 or do anything very fancy, because he's not going to get any benefit of something that he has overts on, and so on. So let's get that out of the road.

And now having done this, let us get clever and apply this data about the stable datum and the prior confusion. Now, this is different than the stable datum and the confusion – the idea that we get all of the stable... we get all the confusions off the case and we will of course knock out at once all of the person's activities, and so forth. No, isn't quite true. We have to knock them out *selectively* – has to be very selective.

So after you got the last two pages of a Form 3 and *all* of a 6 done, you should roll up your sleeves at about that point, and let's go for the hidden standards. Let's find out if there's anything by which this person measures gain or no gain.

"What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" That's the clue question.

And you get these things, and sometimes these things are detached things. Sometime these things are "Well, my mother would have to get well." Well, he doesn't really mean – perhaps he does, but he really, probably, doesn't mean – that his mother would have to be sold on Scientology and brought to an auditor. No. The auditing command which he is doing, if applied to himself, would have to cure his mother. You see, he often means that, too. So this idea, this... he says, "Well, my mother would have to get well." Well, this is marvelous. It means his mother is a stuck – a stuck chronic somatic. [laughter]

Now, the way you would have handled this in the past – the way you would have handled this in the past is not the fastest way to handle it. You could have handled it in the past,

and it would have worked out all right in the past, but that is not the fastest way to handle it. I'm just giving you a much faster method.

When did this occur that Mother became a stable datum? And what confusion preceded it? Ahhh. In other words, we don't run O/W on Mama, and we don't security check Mama, and we don't have very much to do with Mama. We want to find out what happened before Mama became a chronic somatic. Because Mama is a stable datum for a confusion before the fact of accepting Mama as a stable datum. There's some confusion *prior*. Remember, it's always *prior*.

Let's reorient your thinking on this. Now, the fellow says, "Well, uhhh... I just have to get over hating my father. That's what would have to happen. Yes, sir. To know Scientology worked, I'd have to get over hating my father."

"Well," you say, "that's good." So obviously you can do something about that. You do a Security Check about his father. That's obvious, isn't it? This is past thinking on it. And you get all of his overts against his father, and all of his withholds from his father, and you clean up Father. And what do you know? You could do it, too – I mean, you could have gotten a long way in this direction.

Ah-ha, there's a much faster method. Let's find out what happened before "hating Father" became his stable data in life. "Hating Father" must be an activity he can confront, as a retreat from *earlier* activities he *can't* confront. And they probably have nothing to do with his father. Hatred of Father was much more acceptable to him than the tremendous confusion he had with, who knows? Probably not Father. Who knows who it is? Lord knows.

So, what do you do? You assess. And you find the area of prior confusion to the hatred of Father. Now, at first the pc is going to tell you it's something that Father did, and it's something that had to do with Father. But remember, it can't have anything to do with Father if Father is the stuck somatic. Can't have anything to do with Father, you see, if Father is the stuck personnel. If Father is the broken leg on this case, it hasn't anything to do with Father, because he can confront Father. Well, if he can confront Father and he's spent all these years confronting Father and so forth – it hasn't got him well – why do you, in an auditing session, put in more hours confronting Father? Waste of time, see?

No, let's find out what happened before this occurred. So you'd want to know, "When did you notice that you hated your father, and what happened before that?"

First answer, well, inevitably, "My father did this, my father did that."

And you say, "Good, fine." Give him a cheery old acknowledgment and then find out what happened before *that* with *other people*. Oh, you find out his old man hasn't been anybody – man, his old man has been nobody in this fellow's life. There is some kind of a person on a broomstick that has been flying around in this person's belfry.

You know, as a child, why, this person would see – well, maybe it was his father's mother or something, you know? And the child would see her sitting there quietly knitting and rocking in the rocking chair or something, and he absolutely just couldn't resist, you see, spilling the cat on her, or you know, or pulling up the ball of yarn, or somehow or another

stealing all of the bread dough, or putting salt in the plum pudding – just anything, see, anything. And you'll find that these are overts, but they won't come through that way at all.

He will finally recover the character on the broomstick, see? Total occlusion. Recover this character on the broomstick, and you will try to do a Security Check on this, and "She beat me and she socked me and she used to hold me over the well and say she was going to drop me..." And he'll just go motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, see? Of course. Why? Because he can observe the inflow, but he can't observe his outflow.

Yeah, but what did *he* do? That's what's getting interesting here. What did *he* do? Did he steal her broom? [laughter] Because you'll find inevitably that this is what happened. So you make up some kind of a roster of the personnel involved *prior* to the stuck personnel. And you make a roster of the "missing persons bureau." And your little list is a "missing persons bureau." And boy, you're really going to find missing people. Pc doesn't even know they exist. There's going to be sections out of his life he don't know are gone.

And you're going to find those sections and find out who is in them and then write up a Security Check – any old kind of a Security Check – to find out what he did to them; these other people, not Father. Skip Father; he was a confrontable character. Why bother with Father? Just a waste of time. That's what the pc is complaining about.

Now, whatever the pc complains about, do something earlier. There is your stable datum. Whatever the pc complains about, you do something earlier. And don't pay any attention to handling the object about which he is complaining. You pay attention to his complaint. But if you continue to handle the object about which he's complaining, such as his big ears, why, you're not going to get anyplace. He's complaining about big ears. "Well, I'm seeing... Every time I..." You find out every time he answers an auditing command that he finds out if his ears shrunk.

You'll find stuff weird like this, man. Well, did his ears shrink? Okay. "Now, when is the first time you ever notice..." oh, pardon me, that would be wrong, "When did you notice that you had big ears? When did you notice this?"

"Oh, well, I have had big ears for some time," you see? That's your inevitable reply.

Now, if you get a reply of this character which is a non sequitur, you know you are on to a hot area of disturbance, because the pc's attention went onto it, and then flick! – came right up the track to the big ears. Your effort to put his attention on the area of confusion results in putting his area on the object. Whenever you try to put his area on the confusion, and then you only succeed in putting his area – attention on the object, you know you've got it made. You know you're looking at one God-awful area of occlusion.

You say to him, "When did you first notice that you had big ears? Now, what happened before you first noticed you had big ears?" Any such question.

And he says, "Well, I've just worried about it for years – my big ears."

Well, now, you see the mechanism at work? You asked him about a time before "big ears," and he answered "big ears." So it's obvious that his attention deflected from the area you tried to put his attention on. You have located a hidden springboard. He doesn't know it's

there, but you now do. He coasts right up the track to it. Every time you put that hull in the water it goes straight to that particular dock with a crash. It won't head out to sea. It won't go anyplace, you see? You just put it in the water, and it hits this dock. "Father" or "ears" or something, see? Bang! And there it is.

You say, "Well, now in your – in your early life, what went on there? What went on in your early life?"

Now, this would be just asking for a whole bunch of balderdash. Now, it'd take an awful lot of millions of words for the pc to tell you every single, horrible thing that's been done to him in his early life. There's no sense in having much of a synopsis on it. It's up to the auditor to continue to direct the pc's attention where he wants the pc's attention directed, not to listen to a recount – a blow-by-blow recount – of all the beatings the dock gave him. See, that's silly, because that's all he's going to tell you.

He hates his father – this is his hidden standard – he doesn't feel better yet about his father, so not feeling better yet about his father, he knows the auditing isn't working. And you say, "Well, tell me about your early life."

So he says, "Well, my father... and he used to take me out in the woodshed, and then he did this to me and he did that to me. And he did this and he did that, and my father this and my father that." Well, are you doing anything for this pc? No! No, you're not doing anything for him at all, because you're leaving his attention stuck on a refuge.

Any chronic somatic, any stuck personnel, anything of that nature is a refuge on which the pc *can* put his attention. And you are *not* doing your job as an auditor unless you get his attention eased over onto what makes him stick his attention on it. And you do that by a gradient scale, and the pc can get very restive if you jump your gradient too hard.

So you say, "All right. Big ears. Now let's see. What happened just before you noticed that, or when did you notice that you had big ears? Tell me a time you noticed you had big ears. What's some early period when you noticed that?"

And the pc says, "Well... uh, well... uh, well... uh, well... uh, well – well, I was working in London for an attorney's firm. I used to notice it."

"Good." You say, "Is there any earlier time than that?"

"Oh, well... no. In the attorney's firm..."

Oh, well, hell, you got his attention stuck there. And you say, "No, earlier – earlier than the attorney's firm. What'd you do earlier than that?"

"Oh. Oh, well, what did I do earlier than that? Uh... I don't know! What did I do ear...? Let's see now. I went to prep school, and then I went to college, and then – so on, and that was 1952. And I got out of there, and then '52 and then 1955... 1955, and I went to work. Yes, it must have been '55 I went to work – I remember that, yes. It was '55. Went to work for the attorney's firm in 1955. And I got out of college in 1952."

"Oh, good," you say, "well, what did you do between '52 and '55?"

"I just don't know. Now let's see, what did I do? No, I – I met a girl. Ah, yes, I remember now. I met a girl, and she... uh... yeah, I met this girl and she had a boyfriend. And we had an awful... No, that was '58. Let me see. No, no. I – I'll get it in a minute. It's 1952, 1955. Now, there's a period of three years. Now, let's see. After I got out of college, I must have gone home for a little while. And then I must have done this, and then I must have done that, and I must have done something or other – probably. Yeah, I'm sure I must have done something like this, because, you see, you just wouldn't ordinarily just go from college to an attorney's firm.

"Now, let me see. Oh, I know. I had an awful fight with a fellow. Yeah. Oh, that was pretty terrible. We met down in this bar, and he had some kind of a criticism of me one way or the other, and we had this hor – . No, that was '57. No, no. That wasn't '55, that was '57."

And that's the way he'll go on. You understand? And you say, "Well, what happened in this period of – anything that might have occurred between 1952 and 1955?"

"Oh, *uhh-uh, ruh, ruh, ruh, ruh-ruh, ruh, ruh-r.*"

"Well, did you ever think about big ears before 1952?"

"No, no, no, no, no, I didn't think about that before 1952," and so forth.

"Well, did you – you think about big ears after 1955?"

"Well, yes. Oh, yes, oh, yes, all the time. Used to sit there at my desk with ink all over me, and I used to sometimes get it on my ears, and they used to call me 'ink ears' sometimes, and so on... That was probably it. Actually, the firm really hated me. And the senior partners..." this and that.

You say, "That's good. Thanks! Good! Good! Good! Fine! Thank you! Thanks. Good. *All right*, now. Good. Now, we want '52 to '55. Now, who did you know in that period?"

"Well, I must have known my father and mother." [laughter]

"All right. Well, who introduced you to get work at the attorney's firm?"

"Ah... must have been some connection with my father."

And you know, you're liable to find some damn-fool thing like a marriage? [laughter] You're liable to, man. You're liable to find anything. But you will find something, and it'll be a period there of total occlusion.

What you're trying to do is not necessarily solve the big mystery of it all. If you were very clever, you could do the whole thing by assessment. On the meter, one of the ways you do it by assessment is "Well, '54. Did you have a long vacation there after you left college? Was it two years? One year? Six months?"

"Oh, I went to work, something of the sort. I was doing something. I'm sure I was doing something. I must have been doing something. Over a period of three years a young man doesn't do anything, you see? And I went up... I'm sure. Yes. Yeah. I'm absolutely sure. No."

You finally dredge up a name, Agnes. Ohhhh, Agnes. Ahhhh. All right. Now, in essence, as much as you can find out about Agnes, you just do it on an interrogation basis and assess "The worst confusion you ever had with Agnes. When is the worst time you ever had with Agnes?" and so forth. And this finally peters out and you find Agnes is just a red herring. She's hardly a girl at all, and in actual fact it was Isabel.

Isabel turns up along about this time, and now we have got a honey by the ear. And we find out that she used to stand there constantly, and say what she said, and she used to do this and do that, and she was the one who got him arrested. Arrested? [laughs, laughter] Where – where – where the hell did this come from? Don't you see? We don't find out, usually, anything about big ears. Agnes never said anything about big ears, nothing of this sort, but she went off with a boy who had big ears. And Isabel – Isabel, she went off with a boy who had big ears. Something stupid like this. So big ears got to be something in here. And in some of the wild, devious way that all of a sudden works out and becomes completely sensible, we find out how he wound up with a stable datum of big ears.

This person says, "Well, I have a ball of light and it is just back of my eyeballs, and when the ball of light glows, then I know the auditing question worked. And when it doesn't glow, it didn't work." You want to find out, "When did you notice this?"

And then you want to find out what happened before that. "Now, what happened before that?"

And the person said, "I... well, I haven't got the faintest idea. I'm... Let's see, now. What happened before that?"

And we run into some kind of a blank period. Then all of a sudden, marvel of marvels, we find out that between 1945 and 1948 the person was deeply immersed in the Temple of Black Magic, someplace or another, and all this seems to have dropped out of sight. And what they did, really, there, was "see the light." And he's been seeing the light ever since, but it was one awful confusion. Because after the police raided the joint, you see... It wasn't so much that, it was being sued for being the father of the child. That was what got him.

But all of this has been fantastically occluded, you see? And all of these stable data that the person has lead back to a prior unknown, and it's just the not-know followed by the know. It's the confusion followed by the stillness. The confusion, then the stillness.

All right. Now I'll give you something I've got some kind of a reality on. It works like this: You find the bird... This works out on a broader track basis. You find this pc standing on a rock in the middle of the sea waiting for somebody to pick him up. And he has this pain in his stomach, and he had that pain in his stomach for many lifetimes. Many, many lifetimes he's had the pain in his stomach.

And you say, "All right. Let's run this out." So we run him standing on the rock in the middle of the sea. And we – I guarantee you – we can run it and we can run it and we can run it and we can run it and we can run it, and he will still have a pain in his stomach and still be standing on a rock in the middle of the sea. And this is the old engram that wouldn't resolve.

And this is why finding the earlier on the chain resolved the later engrams – the engrams that wouldn't erase: Because, of course, in finding the earlier engram you accidentally

went across the confusion, and you got the confusion knocked out. Well, there's nothing precedes that incident that's hardly worth recounting, except mutiny, shipwreck, sudden disaster, halfdrowning seven times, and there's something kind of strange and spooky about the whole thing. And then we finally find out that he's standing on the rock without a body and hasn't noticed he's dead. And this finally resolves the whole thing.

Up to that time he knew all about it. But trying to get his attention immediately before the incident when this occurred will be one of the tougher jobs, because you say, "All right. How did you get on the rock?"

And he says, "I was just standing there. Well, I must have gotten there some way. Uh... oh, I get a picture now of the surf. I must have come to the rock through the surf."

Well, any fool could tell that, man. He didn't land there by helicopter, that's for sure. But he'll make these suppositional actions.

Now, a person trying to do this, all by himself, begins after a while to appreciate an auditor, because his attention is pinned in a certain category. And as it tries to go back to areas that are unknown to him, it of course deflects onto the chronic somatics. So he tries to put his attention back on this and then comes up into the chronic somatic, and then he's stuck with the chronic somatic; his attention is on it, so he starts auditing the chronic somatic, and he never does put his attention back on the earlier incident, see? So he leaves himself stuck with chronic somatics.

See, his attention goes back up, and he needs an auditor sitting there to tell him to put his attention back again. You know? "What happened before that? What's the worst kind of motion you possibly could experience on a ship?"

"Well, it wouldn't be a ship. It'd be a submarine. I don't know why I said that."

"Well, what's the worse kind of motion you could experience on a ship?"

"Well, being torpedoed by a submarine. Let's see. Or torpedoing a ship by submarine? Being torpedoed by a submarine. Let's see, torpedoing a ship or a ship torpedoing you? No, a ship wouldn't torpedo you, you see? And the ship... It's the worst kind of motion... worst kind of motion... Be standing on a rock waiting for a ship to come in."

That's exactly where the attention goes. Then he'll get all interested in the thing. "Worst kind of motion. Let's see. Well, what might have preceded that? Must be some kind of bad motion."

"What kind of a bad action could a person perform that that would pay for?" You know, asking him for a direct overt – just suppositional.

"Oh, oh, oh, well, you've really asked one now, you know? I get a picture of a fore-deck of a galley. And all the galley slaves are there. And they're all chained and their blood is running down underneath the fetters. And the overseers walk up and down the ramp, and the whips go wham! you see, and so forth. And in a battle, in a battle, when they start throwing Greek fire in amongst the galley slaves... No, that was much earlier. That isn't the same period at all. I got that." [laughs] "That was much earlier. Much earlier."

And you say, "Well, how much earlier was that?"

"Well, that was another lifetime. That's a completely different lifetime. I don't know what I was doing in this thing. It just seems kind of blank, the whole thing seems sort of blank. There's this sailing ship, you see? And it's sailing along, and I think I actually stood on the rock, and I managed to coerce a ship to come in and wreck itself on the rocks. Or maybe... or maybe..."

And we finally find out that it wasn't very dramatic. He just got dead drunk as a Captain of a ship and ran it square aground on the rocks and killed off all the crew, and they all died in the jagged reef, and they were all screaming around him and so forth. But it wasn't so much that. He had stolen the ship and was guilty of barratry.

Oh, we're getting someplace now, yes. Actually, he had murdered the owner's agent the second day out of port. Now we're getting someplace. And the next thing you know, he isn't standing on the rock anymore. See what happens? You get the overts and that sort of thing off on the prior confusion and it blows. And that is the end of standing on the rock.

But the more you Q-and-A with the pc and let him stand there on the rock, the less you're going to get done. It get pretty obvious? The less you're going to get done.

Now, you can keep chasing a pc's attention back, back, back, back, back, back, back, and wind him up at the beginning of track, probably. Of course, that's a kind of a Q and A, too, because that's a method of not confronting. He puts his attention on an incident much earlier that he can confront, rather than confront the incident immediately before. We're much more interested in that span of time just before, that seems so mysterious, and that keeps landing him back on the rock. That's the period we're interested in. We're not necessarily interested in his whole career as a space commander. We're not interested in that period, because space commanders very seldom take ships to sea. All right. So what we're interested in is the period which we have encountered.

Now, you're going to find this technique very interesting in the handling of engrams, just to branch off on to something else. You're going to find this very, very interesting.

When you've got a person's hidden standards and he's been running well, and he's running his goals terminal on the Prehav Scale, and you get up to Class IV-type auditing and you're going to run some engrams, you find these are usually very easy engrams and you haven't got to resort to very much trickery to run them. Because the pc, with the rudiments in, he's in valence, he's already contacted these pictures many times as he runs up and down the track; and you find out they kind of run like hot butter. Take about a half an hour to run one of the things, an hour and a half. Three hours is the longest I've had so far. And they run very easily.

But let's suppose in some peculiar way that we didn't really get this thing wheeling, and the person seems to be stuck in it, and there's a hell of a "burp" someplace in this engram we're running, you see? And the person goes... every time they go through this area, they go "burp." And every time they go through the area, they go "burp." And we're having trouble running the engram, we should assume that something confusing happened just *before* that, and try to get *that* up rather than try to knock the burp out. Get the incident just *before*, and he will *blow* whatever is hanging.

Now, of course, the whole engram is hanging up, isn't it?

Now, how does a person get stuck on the track in the first place? Oh, let's ask a much more important question than that: How does a person get on a time track in the first place, and what are you doing on the time track in this universe? That's an interesting question. Why are you plodding along the time track with such orderliness? Could it *be* that there's a *confusion* at the beginning of track that you can't face? I find that a very fascinating question. I won't bother to give you any answers to that particularly. But what is time? Time very possibly could be retreat from a confusion we cared not to confront. So we retreated en masse and have been going ever since.

But that gives you, now, a basic rundown on the prior confusion – trying to find the prior confusion to find the stuck datum. A person's ability to confront confusions, improved, of course will blow a lot of chronic somatics. But I wouldn't count on it. I wouldn't count on just improving their ability to confront and then having it all work out magically. I would much rather that you just sawed into it from the word go and picked up these things and blew them selectively, one by one and very intelligently. Because a goals terminal run on the Prehav Scale will give them lots of confrontingness and it'll give them lots of changes and that sort of thing, and you're much more interested in that.

Trying to run a person, though, with a present time problem of long duration – one special kind of which is a hidden standard – trying to run a person on the Prehav Scale with five-, six-way brackets and that sort of thing is highly profitless, because the pc never does the auditing command.

When analyzing whether or not a case is running, look to find out whether or not the pc is materially advancing, the sensitivity is coming down and the needle is getting progressively looser.

All right. That all betokens advance of the case. Now, we go just a little bit further than that and we say, if the case has not gone Clear in 150 hours of Routine 3, which includes, of course, Security Checks and assessment and runs, we'd better say to ourselves right about there, this case has never done an auditing command. This case has done something else, too, or has done something else, or has not done it at all; and before that time – that would be the ne plus ultra of being kind of stupid to wait that long, now that we know this.

But if it did reach that time, then we would say, well, there's hidden standards here, and we would determine what they are. And determining what they are, we would get rid of them on this basis of a prior confusion or any refinement thereof. We'd blow these hidden standards. We'd straighten out these things. We return to a goals run. If the case still hung up, we would suspect another hidden standard. We would blow that and go on. So it might be a very good idea to blow *all* the hidden standards that you could blow on a case before you do very much worrying about the case getting on the way with a goals run.

In other words, by all means get their goal. By all means, get their terminal. By all means, assess a level on the Prehav Scale. By all means, give them some running on this sort of thing.

But on a Security Check angle, first, let's get off those last two pages of Form 3, and let's get off *all* of Form 6 on an old auditor. On new people, let's straighten up Security Check in general, let's get this pretty well ironed out, and then let's find out if the person has any hidden standards. And then let's undercut those by finding the prior confusions; let's fill in these blank spots, at least in this lifetime. Let's get them sailing so that they can actually do a straight auditing command. And then, doing that, you'll find you make very rapid progress with clearing.

All summer and all last spring, I've just been working on *speed* of clearing. That is all I've been working on. And this is another seven-league-boot stride in that particular direction.

Thank you.

THE FAILED CASE

A lecture given on 27 October 1964

Thank you.

Now, this is what date?

Audience: October 27.

August, you were saying?

Audience: October.

October 27th.

Now, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. You're going to have a good lecture today for a change! (...Joke.) I have to get these jokes in, you see, because... And the name of the lecture is "The Failed Case."

You're about to have put in your paws, *The Book of Remedies*, which takes all of these failed cases and all you have to do is look up and find out what your pc is doing and what's gone wrong, and it tells you what to do. And if you follow the directions intelligently, why, you'll find out the case ceases to be a failed case in almost all instances.

This lecture that I am giving you has some bits and pieces of that in it but is mostly devoted to the – or in part – devoted to the real failed case that will fail in any event. There is such a case and I have begun to understand this of recent times: that we cannot totally, 100 percent... Now, there's always going to be a failed case. You can just make up your mind to that and you can get just as starry-eyed as you want to in saving the whole of the human race and so forth, but you're still going to collide with the totally failed case. And the reason for this, I must make very clear right at the outset, does not lie with the auditor and does not lie with Scientology, does not lie with technology.

Let's begin at the beginning on this. Along about 1954 I went into a spate of research on the subject of people who had turned against Dianetics and Scientology. And I tried to find a common denominator amongst these people by which they could be understood. So I looked them over very carefully and I listed their names and so forth. And I finally was able to collect irrefutable evidence – something you couldn't contest – that about twenty-one different people had been in Dianetics and Scientology but had been, during that entire period, very active against Dianetics and Scientology and it's caused a great deal of trouble for us.

And so then I made it my business to run down these blokes. And I got up to seventeen names. You've heard of this little project before. I've never laid it out to this degree, because frankly I never really understood it until the other day – not in its total entirety. Its first

echelon is very easy to understand. Seventeen of that twenty-one had criminal records. I thought that that was very, very significant. I thought that was very, very interesting. Because these people had all had auditing. And the other common denominator is they had had no case change – no slightest, faintest case change.

The reason why I haven't got twenty-one criminal records is because I got tired of looking them up at number seventeen. Because they had so far, all the way up the line, been one for one. This was a totally failed case.

Well, I started thinking the other day – no, not the other day, a few months ago – on the subject of case remedies and put together this *Book of Case Remedies*. And I have to add to it this little addendum – this is not in *The Book of Case Remedies*; it is mentioned in passing, but it is a very highly specialized type of case. And the other day I realized what the other factor was – the other factor with this totally failed case. Now, he doesn't have to be a totally failed case; that is to say, you *could do* something to make it not a totally failed case, do you understand, if you understood the mechanics of what would *otherwise* be a totally failed case. Do you und... do you follow me?

But this is as far south – as far south as you can get is no communication possible of any kind whatsoever. That, by the way, just goes south of the English language and actually goes south of what you normally call unconsciousness. It goes into a – almost a total absence. Because you can take a puppy dog, you know, and you can process that puppy dog up tone the like of which you never heard of, you know? Well, that doesn't require any language. See? So you could – processing exceeds language. And right now, knowing that people get hung up on definitions in study and that sort of thing, well, hurrah! We've now exceeded language, don't you see? So what does this case do that is the failed case?

Now, you in the kindness of your heart are always thinking about his past and you're always willing to give somebody a break and not hold his past against him. But you're not dealing with the man's past and that's what's fooled you. In the totally failed case, you're dealing with his present. He commits more overts between sessions than can be picked up in a session. Do you see that ratio at once? He commits more overts between sessions than can be picked up in a session.

Now, in view of the fact that it takes you quite a little while to dig for and get up an overt, don't you see... He doesn't as-is things well; life is on a big, beautiful alter-is-ness of it all, you know? He's going to ch... he's changing everything around. It's all sort of dub. It's all sort of justified. He's pretty detached.

This was Freud's failed case, too, by the way, only he never realized it and I've never spoken of it in these terms before. The person had no responsibility for any place he was or anything he was doing. Freud called him a detached case. I don't know why he'd be detached. I think he'd be dead in his head to end all dead-in-your-heads, see – undetached case. It'd take you quite a while to get in communication with this bloke and his responsibility level would be down around zero. See? The responsibility level would be very bad.

Well, it takes some degree of responsibility to put one's self into the scene. Do you see? You know, "My hand – my hand stole the pocketbook." Well, that's an irresponsibility to end all irresponsibilities, don't you see? And it wouldn't as-is because he hasn't said the rest

of the communication, you see, which is "I saw the pocketbook and I picked it up with my hand." He doesn't say that, so you don't get, really, an as-is-ness of the action. Do you follow? The action then doesn't vanish or key out or deintensify.

He's putting an alter-is on the line. You say, "What have you done?" He said, "Well, I've picked up a pocketbook." But he says this because it's social, don't you see, just to use "I." But if you question him very closely, you would find out that actually his hand had picked up the pocketbook; he hadn't had anything to do with it at all. He's quoting you something it said off the police blotter.

These people are not all criminals, by the way. They're not un... they're not caught; they're not this; they're not that. But you understand here that he isn't really giving you a factual answer, so therefore isn't answering the auditing question. You say, "What have you done?" And he says, "Well, I'll be sociable about it and I've done this, and I've done that." And sometimes the auditor is completely spun in by the fact that this guy is getting off *fantastic* overts, see, fantastic crimes of some kind or another. Guy just sits there and gives them to you by the bucketload, don't you see? And you say, "Well, good heavens, anybody getting off that much would undoubtedly experience a case change," and you find out that his case sits just exactly where it was.

That's because he never answers the auditing question. You're saying to him, "What have you done," or something like that or "What overt have you committed?" or something like that. And he never answers this. He answers something like "The society has forced me to commit..." or "My hand picked up the pocketbook," you see. "And it was purely an accident that the money was found in my pocket." But, you're saying, "What have you done?" but he's not answering "What have you done?" because he'd be incapable of assuming that much social responsibility. So what he's doing is answering some put-off as far as you're concerned. Yes, he'll say the things which occurred in his lifetime, but in his own mind he isn't answering any auditing question. It doesn't really matter to him. It didn't matter if he did these things.

And then there's the fellow who turns around and tries to make himself look good all the time, don't you see? And his concentration is totally on how he looks to the auditor, you see? He's got to look good. He's got to put up a social presence so he never gets off a harmful act, don't you see?

Well, that's peculiar to this failed case. Any – either one: He's either giving you tons of things he didn't do... In his own mind he never did these things. He says, "Well, that's a social response. I'm in a sort of a police court; that's where I am. It's not an auditing session. All right. Well, I'll tell them all these crimes; doesn't matter and..." Or he's saying – he's done some wild things, don't you see, some crazy things and he's withholding these things like crazy. "Oh, I've always been a good boy."

The one that sticks in mind was a pc who was the sweetest, dearest old lady you ever laid your eyes on who had led an exemplary life but had had a lot of bad things happen to her. And it wasn't until we used one of the remedies in *The Book of Remedies*, which you'll find there today, of after finding out completely that she had never done anything in her whole life – you know, never even stubbed her toe. Life was just one beautiful song, you see. A lot

of things had happened to her, though. Why, we got the happy idea of asking her, had she murdered anybody? Questions of that character, total exaggeration, you see? Had she ever raped any small children, don't you see? This dear sweet old lady. It was quite obvious that if she'd had this many motivators in her lifetime, that she herself must have been very, very busy, see? But according to the record that she was putting up, she was just looking nice and sweet and social to the auditor. And the trick that was worked there, you see, is by presenting "Well, have you ever murdered anybody?" you know?

"Oh, that's so terrible! Well, no, I've never murdered anybody, but of course I made somebody awfully sick once." [laughter] And it's the trick – it's the trick of, "Oh, you can look much sadder than that," don't you see? It's the trick of giving them a much worse overt than they had committed as a yes-or-no type of question. And they start unloading real overts, you see?

But I'm just showing you, then, the normal run of cases, and this I would consider the normal run of cases. You have problems and you have to apply special remedies very often to get off overts. Sometimes auditors blunder in getting off overts because they don't get the pc in communication with the auditor. You know very well that there are people you'd say "Good morning" to but they are not people that you would tell your family troubles to. Well, similarly the pc is willing to sit there and say "Good morning" to the auditor, you know, but not go any deeper into his life than that. You see? It's a standoff sort of an attitude toward the auditor. Well, the auditor would have to work on that.

The pc is in this condition of perfectly willing to say "Good morning" to the auditor and say, "Yes, all right to be audited," but that's about the end of the intercourse, don't you see? That's as far and as personal as this must go. And then the auditor says at once, "All right, now tell me a harmful act you have committed." Well, good heavens, the person really wouldn't even describe breakfast with the auditor, see?

You know, you'd have to build up this communication gradient. "What are you willing to talk to me about?" which is a far more effective process than you ever realize until some day you run it on some pc you're having trouble with. You find out, well, hell's bells, you've been auditing him for twenty hours and they've not been willing to talk to you about a blessed thing. And you get these long comm lags on "What are you willing to talk to me about?" "Well..." Finally they get an answer that's real to them, you know, "Well, I'm willing to talk to you about... this room." You've been trying to get overts off this guy, see? Oh, poo! You've been trying to run ten thousand volts on no wire and it just wouldn't go, you see? Or too thin a wire – too little communication line. And that's so tiny a wire that if ten thousand volts ever started over it, it'd blow up the wire, and you'd have an ARC break, of course, see?

So that – there're all these – all those little nuances. This is, by the way, where an auditor lays the most eggs, is in the field of overts. That's where they chicken the most. That's where they buy the wrong things and so forth. So it is a difficult zone of auditing. I won't say that it's unsurmountable because it's pretty confounded easy.

I've gotten to be an old war horse on this now. And the pc says, "Well, I have a withhold. I thought the other day that you were..."

I say, "Oh, yes. That's very interesting. I'm very glad you can think. Now, I want something that you're withholding from me."

"Well, I was withholding that."

"No, I'm afraid you weren't even bothering to withhold that. You were simply being critical. Now, I want the *withhold* that's back of this." See, I just don't ever let a pc get in there and chop me to ribbons, and I sit there, you know, and say, "Well, that's the lot of an auditor," you know? You think this will produce an ARC break. No, no. The other way is the way you produce an ARC break. Because you've just got missed withholds by the ton on the case by – after a while.

No, what you do is the guy starts to get off "withholds" about you and starts to get off "withholds" that's somebody else's withholds, you know, "I was – well, I have an awful withhold here. I was auditing Betsy Ann the other day and she told me – *yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap*." [laughter] When I run into that in a pc, I go *pheew!* Chop!

"Now, look, we're auditing. We're interested in you; we're not interested in other people's withholds. We're not interested in what you're withholding of critical thoughts. Nothing of that sort, and so forth. I want to know what you're really withholding." And the needle goes *mmmm*. [laughter]

"I spilled all – a whole ashtray full of ashes over your new rug the other day. *Oh-ho-ho-ho*. And you can still see 'em." [laughter]

"All right. Thank you. Any other withholds?" Now they give them to you very cheerfully. You don't get these circuitous critical thoughts of the auditor and other people's withholds and all this kind of nonsense, don't you see?

But as I started to say before and complete saying, pulling overts is dependent upon the degree of communication with the pc, the degree of responsibility of the pc, the – it's also in the ability of the auditor to really know what one is and pull the right one. In other words, we're dealing here with stuff that can't be done crudely. We're dealing stuff that has to be done rather slippily and very well. An auditor has to be right on his toes.

Well, even if you were right on your toes, the case that's the failed case still couldn't have his overts pulled fast enough in a session to keep up with PT. And that's why he's a failed case. So it's his *present* that you're in collision with, not his *past*.

He leaves your session; he cuts you to bits with his friends; walks up on the front porch, sees the dog lying there happily asleep in the sun, gives him a good, solid, swift kick in the ribs; goes inside, finds out that his sister hasn't got dinner on time, breaks a couple of plates; finds somebody else's piece of mail, steams it open and reads it. [laughter] Rather incredible!

I want to interject a note here which seems not apropos of anything else, just as an aside here at this particular point. But did you know that you could audit all sex and so forth you want to on a pc – it isn't going to do very much – but you can audit any God's quantity of it – because it doesn't happen to be an end word. You very often find GPMs and that sort of thing what – they are things that it can lock on in root words and end words, but it itself is a

humanoid action and the GPMs aren't, don't you see? So you could pull all the sexual overts that you want to. Don't think that it's going to make all that difference to the case, however, because you aren't on down to the roots of the reactive bank; you're just taking the very surface locks off. I think why Freud did this is because that's about as far as people could go, you know?

But he probably has some – a lot of second dynamic overts on the subject, you see? He has probably all kinds of tangles and withholds, but his life is just one long, harmful action. See? *Active, man, active!* Not the crimes of omission, even. Good and active, and you never spot these. So, therefore the case remains undetected because you can't even get off his shallow overts, don't you see, from his past. So you're not about to get off these overts in his present. Now, you wouldn't even have to classify this fellow as a criminal personality. Maybe this fellow is simply a foreman of the works, or something like this, and he's always figuring out how to get somebody sacked. And he's doing this and he's doing that and he's just chopping them up left, right and center, don't you see? And taking the stuff out of the company till in the bargain.

The guy – the guy is really heavy at it, you know? He's working – he's working at it, you know? He's dedicated. And you get him in session and you just can't pull those overts fast enough to keep the case in balance to return any degree of responsibility. And you wouldn't really know what you were looking at. You just wouldn't really know what you were looking at until you got right down to brass tacks and put a shadow on his trail throughout the entire day, which is outside the province of auditing. Because, you see, he's so irresponsible that those things don't react on an E-Meter.

An E-Meter reaction takes a certain degree of reality, a certain degree of responsibility, and the reason you take – always take your biggest action, is you've got that thing the pc feels the most responsibility for. The E-Meter works, then, at the level where the pc has reality and responsibility at any given time. And therefore if you run things that you know the pc has done, but which don't react on the E-Meter, you are then either running something that's already been run out or you are running into a zone on which he has no responsibility or reality. And in either case, you will practically do him in, see? Asking a guy to run out something that's been run out is pretty grim. But trying to run out something for which he has no responsibility of any kind whatsoever is almost fatal.

You can take a list and the key word – this is Auditing by List – you can take the key word on the list – isn't reacting, but you through some insight or observation of the pc determine that this is the key word – you take that thing and you audit it. And you'll have an awful sick pc on your hands. Didn't react on the meter, see, but you knew it must be, so you audited it. Therefore, the thing that falls best is the thing that's nearest and realest to the pc.

In R6 if you skip a GPM you of course haven't got the thing which is nearest and realest to the pc so you don't get much reads. That's practically the total source of small reads on R6. You're just running him where he ain't. So if you're running him where he isn't, why, you've bypassed something where he is and on – if you had him where he was and so forth...

Another little remedy that goes along with this: You go over ARC break lists – you know, in Auditing by Lists you go over your L6 and – or L4 at lower levels – and you don't

get any reads on this. Well, that doesn't mean anything, except that the pc has got lists suppressed. That's all that means. The lists are all perfectly accurate. So what you do there is a very simple remedy. If the pc is getting small reads and you can't find out where he is because he doesn't respond on any of the lists, then you must assume there's something wrong with the lists.

Now, there's two things can be wrong with the lists: He's never learned the parts of the GPM or the bank. If you're auditing some green pc (as some auditor undoubtedly, stupid-headedly will do sooner or later), uneducated, totally uninformed pc... One recently, by a name that I won't mention – but I will send a bill to for not mentioning – sent a student to the Academy in Washington the other day with orders that they must not audit her because she had been run on R6. And the understanding was that if anybody had been run on R6, they couldn't be run on anything else. That's just about as wild and crazy a datum as you ever heard.

No, they can't be run on processes which involve words; that's all they can't be audited on. A process whereby you're trying to get them, you see, to define whole track-type words, like Clay Table Clearing or definitions of earlier subjects or something like this – something involving words – you're going to lay an egg because this person is already into the slot of the GPMs and of course the only thing that's going to read is the nearest GPM. And you're just going to key them in. So eventually if you were stupid enough to force them into some word that they considered was wrong, which was way down the bank someplace, you'd bypass all that, they'd turn on a tremendous somatic and they'd feel like the devil. But it's just those things which – those processes which – would use words.

Now, you actually could get them to define Scientology terms except some of those terms are also in the bank. That's a liability; but you could get them to do that if you watched it. And if your meter started to go high or something like that, you'd say, "What's the matter?" And you'd better jolly well find out what's the matter, don't you see? You'd have to take it very delicately even to do Scientology definitions. But you definitely could not do definitions of Clay Table Clearing. And you *definitely* couldn't do definitions of earlier subjects. And you *definitely* couldn't list words to assess. Those things would practically wreck your pc.

But good *God!* as far as I know, that leaves some hundred thousand processes! And, you know, there isn't a single process in *The Book of Remedies* that violates it, except the earlier subject, definitions of. That's all. All the rest of those processes in *The Book of Remedies*, whether they came from 1950 right straight on up the line; all these tons of processes that are on tapes and everything else – could be audited on somebody who's running R6 out of his ears.

And the other thing is, who ran R6 *well, well, well*. That's the clue.

So somebody is running R6 and they're not running R6 well – well, you possibly don't even have the liability of Clay Table. They're not in the slot; they're not going down the bank. Lord knows where they are! You might even be able to run Clay Table Clearing on them or run any stupid kind of definitions or run anything that comes into your head or anything in *The Book of Remedies* on them. You're not going to do anything to them. And you

could prepcheck them. Perfectly valid to prepcheck them on various things, providing you prepcheck. Very often people go completely astray by taking a Prepcheck and think a Prepcheck is very harmful or upsetting because of end words that might occur in the Prepcheck, when as a matter of sober fact they don't know how to run a Prepcheck.

Well, if you overrun the Suppress button on a Prepcheck, you of course got all the other answers he would have thought of on the other buttons coming up and hitting him in the face, and then you make some recommendation, "I think I will have to have this pc itsa." (This happened right here the other day. I won't have any withholds.) And having overrun Suppress madly, you see – audited the process wrong – why of course the pc now had all kinds of additional answers. So the auditor's solution to it was to go off Prepchecking and go on to itsa because the pc had so much to say. No, the only thing that had happened the pc had all of his answers to Invalidate and Change and every other darn button in the Prepcheck. You see, he'd been run – the tone arm action had been run out of the Suppress button, see? You don't – you don't flatten a Prepcheck button to a point where a steamroller appears to have run over it, you know? The pc says, "Well, I really haven't got any more answers."

"Well, you'd better get me another answer. I'm still getting tone arm action on it." No, the tone arm action is on the process; it's not on the button. If you don't think it's flat, go through the buttons again in rotation, and so forth, and see if you get anything. But that's actually the mechanics of it.

You'd have to prepcheck properly, you have to audit properly to get proper auditing results. And one of the things is, is when the pc hasn't got any more answers and he *really* hasn't got any more answers you don't ask any more questions.

I mean, it sounds elementary. I know of no auditing situation where the pc who has been getting proper tone arm action – proper tone arm action in the session – who says, "I don't have any further answers to it," has ever had any further answers to it. I know of no such situation.

But occasionally you'll get a pc who is getting wonderful tone arm action on something like O/W, who runs into *mea culpa*. (Latin morals of the Catholic church: "I am ashamed" or "It's my blame" or "It's my fault" – *mea culpa*). I mean, that's – they practically never got off *mea culpa* as a therapy. The Catholic church could be very pleased with this boy because he really now knows shame, blame and regret, see? And he doesn't bother to give you the withhold. He just simply says, "Well, I don't have any more answers."

Well, actually, if you – if you took a pair of magnifying glasses and looked across the table at your pc and cut the smog out of it and so forth, even in Los Angeles you could tell [laughter] that this pc has not answered all of his answers. Because he's sitting there – there's various symptoms that you could notice, you know, like chewing his fingernails, looking cringing like this, you know; he's backed up in his chair; he's turned bright red; he's sweating; the palms of his hands running rivers of moisture. I mean, there are some small indicators that says he's simply hit something he don't want to talk to you about no more, brother. He's not going to say any more about it – *hah-uh!* Oh, no! Well, at this point, of course, in O/W, you press it home; but it's only in O/W that you press it home.

If he says "I haven't got any more present time problems," you say cheerily, cheerily, "Good." He can withhold all the present time problems he wants, really, without getting him in – or anybody else into very serious trouble. He'll only withhold them if they've got overts connected with them that he's ashamed of and you'll get that on the overt line, don't you see?

Not to push it home, but you could actually run a – run a Prepcheck so that it looked like you were restimulating end words and messing up the pc. Don't you see? You could run it in such a way that it looked like catastrophe that was occurring. The only thing that was occurring is you just happened to have flattened the button and you aren't listening to the pc in the session. He says, "Well, that's all the answers I got. There aren't any more answers."

And you say, "Well, I think you'd better answer this two or three more times or five or six more times." And – *hm-mm-mm-mm-mm* – about that time he starts imagining answers and dreaming up answers. You now have a condition where he isn't answering the auditing question, and because Prepchecks are Prepchecks, you now start getting answers to the other buttons on the same subject. So he now doesn't answer the auditing question at all. So now he looks like he's got – a floodgates of Niagara would open at any minute, see? Because he's thought of this to tell you but that doesn't answer the question and there's no way he can. Well, what fouled it up in the first place, you see? Somebody forcing him to answer a question he had no more answers for.

Now, some pcs change faster than others and on this particular course, you can get very, very used to a case going at a certain pace or rate of change and all of a sudden be totally thrown for a loop. The case will start to change at a faster rate. And it's the auditor that worries in this particular case.

Case is changing at a faster rate than is believable according to auditing experience and so processes are madly overrun, particularly at the lower levels, you see? And we sin on the direction now, because of the – of the supervision and other factors involved in the course, don't you see – it's very tight auditing – you'll find the rate of change of the pc is increasing. It's faster.

He's changing faster and very often, why, we run into the sin of overflattening, don't you see? The case will suddenly come up with a cognition. Now, we try to audit this process again and it's blown.

That won't happen with GPMs. You'll find out the GPM was just suppressed at the time and you'll go back a couple of days later after you've run something else and all of a sudden, why, it's got all of its reads, too.

But rate of change of the case increases in ratio to the auditing. The slowest change period of the case is at the start of the case. So if you've actually started a case, then rate of change increases. Do you understand?

Your very failed case – coming back more solidly to that – doesn't experience any rate of change at all. There is no rate of change but one. See? And that will change more slowly as you go on because the case is a failed case. Do you follow this? The length and rate of change, you say... well, this actually has very definite indexes. You can measure how long it

takes for a pc to get a cognition on something. How many hours of auditing does it take a pc to come up to a cognition on something fundamental about himself?

Let's say it starts out early on when he's being audited at the HAS levels or something like this and it's about twenty-five hours or something like that and he comes up to some recognition about himself, you see – some bigger recognition. And you'll find out as he goes on up the levels, why, it would take him maybe an hour to come to some conclusion of similar magnitude, don't you see, about some facet of his life at a higher level. You get what I mean – rate of change. And you sometimes can get somebody who has been audited well and whose case is moving very well who almost audits by inspection and this gets pretty weird. And sometimes then the auditor will overestimate the power of the engram or something that the pc has collided with and think he can get rid of that because he got rid of all of the others, you see, and audits him too short on it and comes a bit of a cropper. Don't you see? It's a variable thing. It doesn't stay constant, but it goes also along with comm lag: How long does it take the pc to answer the question?

And one of your indexes of rate of change is the posture of the pc in auditing. Pc always assumes the same physical posture while being audited. Never assumes an additional or changed posture really. Always comes back to one posture, if they do change to another posture.

It isn't any particular posture; you'll just have to understand it like that. The pc is always dropping into Rodin's [Rodin's] (or whoever it was) Thinker. Don't you know? You'll see that the pc is – very frequently in session the pc has his head cocked, way over here – something like that – some posture. He keeps returning to this posture. He keeps returning and returning and returning to the posture, don't you see? Always auditing like that – being audited like that.

Has a habit of doing a certain type of fiddle with the can. Always has this mannerism in auditing. To the degree that the pc's mannerisms in auditing remain constant, he is not experiencing a rate of change of progress. Do you follow that? You can do that by inspection. You see some pc: He's – always sits down – he always slumps in some position or he always sits in a certain way or he always looks in a certain way in a session. Always seems to return to this mechanism in some way or another – I mean this posture, this pose, this *diddle-fiddle*. That thing keeps recurring. You want to watch for that as an auditor, because that case is parked. That case is definitely parked. Quite important for you to recognize that.

When you see that, you know that you're looking at a case which needs remedying. And if you start – that means that you've got to look this case up in *The Book of Remedies* and do something about it. You understand? No rate of change. Now, the rate of change hasn't changed at all. I mean the case has still got the same posture, same reactions, you know, very often the same overts. But you don't have to go off into that direction to find out that they're stuck. They're not progressing and you can tell that actually from the consistent physical posture in a session. As simple as that.

And tone arm action on such a case is minimal – very little tone arm action. Their other symptoms are all there. They just go on down. Your bad indicators are all there. I mean, everything that you'd shake a stick at is present.

But as an Auditing Supervisor, as an Auditing Supervisor you actually can go through a room on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and if your memory is very good, by the time you've gone through Wednesday (and it's this – it's this fast a rate of change is what is expected) you notice that you still got a pc – by George, you still have a pc – who is sitting there with his cans like this. He always holds his – he's – on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday he held his cans flopped down at his sides with his back bowed and his head hanging and that's the way he's being – he's responding in auditing. Well, you wouldn't have to look at his auditor's report or anything else, you wouldn't have to look at his auditing, you wouldn't have to study anything particularly and so forth to know the case wasn't changing. Follow that?

Now that you know the case isn't experiencing a rate of change, now let's look at the case, now let's look at the – at the auditing reports. We're trying to find something wrong and you're trying to find that and match that up against *The Book of Remedies*. And when you get those two things matched – well, you give those directions, and if you did it Wednesday night, by the end of session on Thursday you would find the pc sitting with his cans in his lap. He's no longer sitting like this; he's sitting like this. You get the idea? I mean, it's that superficial an observation. You follow that? There's nothing very – nothing very fantastic is required in the way of instinct to know somebody isn't changing. They've always had a green complexion; they've still got a green complexion. Well, you know their rate of change must be lousy. A non-optimum condition persists is another way that you spot this.

Well, when a person starts in, in auditing, in spite of everything you do, in spite of anything anybody else does, in spite of all the think and everything else and the sweat and so forth, you've got one thing left that isn't in *The Book of Remedies*, because that's a book of remedies. But it could very easily include this one, of course, but it wouldn't necessarily emphasize it. You've got this present time condition of a concatenation of overts which is too rapid to be picked up. And that's your boy; that's your boy.

If after a hundred hours of auditing and all the sweat and change – particularly with *The Book of Remedies* in your paws – you didn't see any change in this pc, there is no reason for you as the D of T or the auditing supervisor or something like that – or the auditor – to go – considering that you have failed in some particular line. I mean, you haven't failed in any line. You did your best.

You'd better start looking at this pc's PT. You'd better look at that PT environment. What's he do when he leaves this auditing session? That's giving him a fair trial, don't you see? That's a long look, you know? Well, what's he doing? You don't know of any big flubs that weren't corrected. Nothing been done to victimize this character one way or the other. Yet there he is – no change. Well, there's the other zone which you yourself would not find it very easy to inspect but which you'd better jolly well find some way to inspect if you're going to do anything with this case at all.

You're going to be horrified at the conduct of some parts of the human race. You're going to stand your hair on end on some of these characters, you know? And it's so pathetic, because they've done so many overts, they get so many motivators. You see, it's not a one-for-one, even. I don't suppose it's that neat a ratio. But it's a type of overt for a type of moti-

vator, so you could actually run it down in auditing; you could search this thing out. You must realize it's not something the person has done but it's something the person *is doing*.

Now, it's pretty hard to spot that this is what you're handling because of course you never get any communication about this from the pc. But there is one method of spotting it and that is what the pc complains about in the conduct of others. And you could just get him busily complaining about what he complains about in the conduct of others and go over this right on down the line and you'll finally find out that one of them is very, very consistent. Well, that is what the pc does between sessions.

Now you see, you wouldn't go to an heroic measure, like this – pc has merely got some motivators and they're talking about this and that and their PT is – their present time is all upside-down or something like this. But you're auditing him and you're getting a change of case, see? Well, you don't take any such measure.

I'm talking about the fellow who was audited and everything is done for him that can be and he still comes around – he says, "What are you going to do – what are you going to do about my lumbosis?" They drive the medical doctor mad. "What are you going to do about it? You've done nothing for it," you know. "You've done me in," and so forth. Now, you're probably part of the – part of the overt-motivator package. He's got enough overts against you out of session, you know, to make a – make a book like *Fanny Hill*.

Anyway, we got a whole bunch of stuff going on here that is outside the observation zone of the auditor. So the auditor is looking at his mind, he's looking at his past and he's looking at his own auditing of this pc, don't you see? Well, those are legitimate areas of inspection. But there is another area and that's what I'm calling to your attention, and that is the failed case – that other area. It's the present time series of overts, and I could add the word involvements but this is rather false because it's not really – he's involved because of overts and don't kid yourself otherwise, you see?

Now, that's the PT of this pc who keeps coming back after 150 hours, saying, "You haven't done anything for his lumbosis." There's your boy. Overts! – comes down to, straight dead on the line. And this case could be so bad and his environment could be so enturbulated that you just did not have a prayer of being able to pull any part of the overts which he commits. You audit him for five hours in a day; that leaves nineteen.

You can audit him on a ratio of five to nineteen. Of that nineteen, let's say he sleeps eight. Let's give him credit, then, for not committing overts during one of those hours. That leaves ten hours of the day for five hours of your auditing, and it's already two for one. Now, if it takes three times as long in auditing to pull the overt as it did to commit it, you're just straight up against nothing but pure, honest-to-God arithmetic. That's what you're up against.

And I don't care, these people are the *first* to tell you how innocent they are and how *inactive* they are. They're the first. They – you give them a stack of Bibles a mile high and they'd do something about it. Now, that person is a failed case where it comes to general practice for this one reason: is you can't monitor his environment strongly enough. He's walking into your zone of influence which extends maybe the size of the organization, maybe the size of your house or your auditing room, don't you see? Maybe even to your front sidewalk. That's your zone of immediate influence as far as this case is concerned, see? Your

zone of influence may be much wider than that, but as far as that case is concerned that's your zone of influence.

Now, the second he steps one foot beyond that zone of influence, he's away. And the way you handle this case, if you could handle the case, would be to establish your zone of influence as far as the case is likely to go between sessions for long enough to pull the case out of it.

Now, it would mean a shift of environment. This isn't the normal thing whereby the guy is simply in an enturbulated environment and so you change his environment during the period of auditing, see? That's a common remedy. And that is not – enters into the failed case. This other fellow would take a lot more, he'd take a lot more than just that. If you changed his environment, don't you see, he'd go on committing the same overts over a long-distance telephone or something. He'd do some way, you know? He's getting even with all of existence.

Now, where you have such a case and where you do not have control of the environment, you can be absolutely certain that this will become a failed case. The only possible remedy that you could have is to project the fear of the auditor or something like that to such a degree that perhaps you keep him under. But then you're defeating yourself, of course, because you're spoiling your ARC, and you're doing an overwhelm of the pc and you're more likely to get a religious reaction. The fellow kisses the hem of your tablecloth before he leaves, you know? Keeps facing your front door as he goes back up the walk, don't you see? You haven't got anybody in a very healthy frame of mind, so that's self-defeating, too.

But you can do some of it. You can do some of it. And it's worth – it's worth trying. Recognize what you're looking at, you see? You don't have control of the society in which this fellow lives or his family or something like this. Well, recognize what you're looking at here. You can say to him, "Now look, the reason your case isn't progressing is because you are doing things which you suppose I have no inkling of, between sessions. And you're thinking things and you're saying things and you're acting in certain ways between sessions which is highly diffi... – highly detrimental to your case. Now, if you change these habits and actions and cease to frequent the same places that you've been frequenting and so forth, why, maybe we can go on, and even then I would have to be very, very convinced before I would pick up the meter on you again," see? It's this kind of thing.

Now, you actually, at this point, have simply to some degree located and indicated the bypassed charge; because this would be true. You've audited the bird for a hundred hours and he's had no rate of change. And you've applied the whole *Book of Remedies* and you've done everything under the sun, moon and stars, and this guy isn't changing in any way, shape or form and he isn't getting any better. Ah well, you've only got one left. And that one left is his environment is being so reacted upon by him that he is laying in more overts than you can get up. And that's all there is to that. You could try a lot of things, but that one I don't think you will ever totally catch up with until you've totally controlled the environment in which the person exists.

Now, you could say, "Well, now, if you'll go to the Bide-a-Wee Hotel and let me put a couple of guards on your door – if you're willing to go through this for a couple of months and pay the price of the We-Spy-for-You Detective Company to relay – put a relay of watch

and shadow on you during this particular period, why, I'll go on auditing you, but not otherwise." See? You might – you might – you might, you see, just on the occasional one, crack through and so on. But you wouldn't – you wouldn't do 100 percent, because these people are dedicated.

Environment – the environment looks so dangerous to them or so provocative or so hostile or so something – we don't care just that; we're not just talking about a particular type of reaction to the environment – but it looks so something, that the only way you can exert your livingness at all or even breathe is to do a certain line of actions which even though they are socially unacceptable nevertheless are vitally necessary. And the person's conviction along these lines are to the degree that if you told them to stop them, you have practically told him to stop eating or stop breathing, see. It just totally violates his reality.

Now, therefore you sometimes look for the fast one – the fast, fast process. What'll get in and undercut this case, you know – *zoommm!* Well, there isn't anything to get in and undercut that case because in the first place you've got to be able to have the case in communication with you. The guy's got to be able to be in communication with you before you can do anything for the case. And it's going to take more than one session to get him in communication with you, because after you've gone to the second session, you now have a bunch of overts in which you're included in the perimeter of overts and this will just go on going in that particular direction.

So there is the social liability. Now that gives us an avenue for an activity known as – doesn't give us one – but that gives a justification to the psychiatrist: One, he didn't have any processes – well, one, he didn't have any understanding of the situation. Two, he didn't have any processes to handle the situation. But those cases, then, which can't normally respond just by talking to somebody about their troubles – and you know that wouldn't be very many cases – you know, I mean the case that wouldn't get well just because he said, "Well, I been sick lately." That'd be a pretty – a pretty high-toned case that can do that, see. All the rest of these cases look crazy to the psychiatrist and look unsolvable to the psychiatrist.

Now, because we've gone so far in an understanding of the subject in which we are dealing, because we've gone so far in having processes, because we've now gone so far in having remedies for these particular odd difficulties which the people come up with, we of course could get very, very cocky and say, "Well, we can go the whole way."

And I call to your attention the Axiom "Absolutes are unobtainable." You're always going to have this case. Unless you can exert – unless you could exert what amounts to political control of the activities of the environment, don't you see – almost to that degree – you wouldn't be able to sweep them all in and even then I imagine he'd still find ways to commit overts in a locked room. Do you see this?

Now, about the furthest-south process that operates on such a case – you, I'm sure, would be very interested in and that is – you already got it – it's justifications. But I'd like to – I'd like to – I'd like to put in a word here. If you can get the person to talk to you, why, you've already won your first round with overts. This is true of all overt running. The first round you've got to win is to get the person to talk to you about things, see, without being reticent as he would be with a stranger, see, that degree, he's got to be able to talk to you. And

then you can get off some of his lighter overts and then you can get off some of his heavier overts, you see. And that's about the gradient that it will go on, don't you see?

Now, you actually, oddly enough, can audit the case who isn't obsessively committing overts but he's been so busy in the past that he's got them stacked up to the roof. Now, that case is actually not today very hard to audit. As long as you remember to get the case in communication with you as the first requisite of all overt pulling and as long as you don't ask for the whole basketload with the first auditing question, why, you can – you can do this, don't you see?

But this bird you will run into, and he's commoner, fortunately, than the bird who is committing the overt during the auditing session to – committing overts to such a degree that he can't possibly catch up with it, don't you see?

So you would handle this – they look quite alike, by the way. They – one is – they're both very detached; they're both very irresponsible. They very often will give you fantastic things they have done in life and expect you to be shocked over them or something of this sort but they aren't. There's all kinds of odd manifestations which make these cases look similar so you can – you can make a mistake.

So on either type of case you would try this one. You'd try to get them into communication with you. It wouldn't matter what case it was – you would do that, don't you see? – or what you were trying to do. And then on a gradient you'd get more and more, heavier and heavier – more voltage on the line – and you could go deeper and deeper on the subject.

And remember this one: that for that long-gone case who can take no responsibility whatsoever for his overts or for the recurrent overt – the guy keeps giving you the same overt; you know, he really can't get off of having done this terrible thing. The secret of what holds it in: that overt has become a problem, then, hasn't it?

Well, the anatomy of a problem is postulate-counter-postulate, isn't it? You got that as the anatomy of a problem. It's exactly balanced so therefore floats in time, you see. It – there's just as much force against it as it's pushing, see? And you've got this thing exactly poised in time here and it's floating along with present time. Well, he can't get this overt off and he can't get rid of this overt: You must recognize that you are dealing in actual fact with a problem as far as the overt is concerned, don't you see? Well, you don't bother to address it as a problem. I'm just showing you that having – he's got this overt and he tells you about it but that doesn't get it off. This is true of any of these whether it's from total irresponsibility, you see, or the guy just feels so guilty about it, you know. Whatever it is, the answer is the same at both ends of the scale: It wasn't an overt in his view. It was justified.

Now, I want to give you a note on running this process, because you've run off the rails on it occas... – wherever I've heard it being run and when I was wrestling with it I tried to straighten it out here in the class, and I may have succeeded and may not have succeeded. But if I had to fight that hard to get it back on the rails, I'm sure it's gone a little bit off the rails again. So just let me make a few notes, particularly for those who weren't here when I was fighting to get it on the rails.

Let me make this – few notes here about this, and that is: There is a process of justifications which is really not a repetitive process, which is a wide-open invitation to run as a repetitive process, "What have you done? How wasn't that an overt?" You could say this, see. You could – you could sit there as an auditor with a silly smile on your face going, "Yeah," being – he's totally irresponsible as an auditor – and run a repetitive process called, "What have you done? And how did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it?" Well, that's the essence of the process, but it is not a repetitive process. Let me clar... – call that to your attention. It is not a repetitive process. It requires handling.

You can say, "Well, what ham – ." Well, they don't care what words you use – "What harmful act have you committed? What harmful act have you really, really committed now? Let me see it." Well, the fellow – now, this is not a repetitive process, you see, and it's not itsa. This is taking up the case, see – crash!

And he says, "Well, I did this."

And I say, "All right," and you don't challenge it or anything.

"And I did that. And I did something else." And he's giving you a lot of balderdash as far as you're concerned, because you and the society at large don't consider these things very harmful acts. Fine. Let him get them off. He's just trying to run some variety of O/W. Okay, but that isn't what you ask him. And so you just go on getting your auditing question answered and you – doesn't take you – if you – doesn't matter if it took you twenty-five hours to get this auditing question answered. You get something that he *really did* that *he* thinks was an overt act – it was a harmful action.

That's what you're looking for and it's a sort of a chitter-chat, don't you see? It's not "What have you done? How have you justified...?" That's not the process. Let me put this other form of action across here. It's "Let's sort it out." And he finally says, "Well, I threw my little brother in the river one time." And that was one hell of an overt act. You've got a – it's fine with you that he says something like this. Now you've got your meat. Now let's cook it. I don't care if it took you one minute or twenty-five hours to get an answer that both you and he would consider an overt act. We're not dodging around now about social mores and some people's considerations are different. So the both of you consider this thing as an overt act. All right. That's fine. Now, that's the one you start to put on the front burner.

And this is the way you put it on the front burner: And you say, "All right. Now, let's just start out and count them up. Now, how wasn't that an overt?" And that's not a repetitive question because he'll just go on answering that and he'll get lost after a while and go off maundering someplace and you say, "The auditing question was 'How wasn't that an overt?'" – because you haven't got that one answered yet either. Do you understand? These are two auditing questions you're getting answered.

And it's going to take you, sometimes, one *awful* long time to get each one of them answered. And it's not a toss-off process, the way those repetitive processes are, don't you see? It's not a process by which you could say, "Recall a time you communicated with somebody. Good. Recall a time you communicated with somebody. Good. Recall a time..." – you see. It's not a process, "What would you confront? What would you rather not confront?" and

so forth. Because he's got certainty on these questions. No, you've asked him right into the guts of aberration. You've asked him this question, "What have you done that was a harmful act?" you see.

Now, that actually – actually he has to clip that thing in his mind; he's got to get ahold of something that answered that question. See, you're not going up on it on some gradient and hoping some accident will occur. You're driving right down the center of the road now and you're driving all the way as an auditor and you want to know just that: "What have you done that was a harmful act or action," and so forth. That's what you want to know. It doesn't matter much how you phrase it and so forth. And he'll give you something that, yes, he – even he at the moment considers it harmful and it's something that you recognize as harmful as the auditor. And we finally got this one shaken out. And we can even get into arguments with the pc about what's harmful and what isn't. That's all part of the game, don't you see?

We got this one. Now he's clipped one side of it. Now, let's take the other side out with "How wasn't it an overt act? How wasn't it harmful? Why was it justified?" I don't care how you phrased it. He really, in his first sputterings, is not really answering that question. He isn't telling you what he really justified, what he really thought was unharmed about it, why he really had to do it. So he hasn't really answered the question, don't you see?

And it's going to take an awful lot of answers before you really get the answer to the question. When you finally get the answer to the question, it goes something like this, you see: "Holy suffering Godfrey, I hated his guts! I'd been trying to get rid of him for years."

"Oh, is that so?"

"Yeah, I guess that's why I thought..." And you'll suddenly notice a change to past tense. "I guess that's why I thought it wasn't a harmful act to throw my little brother in the river. Now, what do you know about that! Well, well, well, well, well." And you see, you get a "What do you know?"

It was one overt and it was one reason. Do you see? In the getting of it you got fifty overts to choose from. You got twenty-hours worth of reasons but there was one reason which kept the violence of the action pinned into this thing of postulate-counter-postulate, see. He and society really considered this an overt and there was an *awful* good reason for it. And there it is – hung. And it's accumulated locks and it's influenced his whole life, don't you see? And if you've got patience and skill as an auditor to go through that drill, you've got what I first released as justifications and which easily degenerates into some lousy, relatively unworkable process in which nobody is answering the auditing question, don't you see?

You can ask, "What have you done? What have you done? What have you done? What have you done? What have you?" Well, you're not asking for anything. "What have you done?" "Well, I ate breakfast." "All right, that's fine." That's a perfectly valid answer. He knows he's done that. But I shudder to think of how many answers you could get to that before you would get... The gradient is so long that it's very worthwhile to go at it on this other basis, you see, and cut it down to size because this other basis can be reached, because he's been sitting in that ever since the day he threw his little brother in the river.

Now, the unchanging condition comes from a postulate-counter-postulate. So an overt which created an obsessive problem or which sought to solve one hangs in time and becomes both an overt act and a present time problem. Even though it's not in present time according to time span and calendars it's in present time according to the mind.

And you'll find out that most overts are committed as solutions. So you have another little in¹ whereby you could trip this case into a change and you could trigger off a chain reaction in this case that's committing overts all the time. It's just accidental that you would – you would hit it because he's not much in communication, you see. He's – almost every session he's further out of communication than before, you see. He's really sending himself over Niagara Falls without even a barrel and a publicity agent. And nothing could be drearier, could it?

You've got this other one, is you handle the overt as a PTP that he is trying to solve and you cut in – try to cut in back of it. You understand you're trying to do this with this guy who's the failed case – who's committing these overts. You're trying to do this with somebody who isn't in communication with you anyhow but is just pretending to be, see. So don't pat yourself on the back and say, "Well, we can always trigger it," because you won't. It's worth – it's very worth trying and it's very valuable on other cases, see. It's very valuable on cases who aren't, who are just normally going along trying to get better. A very valuable process is just find out what present time problem they're trying to solve with their overts.

It's very amusing. It's very amusing that you'll all of a sudden have a stream of overts pour into view that the person doesn't even remember having done. This is very amusing. I mean, if you want to suddenly expose to the pc's view over here a whole chain of actions that he never suspected that he himself had done or would never have considered an overt and has now totally got occluded, just start approaching overts as solutions to some problem. Go in through the back door, don't you see?

There's a thousand ways you could dream up to do this even on a repet... I'm not trying to run down repetitive processes. The repetitive processes are – can be repetitive processes only when they can be answered. See, when they can be answered with good reality on the part of the pc and he knows he's answered the question, why, you can ask repetitive. But you can't ask him on something that is far-fetched as "What have you – what harmful act have you committed, you know, that you consider harmful?" And he says, "Well, I did so-and-so," and he doesn't think so and it's not a harmful act and he's got it totally justified and so – it doesn't answer the auditing question, so the guy is even further out of session afterwards.

But approaching this other one now – approaching that as an overt – a harmful act is an effort to resolve a problem. Ninety-nine percent of the cases you collide with – oh, a higher percentage than that – this just works like a bomb. A terrific process, all the time, but it even works on the guy who is categorized at some tiny percentage of the time, see. You find out, well, all men are Martians or something wild, see. That's the problem he's trying to solve. How to get rid of the Martians or... It'll be probably some crazy problem that hasn't got anything to do with reality, see. This is fact. It'll be some problem that existed a long time ago

¹ Editor's note: "in" here: access (Ref.: World Book Dictionary)

that doesn't exist any longer or something. But the obsessive commission of overts means that their – the pc must have some oddball problem that's got a tremendous lie connected with it somehow or another. And all things that persist have lies connected with them. And you could try it from that door. You could try to open that door.

The only reason that it'd fail is you don't get problems, you get a whole bunch of motivators out of such a case. A normal case you say, "Well, what problem are you trying to solve with overts?" You said something like that and he'd say something like this. Well, he'd say, "Well, a continuation of my business. I have to commit one God-awful number of overts to keep afloat."

"Well, how do you have to commit these overts?"

"Well, actually I commit them against the customer by cheapening the product. And I commit them against the staff by demanding more work at less pay. And, uh – actually, you know, it's the goddamned government. If they weren't taking..." And then he'd say something like this to you, you see – "If they weren't taking the additional profit that I might be making, you see, then I might not have to commit that many overts. Hey, you don't suppose I'm trying to make the government guilty, do you? My God, I am! *Hmmm!*" See, one of these brassy, ten thousand-volt cognitions, don't you see.

You've all of a sudden done something very tricky with a case that looks absolutely magical, see. What you did is, you recognized that overts are an effort to solve some problem. Not all overts are efforts to solve some problem – some are accidental, some are habitual, see. I mean, some are just ignorance. There are different kinds of overts that are harmful acts a guy can commit, see. He didn't intend to commit an overt. Well, an overt and a harmful act normally requires some intention, don't you see. Even the law – accidental death, you know, is manslaughter and homicide is premeditated – even the law makes a difference between what was intended to happen and what happened, don't you see?

Well, all of these various wild considerations, they – you needn't tangle yourself up and get too involved with them. I'm just trying to say that it isn't true to say that every overt that was ever committed was an effort to solve a problem, don't you see? That's one of these data like "jewelers never go anywhere," see. It's completely non sequitur to anything type of data, you see. It's a total generality. It doesn't work. Not all harm in the – in the world stems from the existence of problems, see. You could run this down. You'd probably make a pretty good case for it, don't you see, but it's going to – its logic is going to fail some place or other along the line.

But where a fellow is absolutely a dedicated hombre – where this bird gets up in the morning and crosses his heart and takes the hilt of his tie pin and presents it to his forehead and before the mirror, on how he's going to get even today – he's solving a problem. And this person is going around saying, "Well, I really don't want to commit the overt, but I've got to." This also gives us a strange view to it all.

See, he's withholding committing the overt but he's got to commit the overt and so forth. Well, now look at that. Get an insight on this. He's obviously trying to solve some problem, isn't he? No other avenue of solution, so he commits the overt as the last resort. Usually an intentionally committed harmful act – this is ordinary in life – an intentionally

committed harmful act is committed in an effort to resolve a problem. And so, when you get some horrible thing that the person has done in life – as threw his little brother in the river – he agreed it was an overt. He knows it's an overt now. It wasn't just an accident. He didn't drop him in the river. He picked him up and he threw him in the river, see. And we've got this thing now and he knows it's a bad thing and you know that's a bad thing, too – it's not – it's not done. And now he's answered the question, don't you see?

Well, when you ask him on the reverse current, you see, why that wasn't an overt, you're unlocking the door to an ancient problem of some kind or another, see, and you're taking locks off of it. So you let him chatter on and on and on and give you more and more and more on this one question until all of a sudden the real reason – the real reason it wasn't an overt – shows up and you've unlocked it. He will say, quite incidentally, and pass it off shortly after his cognition, that that was a hell of a thing to do. He'll say, "Well, I just didn't figure – I just didn't figure I'd ever have anything, if he was that young. He always used to tear up my things. Parents would buy everything for him." You've already heard all these things, why it wasn't an overt, don't you see, but he explains it to you. He'll sum it up. It was a problem. It was a problem actually in havingness. So why he threw his brother in the river was a problem in havingness. Don't you see?

And you can sometimes be completely magical with this and very lucky. If your pc is very bad off, you're *very* lucky if you make this work, don't you see, because his recognition of responsibility is out the bottom. He's not about to be responsible for any quarter of anything he's doing or has done. And he – therefore, he's not even responsible for sitting and being a pc in your auditing session, you see. So trying to reach this gone character, this totally failed case, is – *bdahh*. But this may even occasionally work with him, don't you see? Treat his overt as an effort to solve a problem.

I don't care how you treat it. You say, "What problem are you trying to solve? Now, you know, let's see, what have you done..." This is a good gambit on such a thing, "Let's see, what have you done in the last twenty-four hours that was pretty antisocial?" Ahhh, but he – before he starts to even say, "Ohoh-oh-oh. Well, nothing, you know," well, you already got this guy taped, you know. Just brush it off, don't even acknowledge it. It's a lie anyhow. "Let's see, now. What would it be in the vicinity of? Would it be something to your family or somebody around that's close and near and dear to you, or would it be me, or the organization? Well, the needle just fell on me. Now, what have you done to me?"

Actually, the last time he left the session, he – you couldn't find your overshoes. Well, he took them and threw them in the garbage can or something like that, see. You run it down. You say, "All right. Now, let's take this – let's take this – let's take this action now, and what problem were you trying to solve with that?" See? Let's go at it on a kind of head-on proposition so he really doesn't get the motivator off. Sometimes by lucky chance, you'll come through. You could ask him, "Well, why wasn't it an overt act?" He could give you a lot of justifications, don't you see. He could give you a lot of other things and so on.

But you could also undercut the thing and have some chance of getting through just with a blunt, "Well, what – by being mean to my possessions, what problem are you trying to

solve?" And he'll some way or another start coming up with, "Well, I'm trying to solve the problem of how the hell I'm going to stay sick."

Of course, your immediate response, "Well, why do you want to stay sick?" see. You probably would ask him that, really before you could check yourself. You'd be too startled, something like that. An auditor should never be startled, but they occasionally are, me amongst them. "Ah," he'd say, "Well, I'd cease to draw a pension."

"Well, what problem are you trying to solve by getting auditing?"

"To show them how sick I am."

But I'm afraid this really failed case would not have that much insight or that much directness to approach it. You can try, you understand. With other cases that are having trouble and so forth, oh yes, this will work. They've got some responsibility for life. They're going to do something in life. They're of some use and benefit to somebody in existence and so forth. Yes, these processes are terrific. I probably err in putting such processes at this lowest, unworkable level, don't you see.

I'm showing you – just trying to show you these processes are terrific processes, work on almost any case. On this case they sometimes nudge it, sometimes budge it, sometimes get it off of the kick, sometimes straighten it out and get it along the line.

But you must know what you're dealing with when you're dealing with this failed case. You must know what you're dealing with. You are not dealing with a person who has committed overts in the past. You are not handling a problem that has to do with the past. You are handling a problem that has to do with today. You're handling a problem that has to do with the session yesterday to the session today time period. You're handling that consistently and continuously.

You handle that with every case that you have anything to do with, one way or the other, to some degree, don't you see? Well, with this case it's all totally hidden. It's all gone. You're never going to find out about it and he's not enough in communication to tell you and you probably can't hire enough detectives to find out about it, don't you see? So you are actually not failing in any quarter except failing to restrain an individual from committing so many overt acts that he can't be audited. And that case is the failed case and that's the only one there is.

You can say, all right, well, there's another failed case: the fellow who died. No, I don't know that he's a failed case. We'll pick him up later on. You keep Scientology going and workable, you pick them all up, see, no matter what happened to them. So that doesn't classify, see. And of course somebody who's unconscious and can't be talked to and that sort of thing, you can get them into communication with their pillow and wake them up. I mean, that's quite interesting.

And we got a dog up to the point now where all she does is try to talk. It's probably – it's having an awful time trying to get along without vocal cords – trying to make up for vocal cords: *Yummm wumm gumm yummm yummm*. Through a little bit of processing from day to day, or from every couple of days to every couple of days and that sort of thing – just Touch Assists sort of thing, you know – why, she's coming up in tone. I notice her communication

level is rising, rising, rising, rising, rising. And she's up to a point now where she – well, at first she would only moan and groan around about her chow, see, something very intimate. Now she moans and groans around because she's glad to see you. And now she's gotten up to a point where she's moaning and groaning around in other – using other voice intonations now, complaining about how cold it is outside.

So these things – these things are not terrific barriers, see. You can process almost anything or anybody up along the line, providing you haven't got this other condition. And what you've got to recognize in dealing with cases at large, is that when easy auditing isn't there with continuous case progress – when that isn't present – that you are facing a circumstance which has to be remedied before ordinary auditing works. There's something odd about the case or something peculiar. There's something that has to be handled about the case, and this is very, very general. This isn't isolated, but it is handleable. It's very easily handleable. It's only when you don't recognize that something is there which has to be handled, that you then have any trouble with the case, and that you would fail on a case, you see.

Now, there's a big difference between that, you see, and the failed case. Now, cases which have appeared to fail in your hands have only failed for technical reasons and for lack of remedies. And you have *The Book of Remedies* now; it is very easy to use and it'll be out in a few days. This you will see is going to make an immediate difference. Because I notice in doing auditing session reports on somebody who's busted down in the line of auditing and so forth, we don't give them anything new. We're giving them stuff that's very old and creaky and antique and so forth: "Look over the auditing report and find the first time the pc set a sour goal. Now go back to the session immediately ahead of that and sc... and investigate that session." It's almost perfect formula, see. Pc set a sour goal: He hadn't been running well since 1958. What? Well, it doesn't have to be that extreme. But you might run somebody down to an unflattened process, don't you see, or something of that sort. And you set that up and they all of a sudden flatten that process up and *zoommm* – they're away, don't you see? Something has happened, they've left a process unflat or a process has been messed up or something has occurred and so forth.

It's just sensible material of this particular kind and it takes that sort of thing. I recognized that I had not, in actual fact, released all of the technology of Scientology, through not having released the auditing remedies used by – in case supervision, which was done over the many, many years – and that was to a point when the student came to Saint Hill, why, of course, he got case supervision of one type or another. He got case supervision, see. And then in trying to relay this material on, the material was too complex to be relayed at a breath, don't you see? There are a lot of them; there are a lot of them. There're – well, it's around a hundred or less, but they look – they look bewildering at first glance.

You know, I mean, if you – if you didn't have any book and you had no guide and you had no map, no chart of anything of this sort and you try to teach somebody – sit down and teach him – he actually would have had to have had each one – one each almost – of all of these various case manifestations, which aren't very many. There are less than a hundred of them. Each one of them would have had a different manifestation, don't you see. He'd had to have handled the case each time. Well, they don't happen that frequently. And it's very hard to train on a practical experience basis. And I all of a sudden realized that section was missing

and so got together and "writ it up." And then I corralled Mary Sue, who is old-time experienced Supervisor from way back when in HGCs, and so forth, and I went over all of those and – that she could think of, and we got a bunch more and put them all together in a ready-reference type of form.

You'll have to learn how to use that book, but that takes care of the cases that you normally are considering cases that are hard to audit or cases that you're failing on and so forth. I wanted to make it very clear from this point on what a failed case was. And a case that is utterly an unauditable, God-help-us, catastrophic bust – with you, with *The Book of Remedies*, with some area of auditing, with somebody able to do something for the case, the case doesn't progress at all – you've still got this one case left, you see.

He's committing overts faster than you could ever get them off. And through that, why, you will occasionally spell yourself a disaster. So I'm pointing that one up as a great big – great big set of rocks that lie under the water up there someplace on some case. And if, after you've done your very, very best to handle the case and done everything possible that you could possibly think of, and you – so forth and so on – why, just hark back and recall this one.

There is such a case. Now, if you want to hire – have him hire a couple of private detectives to chase him around and lock him up in a hotel room and so forth, you could still solve his case, you understand. But under ordinary auditing conditions, his case is unsolvable and so therefore would be a failed case.

Okay?

Thank you.

THE CYCLE OF ACTION: ITS INTERPRETATION ON THE E-METER

A Lecture given on 9 June 1964

Thank you. How are you?

Audience: Fine!

What's the date?

Audience: 9 June.

Nine June, 9 June AD 14. The year of the juggernaut. You look pretty good. You look numerous. [laughter]

All right. Well, today is a very important lecture, very important lecture since it applies to the young and the old, new and the strained and various other categories, and applies very, very directly and instantly to the auditing procedure rather than to techniques; and that is "The cycle of action and its interpretations on the E-Meter." This sounds authoritative enough, doesn't it? 'Tis, too. I have never seen anybody get in as much trouble with as little an item as the auditor and the cycle of action. This easily is the most confused area, field, the most misunderstood, the most maligned, the most defined upside down and backwards type of thing anybody ever had anything to do with.

Well now, just why you're having trouble with this and just why organizations are having trouble with this and just why this is such a gruesome subject is because it's all over the GPMs. And that's why you have to pay attention to it. In the first place, it ain't natural, and you Scientologists, being a cut above the naturalness of normality, of course buck against and see something slightly wrong in the whole idea of time and its forward progress. You get some inkling very early on in the field of Scientology. You say, "Well, there's something wrong with time." A lot of you talk about it. A lot of you say, "Well, if I just had more time or less time." It takes that mild a form. And on the other side of it, you begin to look at time as some kind of a weird taskmaster that you wot not of and want to do less with.

And one of the most interesting recent cognitions I've had in processing, if you don't mind my mentioning something of that line, was to find myself looking at a zero or absence of time. And I was in a very interesting state there for a while. And I took a look at this and I stared it straight in the eye, and it was about – at first I didn't know if I liked it, because if you don't have time, of course, you don't have a lot of other things. And then I took a look at this

and I was trying to find out what was making a pressure on my face, and I found out there wasn't anything making a pressure on my face. There was just a nothingness making a pressure on my face, and the pressure on my face was being made because there wasn't anything there. Do you understand? A completely negative look.

Now, I, of course, immediately invalidated this and said I know some of the end words and some this sort of thing, and I know where these things live and therefore I've just gotten one of these into restimulation and so forth. And I promptly and instantly tried to run this down and get this thing pretty well squared around, and I was unable to spot it as any kind of GPM bric-a-brac.

What I had actually done was escape the time stream. And it was a very funny sensation. Very, very peculiar. But at the same time it was more natural than being in the time stream. You get so habituated to being in the time stream that a sudden cessation of it is uncomfortable. I can remember the old story of the little girl who hit herself over the head with a hammer continuously because it felt so good when she stopped, you know? Another case, a little girl also, that had a perpetual howling migraine headache and had had it for so long that she didn't know what it was. And an auditor turned it off and she felt awfully peculiar. This was life without a migraine headache, you see? And it was something brand-new that she was not used to at all.

Now time, of course, is something that one should be able to move into, out of, up into the forward of and back into, you know? You should be able to straighten out yesterday's goofs, in other words. And at one time or another you were quite capable of doing so. And then you slipped into the time stream and have been going down the line ever since. Now, therefore, I have somewhat of a natural antipathy to the idea that time is there or that something has a beginning, a middle and an end; the beginning, the middle and the end. Because that is a – that is an authoritative action laid on by time.

Well, let me show you something here. You are processing in the physical universe through and across the agreement of the physical universe. And you are making yourself a very good show of going along with the time stream, and if you do this, you are then processing a bank which lays the time stream in with an ax, and you are trying to resolve a subject which is, to a terrible degree, cycles of action. That is to say, the bank is just cycle of action with exclamation points. And you're trying to resolve this, and unless you pay attention to this, you jam the bank. Do you follow me? You jam the bank.

In other words – well, let me say it this way: the pc – the pc has got a sliver in his finger and you don't pull the sliver out. You say, "Well, there are no slivers," and you convince him that it's actually because he has a lot of reactivity on the subject of pain and discomfort. And you sell him this bill of goods, you see? And you tell him the truth, see? You say, "Well, it's – the only reason you're experiencing this pain in your finger because of the sliver and so forth is you have some GPMs and so on, and that's the whole thing and so forth. And there you are! Now, do you feel better?" And he'll say, "No!" Well, why? Well, you just processed him a little too high. Now, maybe you could explain this to an OT, but then, of course, he wouldn't have a sliver in his finger. Or if he did, it – he could as-is it. See?

If you – probably the only thing wrong with the gropings of Mary Baker Eddy and so forth, is she was on cloud nine to the ninth, see? Well, maybe she could make some of that gap, but her articulation of it brought about the nonsense of "if you just not-is it and say it isn't there, it ain't." Let me point it out to you that it hasn't worked. That is not a broadly workable action. It has enough workability so that it retains people's interest. It's the little red flag hanging out. They say, "There's something there. We don't know quite what it is." Then they get it all mixed up with right thinking and power of prayer and living a good life and get into the wrong end of the GPMs and spin, see? Nothing more dangerous than handling something you don't know what it is, particularly anything with as much voltage as this stuff.

So therefore, you enter the wrong end of the line, don't you see? Try to go up too up-scale and you say to the fellow, "Well, you obviously don't have a sliver in your finger because actually that's a manifestation which is created by compulsions forced off on you by the idea that *blah-blah-suh* and so on, and it's actually the hundred and ninety-fifth series and..." You know. Glib, you see? He's still got a sliver in his finger.

So you say to this fellow, "All right. You shouldn't have to pay any attention to time. You shouldn't pay any attention at all to the cycle of action because the cycle of action is just laid in by the bank, and it's your reactivity and has to do with the time stream and, of course, that's all above us people. Okay, evaporate!" [laughter]

And by golly, he doesn't, you know? Well, there's no sense in feeling upset about it because he doesn't evaporate, you see?

Now particularly at lower levels, you're processing straight across this thing called a cycle of action. And boy, it's in there with an ax! The proper sequence and order of things.

The mind is a fiendishly orderly thing. Most of you think of the mind as a great confusion. It isn't. You're the one that's confused.

And the most orderly thing in the world is one of these reactive banks. It is the most precise thing. Some old lady, you know, some old lady, crotchety and so forth, been living by herself for ninety years and so on, and somebody comes down and puts a tea caddy, you know, just one sixteenth of an inch crosswise on the table. Boy! He has it! Well, that's the reactive bank. It reacts just about like that, see? It reacts terribly. You leave out a comma in it, and it just gets very upset, you see? It's a fiendish precision of the thing. And it all follows the same patterns and so forth. And it's very interesting. Your pc, he's all very *bloooahh*.

Well, actually, the pc has to come up through an ability to confront that much order. He's below the ability to confront that much order. He's in an *awful* state of confusion so he's got to come up through this state of order up to the other side of it. And one of the most dominant factors of the bank is the cycle of action – that things have a beginning, they continue and they end. And that is one of the keynotes of order. It has – really, the summation of the bank couldn't add up to anything more strenuously than that. The whole bank is put together on this basis. Things have a beginning, they continue and they end. So it's no wonder you have trouble with it.

Now, the auditor who is having trouble with it because he is below being able to face up to that much order; that's one thing. And the auditor who is having trouble with it because

he can't get back down to that much order; that would be another thing. But equally, a failure to do so would produce no gain in the pc.

Now, where the cycle of action is violated in the pc, the order of his bank is violated and therefore it doesn't as-is. It's that succinct. It's that glib a statement can be made on the subject.

The situation then is that the road out is the road through, and the road through is paralleled by the cycle of action. So the road out follows the cycle of action. And you'll find this cycle of action manifested everywhere in processing. And where the auditor chronically and violently disobeys, turns sideways from and has nothing to do with the cycle of action, he's in trouble, because he's thrown the pc below the fiendish demands of the bank. In other words, the bank parallels this degree of order. And where the auditor does not follow through that much order, why, the auditor does not get the pc through the bank because it is not parallel with the requirements of the bank. It's like trying to process somebody on his father when the difficulty is with his mother. Do you see?

So what you have to do, what you have to do – and this we have proven over a long period of time – this is quite empirical, by the way, this was never derived. This was something that just grew like Topsy along with processing. What you have to do is parallel this thing called the cycle of action. And there is no harm in your doing so. There is no detriment – there is no detriment to you for doing so, and there's certainly no detriment to the pc for going into that agreement that time and a cycle of action exist. In other words, you don't get into trouble – you get out of trouble by agreeing that it exists.

So it's for the nonce and for now it exists. So therefore, you find the cycle of action raising its head everywhere in processing. And a person who cannot approximate this cycle of action as an auditor gets his pc into continuous trouble. And it's not slight trouble. It is enormous trouble. It is just catastrophic. Because, of course, he's gone right straight up against the bank and run the bank wrong way to. Every time you don't process a pc with attention to the cycle of action, you're processing the pc against the bank. So as a result the bank will jam. And you see that manifestation with a high tone arm, with a badly acting needle and other such manifestations. A pc that is not running well has first and foremost had the cycle of action violated. That you can be absolutely certain was the case. Pc isn't running well; the first thing you can say about the pc is the cycle of action has been violated.

Now, you see, "Well, I'm not getting tone arm action on this pc." All right. The first thing we can say is the cycle of action has been violated. Of course, this is a rather broad, general statement. Unless we know what else we're talking about, it could be rather meaningless. Because it's almost, "Well, the sun isn't shining because there – it is a cloudy day," see? It's just the reverse of the coin. So that's what you know.

Now, don't let me hear of any of you back in an organization or in a private practice or something of this sort sending me a query about some pc – you can send me all the queries about pcs you want to – but don't send me a query about a pc with a blank, flat, staring look of "What's wrong with this pc" and accompany it with a hundred and seventy-five started processes, not one of them completed, and say, "Why does this pc have a high tone arm?"

I've exaggerated the hundred and seventy-five because I was too bored to count them, but I did estimate that was something like the number of processes on a case query which I just had last night. I'm not lecturing you out of that particular case because it's one of many. They come in quite routinely and regularly. So the first thing you know about a case – that's the first thing you know about a case that isn't running right, is that the cycle of action has been violated.

Now, we could go back a little earlier than this. We can say, "Why isn't the case not running right," but "Why isn't the case living right?" Well, the cycle of action is being violated.

Now, there's two ways a cycle of action can be violated. One is by – and this is true of life, not processing; true of life, not processing – one way it can be violated is too slavish an obedience to it. There one is out of agreement with the cycle of action in the first place and he is being forced by everything under the sun, moon and stars to follow this particular cycle of action and he practically gets up to the brain ventilation point, see?

He doesn't like it. The fellow who gets up and goes to a bum job, you know, that sort of thing. All of the blessings of the machine age actually lie almost exactly in that zone that I've just been talking about, you see? Well, there is because power of choice is being overthrown. Now, you must not really confuse a power of choice and a cycle of action. Now, if a cycle of action is being followed then, against the power of choice – against the power of choice, see, the person's power of choice is being overwhelmed and overthrown and he is following a cycle of action – we set up quite a conflict. Oddly enough, there is the one zone where the person's power of choice can be overthrown and he can be somewhat improved. This gives you the idea of what value the cycle of action has. It is up there with power of choice!

Well that's a very high – that's a very high point, power of choice. The person's self-determinism, the pc at cause, don't you see? This is power of choice. And we're ranking right along with it, cycle of action, because for a while cycle of action will be fought by the individual and then – here's the trick – by following a cycle of action to a point where he or she is used to it, it will then begin to as-is enough bank to compensate for the power of choice which will then return. You see the trickiness of this, see?

Therefore, you sometimes could force a pc through 8-C against his power of choice but only so long as you repeated the cycle of action. If you were doing a sloppy job of repeating the cycle of action, processing the pc against... this is not a recommendation to process a pc against his power of choice. I'm just giving you order of magnitude. If you'd continued to use the cycle of action in orderly progress of commands, the pc's power of choice would have been more freed than it would have been impeded because you would have as-ised more bank than you were piling up. So it isn't the person's power of choice that gives him reactivity. Self-determinism is something that is imprisoned in reactivity. A cycle of action is the prison.

So therefore, following and using a cycle of action will bring about nothing but a freeing of power of choice, whether the pc consents to it or not. You follow how this goes? This is very intricate. Don't ever tell me now that I recommended to you that you overwhelm the pc's power of choice. I'm just telling you that the cycle of action is comparable.

So you have the determinism of the thetan practically versus – his power of choice and his self-determinism is versus the fiendish cycle of action precision of the bank and this universe. This is the way the thing turns. It's because having started here you inevitably get to there that makes this universe a trap. If you start in at five minutes of nine, you certainly will arrive at five minutes after nine. Wherever you land in space, you are certainly going to land at five minutes after nine in time. That's for certain, isn't it?

Well look, that is an overwhelm. Whichever way you want to look at it, that's an overwhelm. You don't have to do a thing about it, and as a matter of fact there isn't anything you can do about it. You take any human being and sit them down in a chair at five minutes of nine, and no matter what they say, no matter what they do, no matter how they protest, no matter how many books they read or anything else, they are inevitably going to arrive at five minutes after nine. Now, you want to look at the biggest overwhelm there is in the universe – that's it. You want to see what the total overthrow of power of choice must be – that's it. That's the one thing you can't do anything about.

Now, going from point A in space to point B in space is something you can do something about. You can kick like billy-o. You very often get dragged to point B willy-nilly. But nevertheless you've said a – you've made an uproar about it, see? You've at least done that or kicked hell out of A or done something. Do you see? You've done something about it. So that space transfer from A to B in space is not necessarily the degree of overwhelm that time is. In fact, it's such an overwhelm that possibly one or two of you until this minute had never recognized the inevitability of arriving at five minutes after nine. It was just so natural. Well, oddly enough, there really isn't anything natural about it at all. It's the most unnatural proceeding anybody ever had anything to do with.

Therefore, that progress through time is paralleled by cycle of action, and you can approximate time with a cycle of action. It's very close to making time. It's very close to a process you might call "Make some time." And that's a very funny process. That's a very funny process. Now therefore, you can start the pc at A and move the pc through to B, and by distance confusion, he has the illusion of moving through time. Time and space are very easily interchanged, don't you see?

So sometimes you can move him from A to B and just from A to B or get him to move something from A to B, A to B, A to B, A to B – this is very elementary processing – and he all of a sudden differentiates between distance and time. Well look, that's a step in the right direction. Do you see what's got – when I say differentiates, what am I talking about but freeing his ability to see? Well, that must have something to do with power of choice. In other words, he must be able to perceive something new here. He must have a new freedom of observation or he wouldn't have a cognition.

Cognitions only come about on freed perception or freed self or renewed self-determinism or whatever else you want to put on it as a label, you see? The individual is being – is coming loose from the trap. He's that much looser from the trap than he was a moment ago when he can say, "Ah yeah! The third bar is rusty!" Well, he's so much been in the trap before he's never noticed that the third bar was rusty. Well, being able to notice that the third

bar on the window is rusty is to that degree freeing yourself from the trap. See, you're just that much less the effect of the trap. Do you see that?

I found myself the other day being haunted by a GPM. I wondered if it was out of gear or had slid loose from its moorings or something of this sort. And this was all very important because if I missed on this one, as in any of them, why, I'll wrap you around the telegraph pole. And boy, did I resent that for a while, you know? Can't privately get myself snarled up anymore. If I snarl up, it becomes a big overt, see? And I freed that, and that was the end of that. But anyway, I was taking a look at the situation – I still feel that way but not so violently – anyhow, I was taking a look at this confounded GPM that was busy floating around and so forth. I couldn't place it anyplace, and I knew it belonged somewhere and so forth, but it didn't make any sense where it was going. And I suddenly realized that *I* was restimulating *it*. [laughter] This was something new. And I sat back and I said, "Well, what do you know. *Huh-huh-huh*. Bronx cheer. Get lost, you know?" Felt tough! Felt like Vixie out here chasing an imaginary burglar that she was sure wasn't one, you know?

Anyway, I was restimulating it. It was the effect of me – I wasn't the effect of it. Interesting, interesting view. Now, what am I saying in essence there? What am I stating in essence there? I was enough freed from its overwhelm that I could perceive what was happening to it instead of what was it doing to me. Now this is – you see this typically all the time in overt act-motivator sequence. If somebody walks in off the street, all he can talk to you about is overwhelm, overwhelm, overwhelm, overwhelm, you see? You know, "Oh, life has done me in, man. It's just kicked my *oh ayouho-o!* It's lying – oh it's terrible. It's – you know, I ... Look – look, broken neck, you know. Look – look at those hemp marks all around my neck and so. Well, did me in, you know. Ruined – I'm wrecked, you know." And as I was talking to you about obliquely, it – this is quite a mechanism for holding somebody down. You just tell him all the time he's overwhelmed, you see? And tell him he never can be free and he's really had it – wronged, you know. It's a trap!

Well, a lot of you when it first came out on O/W, flinched at invading the personal privacy of an individual to this degree. You thought, "Well, that's something." And some of you were too enthusiastic. But what in essence were you actually doing there? You were just turning the tide. You were saying to this fel... we didn't care what crime he was reporting. We were trying to find something he'd done on his own free will that he then had to restrain and couldn't own. Because this is the mechanism: One does things which he then can't own up to and therefore caved in on because of it, see? He can't take responsibility for his own acts, don't you see? And O/W in its purest essence has never really been well understood since all it is, is – it's not a lesson in morality. It's not a lesson in being good. It is simply a lesson in "What power of choice have you exerted in life?" And you probably could approach the fellow's worst crime just on that gradient and that understanding. You could say, "What have you caused?" But unfortunately, with a great many pcs you get a lot of gobbledygook.

How hard it is to get the individual to admit his first overt. The first time he ever admitted an overt. Not the first overt he ever did; that's lost in antiquity. But just to get him to admit for the first time that he did something that wasn't quite nice. Well, of course, you're striking into the middle of society's effort to get him to restrain admission of this, which is a big overwhelm. And you're getting him to own up to the fact that he's been cause. Now, you

can do some interesting things with this because he owns up and says he was cause and then he immediately says he wasn't cause because it was justified. And then he comes around to a point eventually where he says it was cause because "I did it," but then it was justified. Of course, every time he says it's justified, he's saying that it's not power of choice. "Who have you shot for no reason at all?" See? Now, that auditing question would be a little bit too high but is actually the essence of the question.

The reason why you use an overt, of course, is you're going up against the social mores as the point of overwhelm. You just choose this as the point of overwhelm. So therefore at lower-level processing, you are choosing the society as the point of overwhelm when you're running O/W, and you want the individual's revolts against this overwhelm as an expression of his power of choice. Now, some point of agreement with society can be found somewhere in that, that will undo attention from society.

I'll scale it all down to lower IV processing. You could ask some question like this, "What social activity or what third dynamic activity have you gone along with?" You, oddly enough, would find that this is an auditing question which, weirdly enough, would eventually bring up overt acts. It would be quite magical. You say, "What – what social activities, what customs, what beliefs, have you gone along with?" He starts naming them off, and the next thing you know gives you an overt act! Well, that overt act is nothing more than freeing himself from the straitjacket that he's been following along the social plane.

Well, that's a fairly innocent one, but it does people a lot of good and is very good lower-level processing. O/W, agreements – not disagreements – agreements, communication, things that are real, subjective realities, these sort of things, they're all pretty terrific. You could put those into the same rationale.

But how is the individual getting free? Well, the individual is getting free to the degree that he can step back and look at it. The individual can look at the situation he is in and to that degree is free of it. When he can really look at it, he's really free of it.

Well, now let's apply all this to the sixth dynamic and we'll get a much more subtle level, much less easily perceived by the ordinary human being. And that is what I've been talking to you about: Time. Freedom from the time span and freedom from cycle of action. Now, this is so woven into the pc regardless at what level he is, that even your social addresses, you know "What social agreement have you had, what have you done to society, how have you exerted your self-determinism against society" – you know, getting him to admit himself as cause someplace or another; now all of that, by the way, is all very, very, very junior to the sixth dynamic. No matter who he's shooting, he's standing on MEST, firing across space, don't you see, and his action is measured against time. I don't care what act he's doing. I don't care what he's agreeing with. I don't care what's happening to him. If he's in this universe, that's what's going on. In other words, he's in total slavish agreement with the sixth dynamic. So when you're processing this person, if you violate that to an enormous degree, he won't know what it is that is being violated. It's being violated to such a degree that he can't tolerate it. His tolerance of that violation is terrible. Do you understand what I mean?

You're processing this individual maybe – let's take the social unit or something like that, that we're processing him about, is his family. Well, let's not even take society. Let's take his immediate family, see?

Well, "What family custom have you gone along with?" or something like this. We don't care what we're taking up. And if you violate the cycle of action on the sixth dynamic – it's clear up here at Level VI auditing, see – but if you violate it down there at Level I, it responds on the E-Meter. You violate the cycle of action.

Now, how could you violate the cycle of action? Well, you have to understand how many cycles of action there are. And there are quite a few of them. They categorize on an expanding perimeter. Let's take this as the first cycle of action is the auditing comm cycle. Why do you call it a comm cycle? Because it is a cycle of action. And that is the first one which you see badly expressed on the low-level pc on the meter. This is the first one that shows up on the meter.

You see, I don't care what you're processing this pc on. He's nowhere near Level VI, you see. He's not doing anything about time or something of this sort. You're trying to find out if the desk is real or something, you know, or if he's got an auditor. And yet this cycle of action is so insidious that it weaves itself straight into that question you're asking, and you won't be able to get away with it. It isn't something you can get away with. And that is what is so fiendish about it. It's a point in auditing that can't be violated. If it's violated, you get lack of success. That's your dirty needle.

You say to the fellow, "Well, what have you... what did you do to your father?" And he says, "Well, I uh..." And you say, "Well, we've been into all that. Tell me something about your mother." You have an instant needle manifestation, instant! It'll be right there staring you in the face.

The young and beginning auditor is always mystified why E-Meters have such nervous needles. He blames them for all sorts of things and so forth. And yet it is just this violation, continuous violation of the auditing comm cycle. And it gives him a dirty needle. And that dirty needle is expressing the jam-up of energy in the pc's bank by reason of the violation of the momentary cycle of action. That auditing comm cycle – when you violate the auditing comm cycle, it will jam up energy in the pc's mind and that registers on the needle as a little *bzzzt*. In other words, you don't have to go out and be very esoteric about this. You can grab anybody off the street, put him on a meter, say, "Well, what's your name?"

And he said, "Oh, my name, well, it's..."

"Well, I don't want that."

Dirty needle. See, you asked him a question and you didn't let him answer it, and you didn't acknowledge when he did. And right away you got a dirty needle.

This is pure tyranny and is something that many auditors shudder against, and when they are first presented with the facts of the case that *they* are making the dirty needle, you never saw so many flinches and winces in your life. They cut and run. "Oh, me? No! I couldn't be. It's just the quality of this pc." Oh, no, it's not the quality of the pc. It's that the auditor violated the auditing comm cycle and that produced a disagreement with that very

powerful being called the reactive bank. And when it produced this, to this – just to this degree, a disagreement with its mandates concerning cycles of action, Section 1, paragraph, "And whoever shalt violate this will get one awful pain in his gut. Period!" You know? Real proclamation. All right, the auditor says, "Well, all right. Now, what is your name? ... Oh, that's all right. I'm sorry. I uh – I don't need it on this form." Dirty needle, see?

The meter measures energy manifestations taking place in the pc's bank. Of course, we know the bank is something the pc is making all by himself, unassisted, but this is not a popular theory with somebody who is being subjected to very heavy psychosomatic illnesses.

You say, "Well, you're doing it all yourself," and you're liable then to have violated many more things than a cycle of action. [laughter]

His awareness, then, is not up to the point of recognition of the reality of things. In other words, you've given him eight thousand gallons of reality, and you've given him one erg of attention with which to perceive it. And I'm afraid they would have to be comparable. You'd have to have eight thousand units of reality, and you'd have to have eight thousand units of freed attention to perceive it with. Do you see? It's got to be comparable.

So you can't come along – it's a – the reverse, by the way, is true, just speaking in that line. You give somebody a hundred thousand units of attention, and you give him a thousandth of a unit of reality and he's liable to consider it unimportant. You process somebody up high enough and you say, "Now let's take this conflict between Russia and the United States, you know," and he'd say, "Yeah, well, what about it?"

"Well, it's a terrible problem."

"Well, who-huh?"

You have sort of taken him by storm, you see? You have said something is an enormous reality, but he has an enormous attention factor to put on it, don't you see? And he can't see it as an enormous reality. He can very easily be persuaded to discount its importance and think it is very unimportant. You got the idea? So you could actually get the reverse.

But when you get the amount of attention available and the amount of thing to be perceived comparable, why, then it is perceivable. But when you tip this thing wrongly, either way – well, this fellow can understand everything there is in the whole world of science and some little kid comes up to him and asks him why he can't tie a string to the end of the kite or something like this. This fellow's brains go really creak trying to get down to this point, you see, where he can explain to the kid something about this kite, you know? And he's liable to become very esoteric about it before he gets through, and he's liable to miss it completely. In other words, he's got too much freed attention on the subject in order to regard or concentrate it. You see, so this thing can be in reverse.

But when you take the pc who has one-thousandth of an erg of attention and he's being overwhelmed by a hundred billion cubits to the hundred billionth power of reality, he's got no attention to confront it with, and you violate this one little thing that you can violate. See, there aren't a lot of things you can violate. There's this one little thing you can violate: violate this cycle of action. Bang! There it is, right straight on your meter.

Now, there are fantastic numbers of things, then, that you could violate that wouldn't express itself on the meter. It would just be beyond his level of reality. You wouldn't get those expressed. But cycle of action – if you ask a question, he's supposed to answer the question and you're supposed to acknowledge the question – is a built-in mechanism that is so solid it's like putting the engine in a Rolls-Royce, you know? It's just built-in. Instant response.

You say, "What is your name? Oh, I don't need your name," – dirty needle. Do you follow this? Well, there it is in its most elementary and stupid form, see? I could make an appeal to some auditors who get dirty needles rather regularly to take it in its most elementary and stupid form and perceive it: that it is simply that they're causing a dirty needle by not following out a cycle of action. They don't even have to worry about why there's a cycle of action. If they just followed that out, they wouldn't have a dirty needle.

Let's take the next cycle of action. Next cycle of action: a process. I'm just giving you broad categories here. Let's take a process. By the way, we've been very successful – I've been very successful in teaching people this. I shouldn't be snarling about it at all because it isn't a point of loss as far as I'm concerned. As soon as I properly defined a cycle of action as something that began and continued and ended, that elementarily and so forth, people – people have been doing much, much better with it. And they're not now assigning all kinds of wild reasons to why their pc is misbehaving on a meter. But maybe this lecture will give you a little broader insight into it.

Now, the process cycle of action is not expressed on the needle. It is expressed on the tone arm. The tone arm is what is being expressed – expressing here. Your tone arm starts to move on a given subject: pigs. "Pigs?" Tone arm moves. "All right, what about pigs? Pigs?" "Pigs, they grunt." Tone arm moves. "Pigs?" "They are in sties." Tone arm moves. "Pigs?" "Farmers raise them." "Pigs?" "I don't like pork." "Pigs?" "Hey, what do you know, I was once Jewish. Hey, yeah, pigs. Yeah, what do you know!" No more tone arm action.

Well now, please plot exactly what happened here, because there is a nice example. The guy gets back and he sorts out, you'd think at first glance, cause. No, he just puts himself at cause over pigs. He eventually moves up so he's got a cause on the subject of pigs, and he's not involved with pigs, and pigs are not overwhelming him and his tone arm action ceases. No more tone arm action. Well, you've started, continued and ended a cycle of action on the subject of pigs. That's the lot.

And when you get down to looking this thing over, you find out that any subject addressed has to be continued in its address to a point where the pc's on top of it. And at that moment, the tone arm will cease to move.

Now, if the pc can get on top of it at all, the tone will move. If slightly, it will move. Well, we've got the parity here. We've got the subject which has overwhelmed the pc and we've got the pc with enough attention to regard this subject – enough attention to regard the subject potentially. That's how – that's what you mean when you say, "I audited him over his head." In other words, he never under God's green earth could have gotten on top of this subject, and it wouldn't have given tone arm action either, see?

But it just so happens that if he's potentially got, at any given instant, enough attention or power of choice or self-determinism – whatever you want to call it – to get up on top of this subject with some processing, he will climb as long as the TA is in motion and will cease to climb the moment he has become free of it. And that is expressed on the tone arm. That's your tone arm talking.

I'll go over that again. If it's real to him at all, it will register on the tone arm. Even if slightly, it will still register on the tone arm. We're not really interested in processing things that only register on the needle. A pc has a tendency to become overwhelmed, because you very often have too slight a needle action. A Mark V is too powerful... well, actually, a needle – a needle action on the old-time Mathison was a tone arm action on the Mark V, don't you see? You'd already – the pc had to be hit with a truck to get this – the needle to move, don't you see?

It's not true, so it's – what's changed here is not your viewpoint or understanding of the subject. What's changed here is the quality of the meter you're using. And the Mark V and its equivalents, such as the Azimuth meter and so forth, give you a very, very fine point here. And if you start just following its needle, you find – will find yourself misgauging what the pc can get on top of because it will read things that he couldn't quite get on top of, don't you see? So you follow the tone arm. You don't follow the needle. The only precaution you want to take is follow the tone arm. You assess by tone arm.

You go down a long list of things to audit on this pc. You're checking off parts of his life or something like this, you want to look for one that moves that tone arm. Even if it's – only moves it 0.1, you want something that moved that tone arm while you were busy keeping your needle at Set, see? You wanted a motion there. Now, if you got that motion, the rule follows that the pc has potentially got enough attention to get on top of that overwhelm.

You have found something that is overwhelming the pc, and you have found that he potentially can get on top of it. He isn't on top of it, but he potentially can. In other words, you've found a wall that he can walk up. See, you're not – you're not sending him up the side of the Empire State Building with slippery leather shoes, see? You're giving him something he can climb. Therefore, he will process to wins, providing you don't leave him in a state of half-overwhelm with regard to this thing! Because if you leave him in a state of half-overwhelm in regard to this thing, it's got him half-overwhelmed.

You've only dug him half out, and then you go find a new subject and you dig him half out of this new subject! And then you go find a new subject and dig him half out of this subject, you've got three half-overwhelms multiplied, and they make a total overwhelmed pc. You see this?

Now, your cycle of action there is simply, basically expressed by – when you start to get the pc on top of something get him on top of it. And he will object seriously to not being brought on top of it. We're not interested in whether he objects or not at this particular moment, we're merely interested in the meter responses, and what is the meter response. Eventually, it will be a frozen meter. That meter will be frozen.

In other words, you found some subject he could have gotten on top of and you just raised him up to a point where he was still overwhelmed – you didn't flatten your tone arm

action, in other words – and then you found another subject that he got half on top of. He's still overwhelmed by that one. Now you go find another subject that he could get – and get him half on top of that one where he's still overwhelmed. You've got three overwhelms, and three overwhelms don't make a right pc, man. You never bring him out to where he can say, "Hey, there's rust on the third bar," see? That's all you're trying to do. And at the moment when he says, "There's rust on the third bar," the high probability is you've lost your tone arm action at that point.

There is a limit to which you can carry a tone arm cycle beyond its point of flatness. Here's this very vivid – that if it took you ten minutes to flatten the tone arm action out of something and you then went for two hours to see if it were flat, something is liable to become impatient around here or upset. You see? Because you've misestimated the length of time of this tone arm action.

Now, that isn't the direction that people err, however, but I'm just putting it in as a fact in passing. The direction where the error takes place is it takes them an hour to get some good tone arm action on this subject and then they drop it. *Yaaaow!*

They got it in plain view where it was in good and properly and horribly and meanly and viciously overwhelming the pc, see. Where he had it in full view, you know. You sort of got him as if you had a stroboscopic picture of the thing, you know: The tiger is halfway through the air, you see, and he's standing there wondering whether he's going to be able to grapple with the tiger or not, you see. We're just at this point of parity – who's going to win...?

Let's run another process. Let's leave another tiger jumped half through the air, see? You can only do a few of these and you'll run out of chips because you're going up against the cycle of action of the bank as well as the self-determinism of the pc. Pc's trying to win on this one and so forth – you're going up against that. But you're basically – what's causing – what makes the arm lock up, which is what we're interested in, is because you're going up against the cycle of action of the bank. In other words, you've violated the cycle of action of the bank.

An action was begun and it was not complete and he is hung in the middle of the action and that locks up the TA. And you can go down a line of auditors and just spot where this has happened, where it's happened, where it's happened, where it's happened. And some of those auditors will tell you that nothing is happening in the session. They will also tell you that nothing has happened with the pc. Ha! Ha! Ha! Well, if you're unlucky, it happened with his last auditor, and the auditor's reports were fragmentary and illegible; if you're unlucky. Could get pretty grim, in other words.

Now, the trick here is to find out when the tone arm action ceases. The trick is not even really to find out something that will move the tone arm. People bang their brains out over this: "How do we find something that moves the tone arm?" You had better find what has moved the tone arm. If you're having to ask yourself this question of, "What has moved the tone arm?" and the tone arm isn't moving and the person has been processed for a while, then you had jolly well better ask yourself the reverse question: "What has moved the tone

arm?" And process out of nothing but the person's folder and auditor's reports. Don't ever start a new action on this pc.

I don't care if the tone arm action that you're flattening was noted in 1958, man, flatten it! Whatever it is that you can find that ever moved the tone arm, flatten it. And just keep this up and you'll move him out of all these unfinished cycles of action and the bank will unjam. It's as elementary as that. Every new action that you start without completing these old actions in auditing is liable to produce a greater jam. Your job – your job is very simple to this degree, but you ask yourself very often the wrong question when you face a pc on whom you're trying to get tone arm action.

You ask yourself, "What will get tone arm action on this pc?" and you respond accordingly. And you'd love some tests of some kind or another, you'd like some of this, you'd love assessments, you'd like a new process or so on. You're at the wrong end of the business. That's the simple one, that's the simple one. You can take anybody off the street and have them sit down and pick up the meter electrodes and talk, just let them talk for a few minutes, and you're going to get tone arm action of some kind or another. This would be a very peculiar human being that you didn't note some tone arm action. "*Rattledy-rov, goff-goff, woof-woof, val-vlaow blaow-blaow-blaow,*" somewhere along the line they're going to get tone arm action. You make a note of it: That's a subject you process. The trouble with it is it doesn't look – make you look very professional and it doesn't seem to be very adroit. It's not adroit. Is a car in motion, is it stopped? I mean it's just about as much judgment involved in it as that. The guy goes, "*Rattledy-bang rattledy-bang.*" Somebody says, "Well, I really don't like to have to go down to processing a person on itsa. I really wouldn't know how to... how to untangle some – some pc without just plain itsa. I wouldn't ask them any auditing questions. I don't know how to ask them any auditing questions. I haven't got anything to ask them."

Well, I'm not going to make the mistake of saying I know all about this pc. Even when I have a sixth sense along this line, I'm not still going to make that mistake. I'm going to make the pc hand me the first thing that is real to the pc. Because I can see a lot more wrong with the pc than the pc can see wrong with himself, man. Don't ever downgrade your observation. Pick it up. Say this is very interesting, that fellow's got a gobbledygookitis. He's got his rhombolis on backwards. Don't – don't – don't downgrade your ability to look. But you don't know which of those things is real to the pc. And what will tell you, what will tell you – all these things are perfectly true – but what will tell you is that tone arm, very nicely.

And how does it tell you? Well, it tells you with just plain itsa, and that's all the test you need. That's all the test you need. This – I'm talking about just casual practice of running pcs. And he says, "*Rattle-rattle bong-bong yowp-yowp-yowp-yowp-yowp,*" or something like that, and – or he says, "Well, I never do like to talk to people. I'm very sorry, and I've always been this way. I've just never liked to talk to anybody and so forth." Well, he's running a – he's running an out of communication process, and we mustn't let him go along very long that way because that's out of agreement and that's going to run him wrong way to after a while. And we can let it go along long enough to find something to dive in on. But then we dive, see? "Well, what part of your grandmother were you in favor of?" you know, you'll find very often will produce far more tone arm action than he has been getting on parts of his grandmother that he wasn't in favor of, you see?

There are all kinds of stunts along this line. You process in the direction of ARC, of course. You don't preconceive that you know all about the case before it's opened its yeep. And you let the – you take the easy course. See, you don't work at it so hard. What you get tone arm action on, flatten!

Well, how about unwillingness to flatten it? Ah well, I already – you've already have seen pcs recover on 8-C when they were being dragged across rooms and their fists planted against walls. In other words, this cycle of action is the only zone or area where you can overwhelm, to any degree, the preclear's power of choice. You mustn't overwhelm his power of choice in any other zone or area. See, don't evaluate for him. Don't do these other things to overwhelm his power of choice, but finish that cycle of action, brother, over your dead body does it end, you know.

When he comes into session the next day, "Well, that's – that – process we were running yesterday..." – we were getting tone arm action. It was traveling all over the dial, see – "process we were running yesterday, I don't know, I mean I had a headache and I had a headache all night and I didn't feel so good last night and I don't really think we ought to finish that process."

"All right. Good. Well, I'm sorry you felt that way and so forth. Say you felt bad and so forth. Now, exactly what agreement you had about your grandmother did we take up yesterday that made you feel that way?"

See, you don't have to finish the cycle of action with an ax. You can be pretty smooth about the whole thing. And you go right on and you run that [begins to speak very silent and slow] until we've got the tone arm down here and it is 2.75 still and the needle starts to tighten a little bit and we say, "Good. Well, that cognition you had a little while ago made you feel a lot better, didn't it?"

"Yes, as a matter of fact it did."

We end the tone arm cycle of action, you see, five minutes before we finish the test. See, we spotted where it ended. Not where we stopped processing. See, there's a lot of little tricks involved in this sort of thing. Makes you – but they're just the tricks of a slippery auditor, see. It's how do you fit things into this cycle of action.

You goofed. You've been going all morning long and that tone arm hasn't moved a bit and that process is so flat, and you say, "You know this thing is not going to pick up any further. It hasn't got any more kick left in it. It's dead. And I've processed him all this time and so forth." I would not be beyond, "that process which we finished yesterday afternoon," I would not be beyond saying that, see? I'd say, "Well, I'm sorry we've been plugging away at this this morning here because apparently we finished that yesterday afternoon."

"Oh, we did? Oh, as a matter of fact, I had a feeling that we did! Oh, yeah! Yeah! And *rah-ruh, mmmm, mmmm, yeah.*" [laughter] He finished the cycle of action when it finished, with perfect truth. And your tone arm suddenly loosens up, and the pc's willing to talk about something else, see?

All right. Now there's the meter manifestation of a flat TA, and that's what the thing is registering and that's what the thing is supposed to do and that's where it's supposed to go

and that's how you can handle it. Don't run things that don't give you TA. But if they're not giving you TA, then something must have been run that gave TA. What was it? "Oh, well, we don't have his auditor's reports because this is our first or second session in life." Well, something gave TA. Life does not keep good auditor's reports. I'd say he was in – had been in some other practice that gave him TA. Not some esoteric zone of livingness, see, I'd say it was some other practice. I'd say it was right in here along the line of Scientology, see? See, we're culminating a long line of practices. There are plenty around, man.

Right away I'd be asking – I couldn't – couldn't get any TA motion off of this character, he could it's like crazy and I didn't get any TA motion, there was no action. There was no action on this pc. I'd say, "What the hell, what the – excuse my French, but where we go from here? What's this, what's what?" I wouldn't be asking for a brand-new wonderful process. I'd be asking this other question.

If I don't get TA action on the pc, I don't ask what *will* get TA action on the pc, I ask what has gotten TA action on the pc. And I assume immediately that it is some analogous practice; some similar practice. Right away I start watching that needle, now – and this is where you use a meter manifestation – I start watching that needle like a hawk. Maybe I'm not going to get TA, but that needle's going to give me a clue, man. I'll crank that sensitivity right on up here, 128 and so forth, and sit right on top of this thing keeping it very nicely centered and watch it like a hawk. All right. "Now what other zones of mental practice have you been near, so on and so on. Have you ever been psychoanalyzed? You ever been to a psychiatrist? Have you ever been to a psychologist? Did you ever study graphology? You ever been in the field of phrenology? Have you ever had your horoscope read, so forth?" Clink! Horoscope. All right, all right, all right. Now we found out what gave TA action. It's a process unflat in horoscopy.

You see the rationale with which you can go, and by golly, you know, you can untangle more cases in less time if you're slippy this way than you can shake a stick at. You don't have to go upstairs and fly ten thousand feet up flat on your back in some wild pose. All you have to do is – if you don't get TA action on the pc, then all you have to do is find out what gave him TA action that wasn't completed.

You can trace that back ordinarily in his auditor reports because there's been some sort of a low-level goof, and that's your, usually, your standard action. Just go back through those auditor's reports. Choose objective-type processes as the first choice. When you've got – when you've got thirty processes that produced TA action, none of which were flat, all of which were left with lots of TA action on them, then you have to make some sort of a choice amongst all this mess as to where you pick up the threads of this case. Because it isn't necessarily the first one that will respond again, although that is the best possibility, but it isn't necessarily true.

So if you've got to make a power of choice and be right on the button every time such as in case advising – different than auditing. You're auditing, you're advising – there's a slightly different way to do it. If you were auditing, you'd simply pick up the first one and search it out and see if you could still get TA action on the first one that produced TA action,

see? But if you're advising some auditor to do this, you don't have then the continuing assessment of what you're doing.

See, there's a lot – there's a big difference between sitting there in the driver's seat as the auditor, see, and banging away and – well, you could shift gears very rapidly. You find out that is a blind alley, man, you know? So therefore you can cut a little bit closer to the edge of the road, you see? In other words, you can say, "Well now, look at there. That first process, that seems very unlikely, you see, that that would produce TA action because that process is six or seven years ago. Very unlikely. Well, let's take a – let's take a three-minute flier at it, see?" Which, because you've got the pc on the other end of the meter, you can say, "Well, how about this 'boiling eggs producing a headache?'" This meter doesn't do a thing, you see? Then you can say, "Well, I'm sorry I brought it up." See? You can go on to your next process, see?

But when you're advising auditors or advising cases and so forth, you can't do that. You have the disadvantage of the pc – you got no pc in front of you, you see? You've just got a folder or something like that, and you got the auditor's advice. So what you have to do then is play it surer. See? You play it more positively. You play it on a sure bet. You don't take a chance, in other words. You play it certain.

And you can be absolutely certain that any unfinished Objective Process which gave tone arm action will reproduce tone arm action if flattened. In other words, the Objective Process is the one that's most likely to have stuck the guy in tone arm action because it's right here in the physical universe, isn't it? And it's closest to the sixth dynamic. So therefore, tone arm actions not flattened on Objective Processes are the most likely to have been hung up, and therefore the most likely to complete their cycle of tone arm action if resumed.

Subjective processes are the least likely. In other words, you had a subjective process: "How about your father's screaming at you?" Or "From where could you scream at your father?" or something. You're playing a bet there that is just a little bit wider bet, see? You can't at all be sure that some other process didn't move in sideways on this one and knock it appetite over tin cup, see? Maybe it got covered in some other terminal run that was run the following year, see? And just in passing the pc cognited on it, and there it went as an earlier process and maybe that cycle of action finished in some other fashion or way, don't you see? Could've. So you're not quite so sure.

When you're – so when you're advising cases and so forth, you take the surer bets. You never play a doubtful one. You always give it the business, you know? You don't – you don't hand them a rifle and say, "Well, I hope this works." You don't play it that way. You handle them a mortar that any fool could handle, see? And you say, "You drop the cartridge in the barrel here, you know, and it fires." And you're – you know that mortar will fire, see?

In other words, you've got some guy who's having an awful time. You've got some auditor who's having an awful time with him, you say, "Well, run 8-C and make sure that you continue to finish every cycle of action which you begin on the pc as a command." Well, you know that's going to produce something. In other words, you just run your heavy, sure bets all the time, you know. You never – you never do any fringe effects over here. See? It's always brute certainty that you have to go on, and an auditor that will do that, and so forth, gets very

soon an enviable reputation as an adviser of auditors. Of course, all he's really doing is advising the certainties and if those auditors are left to their own devices they might get themselves into trouble or out of trouble by handling a lot of fringe stuff. But they – somebody might delicately wander his way through something, you see, that he could never have been advised through, don't you see? So when you're advising auditors to do something, always tell them exactly what's right down the middle of the highway.

Never dream up some little process which goes *wiffawackle* and you *woffawockle*, see? Your best bet in doing that is just to take the pc's folder and find somewhere in it an unfinished cycle of action and tell the auditor to complete it.

And if you're dealing with very new auditors and so forth, always remember when they come back and tell you – as they almost inevitably will that it didn't work, that they didn't do it. That's a little maxim that goes along with this which is quite interesting to know and it saves any auditor advising auditors from a broken heart more times than you could count. And the way you pull that trick is you say, "Well, exactly what did you do?"

"Well, I did just like you said."

"All right. Good. What did I say and what did you do?"

"Oh, uh – I don't know. What did you say?"

Very embarrassing moment for the guy. You see – he just [laughs] – he doesn't remember what you said, yet it didn't work. That's hard, bitter experience talking, you see? Never let yourself be boxed around into thinking that your advice is no good. Find out if it was taken. Make sure in the first place that the advice you give is very sound advice. And your best gag on any old cases around is to haul out any old fragment of a folder they've got anyplace from anywhere and find some unflat tone arm action and have that exact tone arm action flattened. That's your best advice.

Now that's, therefore, meter manifestations. Now, those are meter manifestations for Level IV. Now I'm going to give you meter manifestations additional for Level VI and how they compare at Level VI, because they are different.

You are accustomed to tone arm action requiring quite a little time to flatten. They require some time to flatten. Let's say the tone arm action on some process required two sessions to flatten, three sessions to flatten, something like this, you see. You get accustomed to that at Level IV auditing and below. You don't realize at first with Level VI that you're looking at the exact same manifestation happening in the space of ten to fifteen seconds. You're flattening the tone arm action on an item. More broadly, you flatten all the tone arm action on a GPM.

Now, when you've finished an item, there isn't anything else there because that was the basic woof and warp of what was giving all the commotion anyhow, and you can flatten an item in ten or fifteen seconds. And that's all the tone arm action there is. And there isn't any more tone arm action to be had. That's it!

Now, you actually don't even really see all the tone arm action that happens on that. In the first place, it couldn't register on the tone arm or the needle. It's blowing out there in

space. It isn't necessarily blowing up against the pc. I mean, you can thank your stars that it isn't blowing up against the pc. I see these Level VI co-auditors getting – have seen the elephant, from that laugh. But it flattens quick. And that's all the tone arm action there is there. And you spend any more time monkeying with that, and do you know, you're getting tone arm from elsewhere. Now possibly you hadn't recognized it, all of you, that you're getting tone arm action from the next bank or the next item, or you're getting tone arm action from someplace else.

And you sit there and let that pc cognite on endlessly, and *yap-yap-yap*, and finish, *ah-wah-wah-wah-wah-wah-wah*. All of a sudden you're going to get a higher and higher TA and it's going to get stickier and stickier and you're going to wonder what you're doing. Well, you finished the cycle of action, but then you started to drag in charge from something else. That's carrying that cycle of action beyond the point where it can be carried. And I warn you that it is very, very brief – ten to fifteen seconds. It can go up to a minute, but that's unlikely. That's very unlikely. For instance, I see all the tone arm action I could possibly see go out of an item – I mean, it just goes. I don't know, I say fifteen seconds – I'm being very generous. Very generous. I'm allowing for slow freight. It's gone!

Well, now, it's just as though as you came in the front door with a dirty needle and, you see, you go out the back door with a dirty needle. In other words, it's the first manifestation observed in below Level IV auditing, but it happens to be the last manifestation observed at Level VI auditing. Because you overflatten TA action and it is not present, you get an exaggeration of the dirty needle called a tocky needle – a new one on you – and this crazy, tocky needle. A pc in the bank is so sensitive to invalidation that it will turn on a crazy, sharp-edged tickety-tock that it looks – looks like a small rock slam. Not a real dirty needle, but it looks like a small rock slam. And that's sort of the Level VI dirty needle, see? Call it a tocky needle.

And you try to take more tone arm action out of an item or out of a bank than is there, or you try to find something wrong in the bank that isn't wrong, and you'll see this great big, dirty needle. Now, it's expressing *tone arm action completed*. The dirty needle expresses *tone arm action prevented from completion*. You got the difference? But this is not saying that. This is saying, "Hey, you idiot. The tone arm action is *all* finished in this area. How come you're still hanging around, bud?"

And it's just marvelous that the needle will tell you that on a meter. It's just marvelous that it will tell you that, but it will. It's just like a neon sign. It's a nice, great big reaction. It's not a little dinky reaction like a dirty needle because, of course, you're dealing with somebody whose bank is freeing up and who is much freer and in better case condition. And it's a great big exaggerated action.

Now, you can drive that needle and the longer you go the more it will tockety-bock. And you can finally drive it to a stuck needle, stuck TA. Takes quite a little while to do so – you have to be quite a genius at it, you know. But it will tickety-tock and bop and bap and tock-tock, and it's just having a ball. And you say, "I wonder what all this commotion is about?" You'd better ask this pertinent question, "Am I invalidating the correct lineup?" *Hoooooh!* Smooth, see? Just like that. Going *tock-tock bock-bock bagh-bich-bach, bich, bich,*

bah, bah, bah, gug, bah, baow, baow. "Well, all right. Are there any items – any items I've left charged behind me? Did that bank – did that bank – was that really flat? Did it really join in at this point?" *Tick-tock tock, tock, bahg-bahg-bahg bigh-bagh-bagh bigh-bahg-bahg-buh bahg-bahg-bahg* – what the hell is going on here, you know? *Whoa-whoa, whoa-whoa-whoa.* Betsy! You see? What's going on?

You say, "Am I – am I knocking about a correct lineup?" Smooth. Yeah, well then, "Give me the next item." So that's – that's where you begin the next cycle of action. So if you – when you're dealing with the thing that enforces a cycle of action upon the pc and upon life, it then objects to one being overrun. The only objection you get then is insisting there is more cycle of action than is there. If you've got the cycle of action out of something, it raises hell that you're putting one in, and what it resists is a created cycle of action. You try to create any new cycles of action on this pc that aren't there to be created and, man, it just raises the living billy-o with the bank.

Now remember, you came in the front door, and that's when you failed to complete a cycle of action that was there. Remember this is a totally overwhelmed pc. And that immediately went *bzzzt bzz bzzz bzzz bzzz bzzz* dirty needle *drzzzzzzzzzzzzz*. See? Every time you said – this pc, his bank is now insisting, "There are cycles of action to be completed. At every turn, you must complete your cycle of action." See, we've got everything overwhelmed here with a cycle of action, you know. Okay.

All right. You get up to the other end of the thing. When you're undoing the thing that creates the cycle of action, the only thing that raises the devil is making a new cycle of action or extending the existing cycle of action. And then that just raises the devil with the meter.

And you can see a meter like this – now, I can tell if an item has been left charged without ever asking a question about it. Because the new item called doesn't behave right. It doesn't behave well. The thing doesn't fall right and it just doesn't go. And you say, "Well, we left some 'bring about' wrong. Is it in the first pair? The second pair? The third pair? The third pair reads. That's good." Call the third pair, "Does the one that's there – oppterm bring about the terminal?" *Bzzzzt-bvoop*, falls and so forth. "All right. Let's take up this new item." And now you find it reads right.

You can get very alert to this without doing very much examination. Your items aren't reading, so you must have left something charged. Well, let's rapidly find out what we left charged, get the charge off and get back to what we're doing. All right. Now supposing – that's the best laid plans and that's what you would do, see?

Supposing now, you hadn't left anything charged. I'll give you the other thing, see? Give you the other manifestation, see? You just get a lousy read on something of this sort, and it itself has been suppressed or invalidated or you hung around too long before you said it, and you say – you say, "Oh, have I left an item charged? A little bit of a read on that. Was it the first..." *Tickety-tock, tickety-tock, boodibop-bzzzt-blurrrp-blurrrp-bloop.* "All right. Would you please give me the next item." [laughter] You understand? Handy little jimdandy meter mechanism then. God bless a meter.

Pc will get all kinds – he's always getting the idea that the bank he is running went in between two other banks earlier. He inevitably will get this kind of an idea. Why? Because

the bank he is running is always the last bank in existence. So it, of course, appears to be where the present time bank was once. So therefore appears to be where – you see, where another bank was. Do you follow this? Now, he'll – always liable to get, "Well, I wonder what this is, you know. Huhhh. We're supposed to be down here at this one, and yet actually – and you know I feel like this one should have come between a couple of other banks. Hmmm."

And he comes into session, "You know, I feel..." *tickety-tock bock, bock!* And you say, "No, it – bank – bank was in the correct position. All right. Now give me the next item on the line."

"Oh, was it? So what do you know?"

That's the end of that. You just never saw a meter cool off so fast. Turns into a gorgeous flow.

You've got your BA steps in. You've got everything in. There isn't any charge left on it, you see. You couldn't get it with an electric shock machine, see? So you say, "All right now. Let's check this, and let's make sure this is flat. Now, this thing *wah wah twah twah twah.*" *Tickety-tock bop-bop thud, bing.* That tells you right now that you have overridden the pin. It's no disgrace to have overridden the pin. It's only a disgrace if you see that manifestation, not to unload right where you are because it's invariable: it means that you're invalidating a correct lineup. It means you're taking more charge than is there. It means that you're trying to extend the cycle of action beyond its logical conclusion. And that's all the bank now objects to, at Level VI, is the cycle of action being extended beyond its end.

Now, I don't want to do the same thing with this lecture, so thank you very much.
[laughter, applause]

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

A lecture given on 10 October 1961

What is the date here? The 10th of...?

Audience: Tenth of October.

Tenth of October 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Now, supposing, supposing just for fun, supposing that Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing that was a fact. And supposing this was all perfectly true. And when you got processed, why, all of these problems would resolve, everything would straighten out, and there was no vast difficulty of any kind. And this was the answer. And man hadn't had the answer before, but now we've got the answer. Now supposing all that were absolutely true. Now, just a moment now; supposing that were all true, completely true, and that was totally factual and that was it. Got that?

Now just supposing that were all perfectly true: What would your problem have been before you came into it? What would your problem have been before you came into it? Just before you came into Dianetics and Scientology, what would have been your personal problem in existence? Can you answer that question? Hm-hm. Is this a new look? Have you just suddenly realized something? Hm? Have you? Have you just suddenly realized that there was a problem there immediately before you came into Dianetics and Scientology?

Do you get a somatic at the same time? No?

All right. Now let's sort it out again. Was that really the problem you had? Was that really the problem you had? Has that problem been carrying along since?

Audience: Yes. [amusement in audience]

All right. Now I've just been giving you the approach you should use on a PE. That is the approach you should use on a PE.

Supposing Dianetics and Scientology were everything that they were supposed to be – and you can go on, of course, ad infinitum, and add it all up. And there's one old bulletin I wrote about a year ago, or something like that, that give all of its firsts. What is Scientology? And that gives a tremendous number of firsts that Scientology had – for the first time this, for the first time that. Supposing all this were true? And then you ask the people after you had carried on this way for about a half an hour and described Scientology to them completely,

and give them the broadest possible description of it, then ask them what would their problem be that would make them come to this?

Now, of course, you're old-timers. You've been processed a long time. Most of these things are dead and gone and long buried, but not with a group you'll get on PE. It will take their heads off. And that should be the first lecture given on a PE course. I got that taped. Take it from me. That is a piece of technology, not a piece of propaganda nor administration.

Why? What exactly are you doing? What exactly are you doing? You're giving them a stable datum. You're punching it in. You're making a conditional stable datum. And then if you carried it on that this was a very desirable stable datum, if it were true and if it existed – you keep adding that in – this is a very desirable stable datum, you, of course, have restimulated that basic problem of continued, long-time worry and agony up to a point where it's ready to blow their heads off. And then you ask them, "What was your problem? Why did you come to Scientology? What problem do you have that has driven you to this?"

Now, every other group in the history of man would at once conceal this tremendous mechanism, because it would hold a group together endlessly just because they're pressured in. If they never gave them the answer, if they never had anything out of it, they would be pushed together by the duress. They would be told all the time that this was it, and this was the exact thing, and so forth, and there they were, and it would restimulate that problem if processing or something of that sort was not adequate to relieve it. But we are rich in technology, and we have a little more nerve than that, so you could actually ask them the first crack out of the box.

A lot of them there for the first time, you could ask them just *bang!* "What is the problem that would cause you to accept this? What problem do you have in your personal life that would bring you to us?" Well, of course, you've keyed it in, only they haven't noticed it being keyed in. And when you ask them, of course, the problem is just staring them in the face.

And on a certain percentage of these people, you will produce a fundamental and startling change in case. Just like that! *Bang!* You'll turn on somatics on them in many instances, but they will be happy to have them, because they'll say, "Oh, is that what that is? Oh, is that what this is all about?" And they will have a personal recognition.

Now you can go on and describe to them what processing is, how problems are relieved, that sort of thing, and go ahead just from that point of view.

You could send them into a co-audit or into the HGC. And it would be better, actually, to send them to the HGC than into a co-audit. It's always better, in spite of the fact that they can fool around for a long time in a co-audit – unless you've got a co-audit running that is going to do something about problems. And if we're going to use that kind of an approach, then we had better doctor up the co-audit so it takes care of that exact situation.

We're not dealing with what the co-audit would do about this. We're dealing, actually, with what a Class II Auditor would do about this – a Class II Auditor.

We have a new series of classifications. A Class I Auditor is simply an auditor who runs anything, and that Class I exists for just two purposes. First and foremost, it lets an old-timer, who has a stable datum that a process will work, actually do auditing for you without

training, so as to give him an opportunity to get trained while he audits. That is an administrative problem in HGCs, and is an administrative problem in any clinic or any center. You have that basic administrative problem. You have people around, and instead of training them for nineteen weeks, or something like this, before they do a speck of auditing for you, you give them something on which they have reality and let them go ahead, because they will win with it, and they will get some wins, and it'll be a passable show. And this gives you an opportunity at the same time to train these auditors up to a Class II. And we're talking now about, really, Class II. I've just given you the key question, disguised as a PE question, that will take apart any case, providing you go at it right. And there is a new rundown, which you will see very shortly. It's just like a Preclear Assessment Sheet. And it has two new sections on the end of the Preclear Assessment Sheet.

Now, you know that anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet – anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet. You can sit there and ask these questions and fill out these forms, and you can get the data from the pc and there it is. Do you agree with me that that's a fairly easy thing to do?

Audience: Hm-mm. Yeah.

All right. Now, what if you had a process which added a section on top of that, which asked them simply some more similar questions and got you a list of things; and then you had a new section on top of that which you just filled in as you process the exact processes given in that new section? That would be a very easy thing to handle.

There's your O section, and that asks a certain series of things and asks for a certain series of circumstances, and you get – you just write down this new series of circumstances from the pc, and then when you've got those, you read them off to the pc and notice the needle reaction of the E-Meter for each one. And you take your steepest or most reactive needle reaction. You don't do it by elimination. You just read it off and you say, "Well, it fell off the pin or wobbled more than otherwise."

You just take that one, and then with that datum which you've gotten out of the O section, we move over into the P section. And in that section we take that one datum and we just do this, and then we write down we have done that; and we do this, and we have written down we do that; and then we process this exact process for a while, and then we write down that the tone arm isn't moving anymore on this process; and then we do this, and then we do the next, and we write down each time we've done one of these things and we come down to the end of it.

Now, that is one P section. And the P sections are interchangeable – I mean, they're additional. So we take the same form that we've got now, including the O section, and we do this assessment again down through the O section, and we get the biggest read we get this time. And we move over and do a whole new P section. And we finish that whole new P section, and so forth, we lay that aside, we go back to the O section, and we go down the whole list of the O section, and then we write down what was the steepest reaction now; we take that one and we move over into the P section, and we do it down the same form of the P section. We just keep doing this. That is a Class II action, and that is a very easy one to do.

It includes the rudiments' Problems Process, and it includes a Security Check on the people in the prior confusion.

Now, I'll give you the *modus operandi* by which this is done.

O section simply asks for changes in the person's life. It asks for them specifically: Times their life changed, and it makes a list of each one of these things – whether that life changed because of death or graduation or anything else, we don't care. We just write down this particular point of change.

And now, because the pc has not noticed the most significant points of change – if he has, it's all right, but if he hasn't, it's all right – we've got a series of new questions: "When did you take up a certain diet?" "When did you join a certain religious group?" "When did you decide you had better go back to Church and go back to Church?" You get all this type of question. We fill out a whole bunch of these questions. And they're all what? They're all major change points in a person's life.

Here's the sleeper: Each one of these change points must be eventually taken up in the P section, because the P section asks, after the assessment is done, for the problem which they had immediately before the change – and you knock their heads off. That is the prior problem combined with the prior confusion. And the two things are deadly.

You find each time they had a problem just before that change, and that the change was a solution to the problem. And therefore, the problem has been hung up ever since because they solved it. That is the sleeper. And of course, just before that problem, there was a hell of a confusion. So you're going to take up the problem. Now let's see how this would be done. O section – we ask them this long list of changes. It's just very simple. It's "When did your life change?" you see?

And well, they say, "Well, life changed pretty much after I got out of that prep school."

"Good. Prep school. When was that?"

"Well, I guess that was in uh... oh, well, that was in 1942 – no, that was in 1932. No, that was in 1952. Uh... that was in um... it's sometime in the past."

Well, you don't ask the auditor to date it particularly. All you want is an approximate date. That's why I'm giving you this lecture, is to give you the gen on how to run one of these forms, and I'll tell you why in a minute.

The date can be very, very approximate. It can be ten years ago or anything. We don't care, see? And we'll say, "All right. When was another change in your life?"

"Well, when my mother uh... ran off with the iceman. That... that was a big change in my life." Or whatever it was, see?

Well, so we write down, you know, Mother ran off with the iceman. "About when was that?"

"Well, I guess that must have been about, uh... fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty – I don't know. Twenty-five, six, eight, fifteen. No, I was a small child at the time. Uh... no, I was a

small child at the time, and I'm so-and-so now, and so on. And I must have been about... I was either five or fifteen or something like that."

Because all of these things, you're asking for stuff that is floating on the time track, so you don't care about the accurate date. You just get him to make a statement on it. You just get him to make a statement. You put down, well, it was twenty years ago, something like that, see?

And you keep getting these changes. Now, these other changes have missed him usually, but every time he took up a diet, a fad, changed his clothes, all of a sudden changed his methods of living in some fashion, you get all those as changes in his life, too. And you actually will have, by the time you finish an O section, most of the changes in the life. Now, of course, it's going to occur, later on he's going to remember new changes in his life. And it's a moot question whether you bother to add those onto the O section of this particular questionnaire or not. We don't care whether you add these new changes on or not. You'll wind up with a lot of changes, and they'll be the most significant changes in the fellow's life, and you'll hit it.

This, you see, is not a very precision activity, is it? You got to ask questions and you got to get the answers to the questions. The truth of the matter is, no pc is going to kick the bucket because you miss.

In other words, this is a very safe activity. So this is a safe activity, and that would be a very happy day for the Director of Processing in any organization, to have a safe activity.

See, that compares tremendously different than Routine 3. Routine 3 is not a safe activity at all. You get the wrong goal and the wrong terminal, and you run it and you've had it. Oh, you can patch the case up and hang it back together again with sticky plaster, but this is a very precision activity, Routine 3. Well, we're talking about Routine 2, so we've got an imprecise activity. What I have discovered, actually, just as a side comment here, is an imprecise activity that will change the living daylights out of a case and not exaggerating now. You run this and you'll see. And it can be done rather imprecisely, and it can be done rather skimpily, and they can forget to flatten things, and they can do other goofs, and they can have the rudiments out, and other things can happen, you see, and they're still going to get results. So that's a good thing to have around, isn't it?

All right. You see, you've defeated me down here. [laughter]

Now, anyway, here's... this long list of changes. Now just reading off these changes: "All right. Your mother ran away with the iceman, and so forth. And later on... and you joined the Holy Rollers of God Help us, and..." this and that. And you just read each one of these changes you've written down. And you've written it down in his language and he can spot it. That's the thing. It's just a communication that he can spot. And you read your needle reaction; you put your needle reaction down. But you're doing the P section, you see, by the time you do this.

And you get the needle reaction. And then it's number so. And you'll find all these changes are all numbered over here. It's easy. So it's number so-and-so. And you write that

down in the P section, and you put a descriptive note on it if you want to, to make it very plain. And now we spring the big question.

And it's written right there in the P section on about the third line, something like that. And it says, "Now say to the pc, 'What problem did you have immediately before that change?'" Now, you think I'm being sarcastic, but I am not being sarcastic. I'm showing you that this is an easy one to get across. And I'm trying to ease your mind, because you will be administering people doing this one, you see? And I'm trying to give you an easy mind on doing it.

And they're going to have worries. And I'm just telling you, now don't have these worries. I'll tell you the only – about the only two things they can do wrong in the test. We will take those things up, and they're rather minor.

All right. So we say now, "What was your problem?" And we get him to state the problem. Now, this is the first thing that can go wrong, is that he states a fact and the auditor writes it down as a problem. He's got to state a problem, so you've got to keep him stating it if he persists in stating facts instead of problems.

Now, the difference between a fact and a problem is simply this: A problem has how or what or which. It has a question, it has a mystery connected with it. It is not a *fait accompli*. A *fait accompli*, a fact, is this: "My head hurt." See, that's not a problem; it's a fact.

So you ask now... you ask that change, and you say, "What problem did you have immediately before this?"

And he says, "My head hurt."

"Good." You say, "All right. Now how would that... how would you state that as a problem?"

And he says, "Well, my head hurt pretty bad."

And you say, "Well, did you have a problem about it?" You see?

And he said, "Well, also my head uh... sometimes didn't hurt."

And you say, "Yes, well, good. But did you have a problem around this?" And it finally drives home to him that you're asking for a problem.

And he says, "Well, yes. Sometimes it hurt and sometimes it... oh, well, a problem. Yes. Well, it's 'when my head was going to hurt.' Yeah."

And you actually have to work at this point until you get the person to state the problem – as a problem, not as a fact. And you're going to find some auditors that are under training in Class II that will have a rough time doing this, because you'll get the slips back and they will be saying on them "My head hurt." What is the problem? And then the fellow has run an hour and a half of processing on this fact, you see? And he couldn't fit it in, because it isn't... so on. And it's very all... very complicated. And he couldn't run the right process. He didn't do anybody any harm, but he didn't get very far either. You want a problem, not a fact.

All right. Now having gotten that, it says right on the next line that what you ask is simply your problem process. It gives you the wording of the rudiment for problems. Of

course, you're running what? You're running a present time problem of long duration. Naturally, you're into it with a crash.

Now, your next point is that you're just going to run that till the tone arm quiets down. Now, that doesn't say how long. Supposing they leave it unflat. Oh, it doesn't matter. It'd be nice to get a nice, neat, workmanlike job done on it, where "unknown" was run against the problem until the tone arm no longer moved for twenty minutes. That would be nice, but it is not vital.

Now, it ceases to be vital after the somatic that turns up with it has disappeared. It ceases to be vital. But if a person just backed off of it while the somatic was in high gear, there possibly might be a little repercussion.

When we first gave, oh, I don't know, let's see... "Is this a withhold from Scientologists or is it an overt to say so?" You know, you come against that all the time. Would it be an overt to say it, or is it a withhold if you don't?

We gave Mike Pernetta the gen on how you flattened a level, and we said you ran it until the tone arm didn't move, you see? He got the tone arm into motion and then left it. And that was his interpretation of it, and he did that on three consecutive levels on a pc I'm looking at right this minute. I had his head and dried his ears, but it didn't do any good. This is what he had done.

So you see, that can be badly interpreted even by a relatively good auditor. That tone arm motion, on just an old point like that, you know, everybody knows "Well, you run it till the motion goes out of the tone arm and it finished," and so forth. And you'll get somebody that'll turn it square around and say, "Oh, you get the tone arm so it's moving, and then you knock it off."

I know this sounds utter idiocy, but I'm telling you something that has happened. So you have to do a little police work on that point. And that is the other point you have to be a little bit shy about. Just make sure that the problem gets flattened, the tone arm motion disappears, on that rudiment command.

Now, you're not running that rudiment against the needle, as you ordinarily would, because this has directed us to do what: This has found for us the present time problem of long duration which will produce hidden standards. And I've just shortcut the route into hidden standards here with a large, wide knife. So it's a present time problem of long duration that you're running, so therefore you'd better run it by the tone arm.

So you run the tone arm motion out of that. Now how long is that going to take? Well, at a conservative estimate, I would say that it was two to five hours of auditing. I would say it was something on that order, two to five hours of auditing.

Now you say, "Well, what happens to Model Session while you're doing all this?" and so forth. Well, we assume that some kind of a session was set up at the time they started the assessment. We assume this, and we assume that the next day that they start auditing, that they're going to do a Model Session and move into it. But what if they hit a present time problem?

Well, you're running a present time problem, so you are running a rudiment. So a nice, precise job of auditing would include running the pc on this particular rundown with Model Session in full play. Yes, that would be a nice, neat job of auditing. But let me tell you something. It doesn't much matter if the whole rudiments and Model Session are omitted. That's a nice, sloppy process, isn't it? [laughter] I designed a real sloppy one here. That's real good. You can make lots of mistakes with it.

All right. Now what happens when he's got the tone arm motion off of this problem? Now, he asks, it says right there, the sixty-dollar question: "What was the confusion in your life immediately before that?" "What confusion was in your life?" And it does an assessment of the people in the confusion. You write down then all the names of the people connected with the confusion in his life, see? And the idea of listing and asking for another person in the confusion of the life will keep putting the person back into the confusion, and stop him skidding forward, and you will wind up with a list of personnel. And now you security check this personnel.

Now this, of course, perhaps could require a little bit of acumen and alertness, because you've got to sort of make up a Security Check. But at the same time, there are other Security Checks, and so on, and there will exist a Security Check that matches up to almost any person, you see? You know, the idea "What have you done to him?" and "What have you withheld from him?" is about all it is.

Now you could put in at this point – run overt-withhold on that person and get some result out of the thing. You actually could do just that. You could run O/W rather than security check, but it is much slower, and it doesn't get you anywhere near as far as it should, and it is running against a terminal for which they have not been assessed. And so it has a point of danger to it. It is better to security check the terminals. Now, that question is going to come up, and you're going to be asked why you just don't run O/W on each one of these terminals. Well, it's because you're using a terminal process on a terminal that has not been assessed on the goals line. And if the terminal is not on the goals line, it can beef up the case. The only thing you can do is security check it. That won't beef up the case, and all you want to get off are the withholds, and you don't want the overts at all. Simple, huh?

All right. This is the kind of a list you've got: "Now, what was the confusion immediately before that?"

"Oh, my God, I'd forgotten all about it, but there was an automobile accident, and this and that happened, and so forth. And uh... my father was very upset, and there was a terrible confusion. And uh... uh... actually, I had to pay for the car and I borrowed some money from my uncle George, and then they all... oh, that's just terrible."

You say, "All right. That's fine. That's the confusion area. Now, who did you say, now – your father?" and you write that down, you see? The people in the confusion – it provides a long list there for the people in the confusion. You write down, "Well, the people in the car. These were so-and-so and so-and-so. And there's your father. And this was so-and-so and so-and-so. And this was... and your mother was part of this, and your sister and..."

"Oh, yes," he says, "and my... my... my boss. He was part of this, too. Yeah." So you write down boss, you see?

And you just take this list... Now, if you were doing a very workmanlike job, of course, you would assess that list. But again, it isn't important. You could just take them in order of rotation, and you just get the withholds off on each one of these people with this type of question: "What were you withholding from your father at that time?" You see? "Good. Well now, had you done something else that you didn't dare tell your father about?" You see? "What didn't your father find out about that?" You see? "What hasn't your father ever found out about that?" You know, just keep plugging this type thing to get the withholds off.

Now we get the withholds off of Father, and that seems pretty good; and then we get the withholds off of the next person, and that seems pretty good; and we get the withholds off the next people, and that seems pretty good. And it isn't done thoroughly, it doesn't have to be done thoroughly. It's going to resolve the confusion. Why? You got the problem off the top of it already. And you can just take a sort of a lick and a promise at the thing – now, it'd be nice if it were done thoroughly, and it would produce a much better case gain, and all of this, and you would for sure have this thing out of the road if it were well – done well, but you understand that if it were done at all, why, it's successful – you'll have success on every hand just doing it at all, don't you see? So that could be kind of sloppy, too. You try to get them to do it well, but they do it sloppy and they still win. All right. So you go down the end of this list, and that is the end of that P section. And you put that over here, and that is that.

Now you take up the next item assessed off of the O section. Now you assess the major changes in the person's life – you've got a new P section form, see – you assess the major changes in the person's life from the old O section that you had, and you write down the one which you now find produces the biggest needle action. And you go through the same routine on it: Find out the problem that preceded it, run the rudiments process on that problem, find the prior confusion to that thing, get a list of personnel involved in that prior confusion, get the withholds off from those people.

This is kind of a, kind of a *different* Security Check, in that it's withholds from those people specifically. It's the not-knows, actually, that he's run on that personnel. And you got that nicely cleaned up, and then you, of course – that's the end of that P section.

And you get a new P section form, and you go back to the old O section and you do a new assessment. And you just run the whole thing down till you can't get any needle motion anymore on that old O section.

And at that point, we could say at that point, with a considerable amount of truth – when we have finished up this activity – we could say that the person was a Release. We could say it just like that. And we could also say, with some security, that the person had no hidden standards and would do auditing commands.

All right. Now you could go ahead with general Security Checks. You could go ahead with checking against any lingering chronic somatics, using Model Session, getting the rudiments in and that sort of thing, and you could finish up the activities that a Class II Auditor could do. You could do all of them. But you know these things are going to be fairly functional, because you've gotten the hidden standards out of the road. You've gotten the basic problems of a lifetime, the hidden standards have been swept away by this particular packaged activity.

Then you'd go ahead, now, and you would assess for goal – you turn him over to a Class III activity. The pc would have to be turned over. After all the Security Checks anybody could dream up, or any Security Check published anyplace had been given, why, that would be as far as you could take him at Class II. But you've gotten quite a ways. You've got Security Checks done. You've got hidden standards off. You've got chronic problems of long duration off the case. And that seems to me like that would really be setting one up, wouldn't it? And the case would have an enormous reality! Let me tell you, some enormous reality can greet this particular activity, because this is a sneak way of finding the present time problem of long duration, which I've just dreamed up for you and squared around, and you'll find it very functional and very workable.

Now, a case that had had this done to it, coming into a goals terminal assessment and a goals terminal run, of course, would run like hot butter, because the only thing that's getting in your road in clearing is the hidden standard and the withhold. That's all. The present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards – let me say that – and the withholds that you get off in Security Checks: those are the only things standing in the road of people going Clear. And if you could handle all of those, why, *bang!* that would be very profitable. And it isn't just turning somebody over to an auditor, because you haven't any auditors that can do anything else. It actually is very profitable to set a case up.

Now, this would be a much more profitable way of running 1A, and it supplants 1A in full. This is how you get the problems off a case. You find out this is more workable, and it will work on people who have not had their goals and terminals found – even better than 1A. Short. It's very fast. Produces a high level of reality in the pc. Produces a *tremendous* amount of interest. The interest goes way up on this particular activity.

Well now, just look at the assessment alone. Let's go back over the points of improvement now. Look at the assessment. You mean to say that somebody is going to sit there and actually have spotted for him all the changes in his life without getting a case gain? He'd cognite. He'd cognite on some things, because these things will start turning up, you know?

And after he thinks he's given you all the major changes, you ask him when he went on a diet, or something screwball like that, or when he started eating special food, you know, and he...

“Special food? Yes. Well, you know, uh... well... I've just been doing it for so many years. Actually, I'm not any vegetarian or anything like that, but the doctors put me on uh... a diet, and I actually haven't ever much exceeded it since. It's no salt and uh... so on. It's a very mild thing. But come to think about it, yes, I am on a diet, and uh... Well, good heavens, when was that? Must have been about '50 or 1935. No. I wasn't born yet in 1935.” And all of a sudden, a new area of track opens up. So this type of assessment just keeps opening up track – in this lifetime, you see; opening up track in this lifetime – just the assessment all by itself.

Now, you've already asked him earlier than this, on the straight Preclear Assessment Form, for his operations, and for everything, and you've noticed that that sometimes opens up track on PCs. Well, an assessment of the major changes of a person's track, that certainly

does. And now we take these things apart, because every one of them sat on top of a problem. And don't be surprised.

Now, here are the limitations of all of this, and things you shouldn't be surprised about in doing this particular rundown.

Don't be surprised at all if it always turns out to be the same problem before each change. And if it again turns out to be the same problem, what do you do? Now, you will be asked this. You will be asked this pleadingly and burningly. "This is the second assessment we did. We've already got the personnel all 'hidden confused' out, and we got the thing flat with the rudiments process – and it was flat. And we had an awful time because he kept going back into a space-opera engram. And we kept him out of that." (Knucklehead.) "Um... and we guided him as well as we could, and all of a sudden we find this 'left school,' 'left prep school,' and he comes up with the same problem, and it's still alive on the meter! Now how about that?"

Well, your proper answer to that is, "What came up on form of the P section? What came up on that form?"

"Well, this problem – same problem. Uh... he had the same problem just before he left prep school."

"All right. Now what is the next line on the P form?"

"Well – oh, well, I see what you mean. All right."

So he goes back and he runs the rudiments process on the same problem again. Of course, it has changed aspect and shifted over into a greater or lesser intensity of some kind or another. And he'll run that thing down. He'll find the area of prior confusion. And of course, the whole of the fellow's schooling opens up this time. And that had all been closed in. And so on. And he has a win. Everybody has a win, you see? But it'll worry people because the same problem will turn up, as it will often do. And it'll now turn up live all over again because it's got a new aspect.

Of course, the joke about this is, is he's had this same problem for the last hundred trillion, you see? So, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. You just get some more running on the same problem, and then get the application of that problem to this life by getting off the area of prior confusion, don't you see? And you're just unbalancing the case and unbalancing it and – naturally, and so forth. But it'll worry people. You mark my words.

Now, sometimes the person is dispersed off the main problem and nothing happens with this; nothing will happen, I guarantee you, for the first four sections that you fill out. The first four P sections that are filled out, there's nothing – nothing really happening. The person is just plugging along and... Find the areas of prior confusion. The problems are *wildly* different. And on the fifth one, you get *the* problem. And it almost blows their head off. You get the idea?

So that may happen in the first one you do, and it may happen in the fourth one you do, and it may happen in the tenth one you do. It's going to happen. Sooner or later he will

move onto this, because the other problems are simply baling off the center-line problem. And he'll recognize that all problems *are* this problem, and so forth, and he will run it.

Well, after you've addressed this problem for quite a while, this problem will move out into another perimeter and he will feel freer and more in communication in this lifetime. And more important than that, you will have keyed out his hidden standards.

Now, let me warn you about something: Until you have the goal and terminal of the pc, all you can do with a case is key it out. That's all you can do with a case until you have his goal and his terminal and start running them. You say, "Well, then it's unfair to the case." Ah, well, but this is a double sort of a package. You can have his goal and terminal without getting off his hidden standards and problems of long duration, and they won't run.

So, you could find his goal and terminal, and then go back and do this problems straighten-out – I've been calling it a – Problems Intensives. You could straighten out all of his problems and hidden standards, and so forth, and then go back and run the thing; or you could do the Problems Intensive and then assess him and then go back and do all the thing. But you're going to have to, in any case that's going to hang up – and that is something on the order of 90 percent of the cases you'll audit – you're going to have to do something like this to get the present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards off the case, anyhow. So it doesn't matter whether you do it before the goal and terminal are found; you will certainly have to do it after the goal and terminal are found if you do that first, you see? So it doesn't matter which side of the thing you do it on. It really doesn't matter very much, except that the pc cognites faster if he knows what his goal and terminal are. He gets a little bit more zip out of this particular activity. That's about all you can say about it.

If you haven't got the pc's goal and terminal, and you aren't running Prehav levels on the pc, all you're doing is keying things out. You are keying things out.

Now, the funny part of it is that when he gets his goal and when he moves over into his terminal and when you go on down the terminal line, the Prehav runs, and he collides with engrams as he goes down the thing, this headache that he thought desperately was turned on by having left prep school, this difficulty he has had with women, and all of that sort of thing, are suddenly found to be resident when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. There they sit. And it's there in full, and the somatics come back on in full, but this time they run out. A somatic is where it is on the track, and it's no place else.

But you've put him in shape to be able to function without the somatic for a while, don't you see? And then when he runs into it, it runs out rather easily. Otherwise, you're always running him in the engram when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. See, that's the silliness of it all.

You can't get anyplace if you don't key it out, because he's in 7,762 engrams, various kinds, and your goals preparation keys out the hidden standards and fixes these things up and gets this life so it's functioning, and so forth. And then you've got a pc who can stay in-session. And then you can run him on down the track and really find where they are. Otherwise, you're only going to run into locks anyhow, and you're going to do a key-out and a key-out and a key-out as you run with the Prehav Scale, and so forth, see? You're going to do key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, then all of a sudden he goes into the engram.

And on a Class IV proposition, don't be too surprised to have somebody almost Clear, or actually reading Clear, that moves over then into a Class IV activity. And the reason they came into Dianetics and Scientology is because they had terrible pains in their appendectomy, and... – the pain is not in their appendix, it's in their appendectomy. And all of a sudden, they find out this has nothing whatsoever to do with an appendectomy. Actually, it wasn't that type of thing, but earlier on the track they used to install meters in people at about that period of time, and so on, and somebody's screwdriver slipped. Something real goofy. And it comes off – right where the somatic went in, the somatic will come off. Somatics are where they are, and they are no place else.

So this is a key-out activity so that you can run a pc. Of course, he gets very happy about all this and straightens out his life to a remarkable degree, and you are making case gains, and they are stable case gains. No doubt about that, because it'd take him another lifetime to get him keyed in this nicely again, see? But if you just left him at this point, that is what would happen. Next life, why, he'd just stack them all in again, because you haven't got them out at source. Got the idea? So this is the value of it. It actually sets a person up to be audited, and incidentally makes them much happier with life, and also gives them a reality on Scientology.

Now, the reason you are handling hidden standards should not be hidden from you.

You are handling a hidden standard not because the individual has his attention stuck someplace, you are not running a hidden standard because the individual vias auditing commands through it, although that is one of the things that it does; you are running a hidden standard only for this reason: it is an oracle. Every hidden standard is an oracle. The pc has got an oracle.

Now it may look to you this way: The pc *every* session takes off his glasses and looks around the room to see if his eyesight is better.

“Well,” you say to yourself, “well, that is a test he is making to find out whether or not his auditing is progressing.” And that's what you think is going on, but that is not what is going on at all. His eyesight somatic knows, and it's the only data there is. That is all the data there is. Observation and experience have no bearing on his knowingness. Airplane crashes in the front yard: He sees if his eyesight is worse. If his eyesight is worse, he knows that the airplane crashed in the yard. If his eyesight isn't worse, he knows it isn't there.

The fact that the airplane crashed in the yard hasn't anything to do with his knowingness. It does not much influence his knowingness. This you have to get straight. A hidden standard is his present time problem of highly specialized import, but is in highly specialized use. And when you first collide with a hidden standard, when you first begin to study a hidden standard, you think of it rather loosely. You think of it as, well, it's just a specialized present time problem of long duration of some kind or another. And the pc is viasing his auditing commands through this thing and he hasn't therefore got his attention on the session, and therefore anything that would disturb the pc during a session would be a hidden standard. And actually, then, aren't the pc's hidden standards all expressed in his goals for the session? And therefore, isn't it true that a person who is trying to find out if he is brighter or not after a session is over would be operating from a hidden standard? And therefore, isn't it true that eve-

rything the pc ever gains is basically a hidden standard? And isn't it true, then, that everything, every change the pc notices in his case would be because of a hidden standard? You see, you can get the hidden standard is no longer hidden, man. It's "any change is a hidden standard."

Well, that's not its definition. That is not what a hidden standard is, by a long way. And you at right this present instant are labeling things "hidden standards" which are simply, oh, little bit of a present time problem of long duration, or a goal for the session, or it's something else and it hasn't any real influence on the auditing, see? A hidden standard is a pretty vicious proposition. It is not a tiny, light proposition at all.

The fellow does it every command or every session. And if he does it every command, every session, it's constant – then *it* knows. Then you must assume this about the hidden standard: The hidden standard is, *it* knows and *he* doesn't. So he has to consult it to find out. But because you're not auditing him out of session, you don't notice that he does this all the time in life. Ear burns, it's not true. Ear doesn't burn, true.

What a way to adjudicate a piece of music. Now, most music critics are pretty badly spun in, but here'll be a music critic: All right. He listens to the medulla oblongata in E-flat minor, and he listens to this.

I was listening to some music critics the other day on BBC. They were criticizing jazz, and I thought this was very amusing, because they were all sitting there, and every once in a while they'd talk about "being sent," [laughter] and so forth. And "it didn't do something," one of the fellows said. You know? "It didn't do something," and he touches his chest, you know? And these people weren't judging music at all. They were reading their own somatics. [laughter] The poor composer. If the composer knew this, he would pay less attention.

Well, let's take a music critic and actually he listens to a symphony orchestra or something tearing off a long chunk of the "Overture of 1812." And afterwards he says, "Well, actually, it was not a bad performance but it lacked impact." What does he mean? Now, you go back over his criticism and you'll find out that every time things are pretty bad, they lack impact.

And if you, the auditor, were to ask him what impact, he would say, "Well, here, of course." And then if you searched a little bit further, you would find out that when he heard a piece of music, he knew it was good if he got a pressure on his chest, and if it was bad, he didn't get a pressure on his chest, so therefore he knew it was bad.

And this tells us (hideous thing) that this person actually never really hears the music. He is paying attention to a circuit which gives him a pressure or doesn't give him a pressure on his chest. Now, you're going to teach this person?

All the composers in the world could hire all the symphony orchestras in the world to play all kinds of music to him, loud and soft and so forth. He would not notice any of this music. Something else is listening to the music and reacting. And if it doesn't react, he knows the music is no good. That's why you get these *wild* criticisms on art.

You know, some kid has stumbled over a paint pot in a kindergarten and spilled it on a piece of canvas, and somebody has come along and put it up in an exhibition. And you have a

number of critics, then, all of a sudden raving about the beauty of form and rhythm and impact of this particular painting, don't you see? It was when they walked by it, did it restimulate an engram or didn't it? Had nothing to do with the painting. And so you get off into wild schools of bad draftsmanship, bad music; you get sudden popularity of somebody who goes flat on every note. You know, she always wears green dresses when she sings, and this adds up to certain producers getting a restimulation from green dresses. You know? And so here's this great singer. And then they put her on TV, you see, and the eggs pour out of the television screen like mad, and she gets no Hooper rating, and they say, "What happened?"

Well, you see, her impact wasn't singing, it was a green dress. And television is in black and white. You see, it's as screwy as this. Just as crazy as that. It's just as far offbeat.

All I'm trying to punch home is that the person's knowingness is not a result of experience; the person's knowingness is as a result of circuit. And now you're going to prove to him that Scientology works? And Mamie Glutz is going to get well? And everybody is going to get happy? And everybody is going to live better lives, and they're going to make more money, and that sort of thing. And this character goes on, and he knows it isn't working. Why? Well, you see, it lacks impact. Well, what impact? The impact that moves in and out against his chest, of course. You see how this could work?

Now, I'm not berating anybody who has a hidden standard, particularly, because it's too easy to knock these things out. But recognize what they are. They're consultation mediums with which one knows.

And I think it'd be a highly risky thing if, flying an airplane, you knew you were on the right course if you had a pain in your right hip, and didn't have to pay a bit of attention to the instruments. I would say that...

This is the lower mockery of the great pilot who has a homing in... pigeon built in and actually can fly a straight course and wind up in the – with tremendous accuracy, and so forth. But he does that because he's a great pilot, not because he's got a circuit.

You see, anything a circuit can do, a thetan can do. [laughter] And do better. Any knowingness which can be imparted to the person is the mechanism of Throgmagog, which was handed out in *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*. You can set up an independent intelligence alongside of you that tells you right from wrong.

Now, most criminals are the product of circuits. It isn't true that people who have circuits are criminals, but a criminal is a specialized part of this. Now let's look at what a criminal does: A criminal knows right from wrong because a circuit is active or inactive. In other words, because something is restimulated or not restimulated, he knows right from wrong. And therefore he knows the cops are crazy, because they don't agree with his circuit.

They say, "You shouldn't have stolen the car." Well, he's got a little green light that lights up, and when he's doing right, why, the green light lights up, and when he's doing wrong, why, the red light lights up. And it happens inside of his skull, and when he passed this car the green light lit up, so he knew he should get in the car and drive off and that that was a right and proper action.

And the cops pick him up, and the cops tell him that wasn't a right and proper action. Well, man, they're crazy, if they're observed at all. And he is very puzzled as to why he's in court. You never saw more baffled people than criminals. I've studied this breed of cat and found it a very interesting breed of cat, because it's a type of intelligence which isn't generally credited with being insane. But it isn't there. And they are very baffled.

They say, "People pretend that you can tell right from wrong. Ha-ha-ha. Talk about silly. Nobody can tell." That's the extreme one, see? Or, "Yes, of course I can tell right from wrong. When I'm doing right, I feel well, and when I'm doing wrong, I get a terror sensation in my stomach. And as long as I only do things that make me feel well, that is right, such as murder babies and steal jewelry. And if I do those things, that's fine. But if I become... if I get a job, this terror sensation turns on, so it's wrong to work." And if you went into it closely with one of these characters and had a conversation of that depth and that searching type of questioning, you would learn some of the most fantastic things you ever heard of.

Well, to some slight degree, anybody with a hidden standard, you see, is no blood brother to this criminal – that's just a lie – but he's doing this to some degree.

So the auditor says, "Are you in-session?"

And the pc looks inside to find out if the little white bulb is burning. And the white bulb is burning, so he says, "Yes, I'm in-session."

"Now, did you get any result from the processing"

Now he looks at the little white bulb, and it's not on, so he didn't get any result from processing.

But what during the auditing did he do? He would do the command on a sort of a via. It'd come from the auditor, and then he put the command over here, and something over here gives him the command and then he follows the command. He's on a self-audit. It knows, he doesn't.

Now this is the way people get that way: First, they're a thetan as themselves, actually, and then they become so invalidated, or they invalidate people so much that they get overwhelmed with their own invalidations, and they pick up a valence. Now, everybody's got a valence – everybody's got one of these things. Even people with hidden standards have valences and you can find them.

But the steps are two more than this. There are two more steps of overwhelm. The next step to the valence overwhelm is the somatic overwhelm. While being the valence, he got a hell of a somatic. Now, an impact is easily substituted for knowingness. Impact, knowingness – these can integrate in a mind as the same thing. Impact and punishment can also integrate. They don't necessarily integrate as knowingness, they sometimes only integrate as punishment.

So the fellow is walking down the street, and something is thrown out of an airplane and a wrench hits him on side of the head, and after he gets out of the hospital he has a definite sensation that he must have done something. Well, the only thing he was doing was walking down the street. But he got a definite sensation he must have done something. Now the

truth of the matter is, he doesn't even have to go back and pick up his own overts, but he must have had them to make the thing hit him, but he doesn't even have to go back and pick up the overts to feel that he must have done something. The fact that he was hit meant that he was being punished.

So the punishment must have had a crime that goes with it, and he's got a terrible problem: What has he done? What has he done that caused him to be punished? And he doesn't know. Well, of course, the answer is very often he hasn't done anything. But he can't separate this thing out.

Now, an impact, then, can go into that category, and people with guilt complexes – which is a small section, by the way, of mind. You say everybody has a guilt complex, it's like saying everybody has an inferiority complex. It hasn't any level of truth, you know, at all. It's just taking a small class of cases. There are a small class of cases have guilt complex. There are a small class of cases have inferiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have superiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have complexes that tell them they can never do anything wrong. There's... You know, there's classes of cases. But this is not a broad generality at all, that everybody is guilty or that aberrations comes from guilt. That's a hangover from old psychotherapies. Sometimes they ride along and you've given them credence at sometime or another, and it takes a shake of the head to get rid of them.

Well, now, an impact can interpret as knowingness. Because the person's been hit, he feels he now knows something. You'll sometimes have a person coming out of an operation telling you he knows something. Well, the odd part of it is, two things can happen: He can come out of an operation knowing something, or he can come out of an operation feeling that he knows something. In the second case, he doesn't know anything.

For instance, if you take a thetan, you operate on his body and he blows out of his head, and during the operation he finds himself outside, he will wind up later on knowing that he can exteriorize. That's a perfectly valid piece of information. Because this other thing happens so often, that gets invalidated. Lots of patients wake up out of the ether and then now they know something. Only they don't know what they know, see, and the more they search for it, the less they find out. They don't know what they know, but they know they know something. Got the idea?

Well, a circuitry can get set up in more or less that fashion. The person himself has been invalidated – his own knowingness, as a valence, is invalidated – and so he's got an impact knowingness that he keeps around, which is part of an engram. The engram is actually on his goals-terminal chain – that's where it comes from – but it is not reachable or attainable because it's right in the middle, and you can't audit him down to the goals-terminal chain because he's got this thing in the road. But it's on the chain, and you can't audit him through it or past it, but you can't audit him because of it, and yet unless you audit him he's not going to get rid of it. This is the kind of a problem one of these circuits sets up.

So here he is – here he is with this thing, and it actually – his own knowingness has been terribly invalidated. As a circuit, then, he can go on being validated in his knowingness, but he has to be careful because this thing knows more than he does, and it's a somatic of some kind. It's a pressure ridge. It's a sensation. It can be almost any one of these things. It's

a difference of light. It's an occlusion. It's a singing in the head. It's bubbling in the beer, you know? Doesn't matter what it is, it just is. And he's going to have bad luck tomorrow.

Well, actually, all of Roman superstition, and everything else, stem out of this circuitry. Rome had a circuit called the auguries. And they used to shoot down birds and gut them, and they'd examine the entrails and then they'd know whether or not tomorrow was going to be a lucky day. Well, that's a circuit. You'll find in superstitious peoples that have very little and have been knocked around very badly, you have just absolute huge catalogs of superstitions. You've got some superstitions yourself, and so forth. Well, this is just a hang-over on the third dynamic. That's a sort of a third dynamic circuit.

They were looking at the moon one night on some planet way back when, and it was half-full. And they get a restim on the thing every time they look at the moon half-full. And it was half-full this particular night, and a couple of spaceships came in and blew up the planet. So they know that a half-full moon is dangerous. And this kind of gets established somehow or another. So you have to be careful when the moon is half-full. What are you saying? Well, the moon knows more than you do, because you couldn't find out what happened. But the moon obviously knows what happened because it's a symbol of what is happening so now the moon knows, and you can set up a whole moon circuit. Quite interesting.

The circuit knows, the pc doesn't; the circuit can observe, the pc doesn't; the circuit can give auditing commands and the auditor can't. All kinds of these things happen.

Now this moves out into a secondary state, which is the fourth state up the line, and it becomes an audible, dictational circuit. It's worst off. It's where the ideas come from. It dictates to a person. It speaks. It gives him his orders aloud. All kinds of wild things go on with regard to it. But the person never does anything unless he's told by this particular mechanism. Well, what is this? This is the total, final result of a valence that has been overwhelmed by a somatic, which has been overwhelmed in itself by some other thinkingness, and you've got just continuous, consecutive overwhelms.

Now, of course, there can be many cases after this where these conditions are consecutively and continuously overwhelmed, but they will all be of the same character. They will not be more personalities; they will be circuits, from the acceptance of the first valence on out. And that's something to know. You haven't got an endless number of valences on the pc, but you can have a near-endless number – it will seem to you sometimes – you can have a near-endless number of hidden standards. You can have a lot of them on a case, if they're real hidden standards.

Now, what is the test of a real hidden standard? It's whether or not the pc consults with something each command or each session. "Consults" is the clue. Now you see, he could look around to find out if his eyes changed. But does he always look around to find if his eyes changed?

Now, the change in his eyes is not particularly the hidden standard. The hidden standard lurks in the vicinity of that. And it moves on and off his eyes. The day is bright. The day is dull. This is the way life goes. It's going to be a good day because the day is bright. It's going to be a bad day because the light is dull. There's going to be something going on like that to make that a real hidden standard. And then it becomes a consultational circuit.

Now, that is a rather mild form of one. That is not particularly a very bad hidden standard; possibly a person could even be audited through it without much trouble.

But now let's take this one. This is how bad a hidden standard can get: Pc sits down in the auditing chair, and the hidden standard says to him – says to him – “Uh... well, that auditor is going to do you in today.” So he relays all the commands through the hidden standard, because the hidden standard will give him the safe commands. So he can do some commands and he can't do other commands, because the hidden standard will only relay the safe commands. And oh, wow. You haven't got a pc under control. You haven't got a pc there. You're not auditing a pc. See, this is all vastly removed from the thing.

But these hidden standards key in with problems and areas of prior confusion. And that is what kicks in a hidden standard. It comes in because of a problem of magnitude or an area of prior confusion. Now, I've put in the “or” there just in case sometime or another the guy got a problem without a prior confusion. But the usual course of human events is that the individual went through a lot of trouble and a lot of confusion, and he couldn't quite figure any part of it out, and it left him hung with a problem.

Now, he's an active cuss – any thetan is a fairly active thetan – and he will up and solve it every time. He solves that problem by changing his life in some way. Now, this can get so bad that the effect I talked to you about the other day, the effect whereby, because something happened, the individual felt – and I've mentioned in this lecture – because something occurred, then the individual must have done something. He didn't do anything, but something occurred.

So some of these changes in his life are going to be red herrings. That is to say, there was a change in his life, so he figured he must have had a problem ahead of it. A person could have a change in his life without having a problem before it.

He's got a couple of very active parents that go flying around to every place, and so on, and they change his location rather continuously, but one day they stopped moving around. And he finally finds himself sitting someplace, and it was a change in his life because he was now in one place. And you ask him for a problem before this, and he'll almost beat his brains out trying to dream up what problem *he* had that caused this to occur. Well, actually, he didn't do anything to cause it at all.

In other words, the change in that particular case is other-determined than by the person. So there can be other-determined changes, and they, however, do not assess by an E-Meter reaction. So, therefore, assessment becomes necessary in doing the O section of this type of Problems Intensive I was telling you about – necessary to assess – because it eliminates those changes which occurred without a problem having preceded them.

All right. So there's the one, two, three of the hidden standard. The hidden standard develops out of problems of long duration. Individual solves the problem with a hidden standard, has solved the problem at some time or another with a hidden standard, and says, “Well, I just won't think anymore. I will let this think for me.”

Now, I should say just one brief note on, where does a circuit come from? Well, frankly, you'll find circuits first mentioned in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*,

so they're not very hard to find. They're quite obvious. They're quite visible. You could go around looking and asking people about circuits. You'll find plenty of circuits. You'll find talking circuits and pressing circuits and color circuits and all kinds of things. They're how-do-you-know things. This is circuitry as different than valences.

Valence answers the question "who to be" or "how to be right with a beingness" – "how can you be right with a beingness?" A circuit answers it entirely differently. That is, "Without changing the beingness, how do you know whether you're right or not?" They are two different aspects. A circuit furnishes information. A valence furnishes beingness.

Now a circuit, from furnishing information, can step upstairs to furnishing orders. And then it can step upstairs to furnishing orders and commands which are below the level of consciousness. But they always express themselves to some slight degree in terms of a somatic. One knows they're there if the somatic occurs.

Most people live in haunted houses. There are a lot of people around will tell you there are other thetans inhabiting their body. These are just circuits. You will occasionally run into somebody that after he got a bad shock, why, just thousands of voices turned in on his body in all directions, or a dozen, or six, or something. And they all spoke to him, and so forth and so on. You'll run into an experience of that character in somebody else.

All right. A circuit can be... is very easy to set up, and you actually think and use circuits all the time. A circuit isn't a bad thing. It's only when it goes out of a person's self-determinism, is no longer in the individual's control, that a circuit becomes a bad thing.

A person is totally knocked in the head as far as a circuit is concerned.

He has no longer any life or reason of his own. Only the circuit has life and reason. And when a circuit is in this particular condition or state of ascendancy, it, of course, furnishes a hidden standard. It's right or wrong according to the appearance of the circuit, or according to its behavior. It tells the individual right from wrong, and the individual himself never differentiates, never experiences, has no criteria, and so on. That is a circuit in operation. And this circuitry is set up by a thetan very easily, and is set up by him every time he turns around, and is one of the easiest things that he does and there is no reason he should stop doing it.

We're only talking about the obsessive, out-of-control circuit. Circuits are very often completely reasonable, that a person sets up. But he's still totally in control of the circuit. He set it up and he knows it, see? And it's gone. He doesn't set it up forever.

Well, you look at... look at a motorcycle, and you say to yourself, "What's wrong with the motorcycle?" You see? And you sort of set up a computer that is like a motorcycle engine or something, you see? And you say, "Gosh, there it is, and it goes this way," and you kind of mock it all up. "And it goes this way," and so on. You go to bed that night, you no longer got the motorcycle engine in front of you, you see?

And... Tesla, this great character Nikola Tesla, who invented alternating current and tremendous numbers of other things, set up the alternating current motor and let it run in his head. It wasn't in his head, of course; he probably had it out somewhere. I wouldn't want an alternating current in my head – motor in my head, see. Because if he set it up right, of

course, it was greasy. But anyhow, he set up an alternating current motor and he let it run for two years just to find what parts of it would wear. That's right.

So that was kind of a long time to let a circuit run, wasn't it?

Well, it was to tell him something, wasn't it? So he set up a mock-up in order to find out from it, and there's nothing wrong with this. This does not mean that Nikola Tesla, as a result, had a hidden standard. He didn't have any hidden standard. He knew he set it up and he knew he took it down, and he knew when he set it up and he knew when he took it down.

But you'll find circuits are not in this degree of control when they're obsessive, you see? Now the person doesn't know when he set them up, he doesn't know why he set them up, he doesn't know why he's listening to them, he doesn't know where they came from. All he knows is that he has a total slavish obedience to them. See, that is the difference.

You can set up circuits that'll answer mathematical problems for you. You can do all kinds of wild things with your mind, you see? There's nothing wrong with doing this, you see, as long as you're doing it. If you're doing them, why, you can't hurt yourself any. But when you start burying them, and when you say, "I'm no longer responsible for that thing," and when you say, "This thing will now from hereinafter and aforesaid tell me which side of all electrical circuits will go this way and that way"... The individual looks at a house and he hears a buzz-buzz-buzz. This is eight lifetimes later, see? Buzz-buzz-buzz, he hears in this house, and he knows there's something wrong with its currents.

You get an electrician sometime and you say, "Well, how did you know the house was old?"

"Well, I get this sensation," or something. "I knew the wiring was off," or something like this.

And you talk with him, "Well, how did you know that?"

"Well, I don't know, but I always get this sensation right under my left rib, you see, and so on. And I can kind of hear a buzz-buzz, and so forth. It's very easy to tell." That's a knowingness circuitry on the subject of electricity, you see, which he doesn't know anything about. He just told you so.

A thetan, you see, is totally capable of this operation – of permeating the whole house and finding every short circuit in it. And says, "Zzzzzzit! Well, that was one. Zzzzzzit! There's another one. Zzzzzzit! There's another one." See? "Oh, well, guess we'll have to rewire that." Thetan is totally capable of doing this, so, therefore, it's one of his skills.

The basic on this is setting something up on automatic and taking no responsibility for it at all. And out of that you get trouble. You always will get some trouble. And it becomes a hidden standard, and so on. But to have set one up and put it on total irresponsibility and let it run totally automatically, the individual had one God-awful problem just before he did it.

And just before he had that awful problem, he was in a fantastic amount of confusion. And just before he got into that fantastic amount of confusion, he had plenty of withholds from all of the people connected with the confusion. And those conditions must have oc-

curred. And all of those conditions need to be present to unravel a circuit – to have a circuit set up this way – and you’ve got to pay attention to all of those things to unravel a circuit.

All right. So how would an individual get into this sort of state? All right. Life would be pretty active, and he would start withholding from everybody he was in contact with, about everything, or about some special thing, or something like that. He isn’t free to communicate in any way. He’s withholding from here and he’s withholding from there, and he does an overt here, and he’s got a withhold there, and he does another overt someplace else, and things start running a little bit wrong. Naturally, he’s out of communication with it. You’re answering the first requisite of a circuit: going out of communication.

You see, the individual who has a circuit that tells him about house wiring never has to permeate the house. Well, he never has to communicate with the house. All he has to do is communicate with the circuit. The circuit does all the communicating for him, you see, and he doesn’t have to do anything about it. All right.

So he had all these withholds and all these overts against all these people, and life became pretty confused, and it got more and more confused. And it finally wound up to where this confusion added up to a distinct problem. Whether he could state it or not is beside the point, whether he’s aware of it analytically at that stage of the game or not, but it got to be one awful problem. And it’s a storable problem. *Blang!* it went, and then he had a problem on his hand. And then, of course, he solved the problem.

Now, if you got enough withholds and overts, you’ll blow. You get enough overts and withholds against any one person, or any one thing, or any one area, you’ll blow out of that area or off that course of existence – if there’s enough.

All right. So the individual had this awful problem, and he blew. He blew that particular life channel that he was on. And of course, this brought about a change. And the only tag that is uniformly left in view for the problem, the confusion, the people, and the withholds and the lot, is the change. “When did your life change?” So, of course, by tracking that back, you can find the problem. You get the problem more or less handled, you find the people. You get the people security checked out – this individual security checked out about the people – he comes off of the nervousness of the confusion which was, after all, yesteryear. But his withholds have got him pinned in that area of time. He’s stopping and not communicating in that area of time, so nothing as-ises in that area of time, so he’s stuck there.

And this, of course, tends to turn on a circuit, because it’s a withdrawal. Now, the point of change, of course, is a withdrawal. The point of change of life is a withdrawal from his former change of life. So the whole story is out of communication, out of communication, out of communication, and then out of communication.

Now, if he wants to remain out of communication safely, he has to have a periscope up. So that the periscope is very dangerous to approach the eyepiece of, so he has to have a periscope that not only looks but tells him. And that is a hidden standard. And when an individual has gone through that cycle violently, he comes up at the other end looking at life through a circuit. He never looks at life, the circuit looks at life; he never gets audited, the circuit gets audited. That is an experience. Experience must not approach this individual. And remember, auditing is an experience.

So, if the individual is living a life on a via called a circuit, then of course, your auditing is only part of the via, and of course never reaches the person. And you are trying to audit the person, you are not trying to audit the via. And when auditing takes a God-awful long time, it is just because you are not auditing a pc, you are auditing a circuit. You haven't got an Operating Thetan, you've got an operating GE, or an operating circuit. And so all experience is filtered through the circuit, and it is true of auditing, too. Auditing also filters through the circuit.

Now, the trick in supervising auditors is to give them some type of a rundown that hits all this, and knocks all this out of the road. And they can do it rather sloppily, and they don't have to finish it up in any terrific way, and they'll still knock the circuitry out of the road so the person can be audited. And that is what this Problems Intensive is all about. And this thing is tailor-made for a Class II activity. And people can be trained to do this much more easily than they can be trained to locate goals and terminals. Why? Because goal and terminal operation, and Prehav Scale running, requires a precision of auditing which is a very, very high, hardly won precision. And you know that because right this moment you are struggling up the line toward that precision. But it requires a terrific precision. There's only one goal; you must never get the wrong goal. There's only one terminal; you must never get the wrong terminal. There is only one level of the Prehav Scale live; you must never audit the wrong level. The auditing commands have to be exactly the right auditing commands. The individual going up and down the track has to be run precisely against the E-Meter. Precisely. When it is flat, it is flat. And when it is not flat, it is not flat. And furthermore, the individual cannot be run with rudiments out, much less assessed when the rudiments are out.

So that is a highly precise level of auditing, don't you see?

You have another level of auditing, now, in Class II, which is imprecise and will get the job done.

Now, this has an additional advantage. Where you are shy about an individual coming in off the street, this has to solve this problem. The individual is coming in off the street, he doesn't know very much about Scientology; without giving him a broad, general education, you cannot easily sit down and open up a Form 3 on him. You won't find auditors doing it very glibly.

And the individual, not knowing what it's targeted at, is going to feel that he's being suspected, and he's going to get some kind of an ARC break with the people who are doing this to him.

Ah, well, on such a person, very simply, you run this Problems Intensive. It is what? It basically goes back and makes the most fundamental Security Checks that can be made on the individual, without getting very personal about the individual.

Now, when he's opened up and is expressing himself a little bit better, and you've got the hidden standards out of the road, you can, of course, uncork a Form 3. Now the individual knows what it's all about. Now he'll go for this now, he'll stay in-session with this now, and he'll get it off. And he'll know where he's going because he has a subjective reality of what he's been doing to himself with withholds. He got that out of this rundown.

So this gets you over the bridge of “How do you take raw meat and audit it directly?” And actually, you could get somebody up here that just was walking down the road, say, “Have you ever had any changes in your life, and what has your life been all about? Have you ever had any operations? Have you ever had this? Have you ever had that?” – it doesn’t matter. It’d be any of the data. You could ask this individual any of the data on any part of this form right up to O, and the individual will be pitching right straight with you. And now, of course, part O, why, he’ll be happy to tell you all about the changes in his life. Everybody is very happy to talk about all of their troubles and difficulties and changes. They’re very happy to tell you their problems. That’s for sure. And of course, the Security Check is not between you and the person, it is between the person and people who aren’t there. And he’s perfectly willing to give you withholds from people who aren’t there.

So this is the answer to raw meat. And you take this particular rundown, which will be released to you shortly, and you will find out that an individual is then processable. Practically any level of case becomes processable if you approach it that way; requires no specialized address of any kind whatsoever. And the most self-conscious auditor would be happy to sit there and do that.

I developed this from this reason and this way: I found out that auditors will fill out forms. [laughter] That is not a sarcastic thing. That happens to be a common denominator of all auditors. They will all do it, and they will do it very well. All right.

Let’s build on that cornerstone, and let’s move it on up, and run some processes up along the level and you’ve got it made. How could you miss? [laughter]

Okay. Well, it’s taken quite a bit of thinking to get this squared around, and quite a bit of looking, and so forth. I hope you make good use of it.

Thank you.

CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS

CONSIDERATIONS TAKE RANK OVER THE MECHANICS OF SPACE, ENERGY, AND TIME. By this it is meant that an idea or opinion is, fundamentally, superior to space, energy, and time, or organizations of form, since it is conceived that space, energy, and time are themselves broadly agreed- upon considerations. That so many minds agree brings about Reality in the form of space, energy, and time. These mechanics, then, of space, energy, and time are the product of agreed- upon considerations mutually held by life.

The aspects of existence when viewed from the level of Man, however, is a reverse of the greater truth above for Man works on the secondary opinion that mechanics are real, and that his own personal considerations are less important than space, energy, and time. This is an inversion. These mechanics of space, energy, and time, the forms, objects and combinations thereof, have taken such precedence in Man that they have become more important than considerations as such, and so his ability is overpowered and he is unable to act freely in the framework of mechanics. Man, therefore, has an inverted view. Whereas considerations such as those he daily makes are the actual source of space, energy, time and forms, Man is operating so as not to alter his basic considerations; he therefore invalidates himself by supposing another determinism of space, energy, time and form. Although he is part of that which created these, he gives them such strength and validity that his own considerations thereafter must fall subordinate to space, energy, time, and form, and so he cannot alter the Universe in which he dwells.

The freedom of an individual depends upon that individual's freedom to alter his considerations of space, energy, time, and forms of life and his roles in it. If he cannot change his mind about these, he is then fixed and enslaved amidst barriers such as those of the physical universe, and barriers of his own creation. Man thus is seen to be enslaved by barriers of his own creation. He creates these barriers himself, or by agreeing with things which hold these barriers to be actual.

There is a basic series of assumptions in processing, which assumptions do not alter the philosophy of Scientology. The first of these assumptions is that Man can have a greater freedom. The second is that so long as he remains relatively sane, he desires a greater freedom. And the third assumption is that the auditor desires to deliver a greater freedom to that person with whom he is working. If these assumptions are not agreed upon and are not used, then auditing degenerates into "the observation of effect", which is, of course, a goal- less, soulless pursuit, and is, indeed, a pursuit which has degraded what is called modern science.

The goal of processing is to bring an individual into such thorough communication with the physical universe that he can regain the power and ability of his own considerations (postulates).

P.A.B. No. 13
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office
163 Holland Park Avenue, London W.11

[1953, ca. mid-November]

ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR

It greatly facilitates the work of the auditor to know the most aberrated and most aberrative types of personality.

Kraepelin in Germany a long time ago made a long and varied psychotic classification. This has been refined and made, if anything, even more unwieldy in modern times. It is valueless since it does not lead to the immediate remedy of the situation. Further, we are not very interested in types. There is really no such thing as a special type of psychosis or neurosis, beyond those types which are quite aberrative around the preclear.

If we could isolate a particular set of traits as being the most aberrative traits, we could more quickly process the preclear by using Acceptance Level Processing or Viewpoint Processing on such people.

Probably the truly aberrative personalities in our society do not number more than five or ten percent. They have very special traits. Where you find in the preclear's bank a person with one or more of these characteristics, you will have the person who most thoroughly tried the preclear's sanity.

What we will call the aberrative personality does the following things:

1. Everything bad that happened to the preclear was (a) ridiculous, (b) unimportant, (c) deserved.
2. Everything the preclear and others did to the aberrative person was (a) very important, (b) very bad, (c) irremediable.
3. Those things which the preclear could do (a) were without real value, (b) were done better by the aberrative personality or by others.
4. Sexual restraint or perversion.
5. Inhibition of eating.

Such people would be better understood if I called them the "merchants of fear." The most degraded control operation of which the GE is capable is utilized by these people for their sole method of getting on in the world. They have lost all ability themselves to create, they cannot work themselves, they must either amass money which is never to be spent or

must prevent others from amassing money. They produce nothing, they must steal one way or another, and then devalue whatever they obtain. They speak very sternly of honesty or ethics and put on a formidable front of complete legality. They are impartial, which is to say they are incapable of decision but ride continually a maybe. They close terminals easily with courts, for courts are, sad to say, more or less of this disposition themselves. They feel called upon at no pretext to become adjudicative on subjects where their opinion has not been invited.

Probably a society could be cleared and allowed to bloom if these people were simply rounded up and removed from contagion with the remaining populace, for they are not numerous. Yet they are in sufficient number that it is doubtful if your preclears who are more seriously badly off have not had at least one in their past. It is particularly true of the occluded case that he has been victimized by one of these “merchants of fear.”

Although there are many characteristics which are undesirable in such aberrative people, it is remarkable that only those listed above are aberrative. These wind sinuously as a threatening thread through all of their conversations. Such people are a mixture of paradoxes to the observer who does not understand the basic ingredients of human character.

Such people are themselves a continuous maybe, and therefore will be found very easily in the bank, for they appear most often. Where you find one, two or three people appearing almost continuously in the preclear's bank, or his lamenting conversation, you will find that these people answer the above-numbered characteristics.

The method of processing these people is to have the preclear mock them up in large masses with the certainty that they are there, and then, with them unmocked, with the certainty they are not there. Then, mocked up again, with the certainty that they will be in the future, and, unmocked, with the certainty they will not be in the future. One also runs the above concepts in masses and in brackets.

A case cannot be said to be well so long as these aberrative personalities continue to reappear in his thoughts and processing. Therefore the auditor will find it extremely profitable to use all available means to process these people out of the preclear's bank. When the auditor has succeeded in doing this, he will find that the preclear now believes himself to be very much better than before and, indeed, he will be.

It should be remembered that such people have invited many overt acts. The “merchants of fear” specialize in being offended themselves and, even though the overt acts against them are slight, these have become magnified in the preclear's bank until such people, on the overt act phenomenon alone, occupy a major role in the preclear's thinking.

It will often be discovered by the auditor that the preclear has “swapped terminals” with these aberrative persons. The weight of aberration is such that the preclear has been swung into the valence of such people, for they have obviously won.

The truth of the matter is: such people never win. If one traces out these people, as I have done occasionally after processing a preclear, he will discover that the aberrative personality is very close to the brink of a crack-up, has a very low survival level, and quite commonly goes insane.

It should be understood that anyone going down tone scale in moments of anger is apt to use the above-numbered steps one way or another. But this is a momentary thing; the above steps belong, of course, on the tone scale and are significant of a level on the tone scale. Thus, one going down tone scale into anger or into apathy, is inclined to use these operations momentarily. This is quite different from the aberrative personality. The aberrative personality is at work with this operation 24 hours a day. Ceaselessly, relentlessly, calculatingly, with full knowingness, the aberrative personality continues this onslaught against those around him.

The entire computation of this aberrative personality is that he is worthless, he himself knows himself to be completely worthless. One might feel a little pity if the harm were not so great, for there is nothing more terrible than this knowledge. The aberrative personality feels he cannot succeed unless he drives others away from him with fear, preferably with terror. He assumes aspects of ugliness in matters of clothing; he is quite prone to ugliness. Very often this personality does not bathe, his breath is very often foul, his feet become odorous, the endocrine system has failed one way or another, the person has considerable bowel trouble. Other people than the aberrative personality occasionally manifest these difficulties; unfortunately, it all stems from the same idea – to drive other people away.

The communication lag of the aberrative personality is his easiest clue. These people are slow to respond, they are very thoughtful about what they say. They “think twice before speaking once,” if they speak at all. When they do speak it is very often not on the subject. Their favorite phrase is “You do not understand.” They preface their statements with, “Well, I don’t know but...” There is no decision in such people; they do not know whether to go up the street or down the street. Put into a certain routine and forced into that routine they will carry on, but they do not themselves produce anything, they are entirely parasitic. This parasiticism is gained either by the inheritance or other accumulation of money or by a direct and forthright nullification of those around them into the status of slaves. For this person knows above all other things that he cannot produce an honest day’s work.

Now in case you err and try to apply this classification too widely, there is one definite characteristic you must not overlook. This characteristic makes the difference between the aberrative personality and run-of-the-mill human beings. The secrecy computation is the clue. The best index to a secrecy computation is a refusal to be audited. Because of this factor of the secrecy computation, and for no other factor, it chances to follow that the aberrative personality can be known by his refusal to have any auditing of any kind, or, if he has any auditing, accepts it very covertly and will not permit it to have any effect upon him. He will not have a second session. He has all manner of excuses for this such as “altitude”, but in any way, shape or form he escapes auditing. If your preclear’s unwilling to be audited, he himself may fall into this classification.

Because justice in this society prides itself upon impartiality, these impartial people – the aberrative personalities – are quite often listened to by those around them. The pose of being impartial is an effort to escape decision. People who get things done or who are worth anything to the society make decisions. The impartial people make no decisions if they can possibly avoid them, and at the very best put off decisions as long as possible, as in the case of a court of law. These people, being well downscale, are very close to MEST and have a very solid agreement with MEST.

Very often you will find aberrative personalities addicted to religion, but the addiction will not be accompanied by any belief in the human spirit. Just how this paradox is accomplished a professed avowal of Christianity and a complete unwillingness to accept any effort to heal or help the human spirit as opposed to the body – is just another one of this bundle of paradoxes which mark the aberrative personality. For, you see, the person is such a complete maybe that anything about him is indecisive, and people trying to make up their minds about this person, of course, fall into the state of maybe, because that is the clue to the personality. Impartial personality – the maybe personality – and the “merchant of fear” are more or less of the same order and are alike aberrative.

Men in the field of the arts are very often victimized by these aberrative personalities. The “merchant of fear” closes terminals rapidly with any area which contains a great deal of admiration. Since the person is actually incapable of decision, this is a mechanical closure. The presence of admiration around anyone else begins to dissolve some of the completely stultified bank of the “merchant of fear” and this finds him very close to the source. Orchestra leaders, painters, writers are always having the terrible misfortune of closing terminals with such personalities. There is hardly a man of art or letters who does not bear on him the scar of having associated with a “merchant of fear,” for these are vampire personalities. They are themselves so starved of admiration and of sensation that they drink out of others around them any possible drop of admiration in any form. Where a woman becomes a “merchant of fear,” sexual starvation is continually attempting satiation and all the while the “merchant of fear” will protest and, to all visible signs, follow a life of complete celibacy.

While it is not my purpose here to revile, I wish to impress upon the auditor that the “merchant of fear” is extremely dangerous, both to creative impulses and to sanity. One could say airily, “Why don’t we just audit these people upscale, since they are so few,” but these people will never present themselves for auditing and will discourage anyone else from having any auditing. A solution to the “merchant of fear” probably does not lie in the field of auditing.

The society at large is so accustomed to association with MEST and the “merchant of fear” so closely approximates some of the characteristics of MEST – the maybe, for instance – that the public quite commonly misassigns strength to such aberrative personalities and thinks of them as strong people or as wise people. They are neither strong nor wise, and before an even indifferently forceful attack quickly capitulate. They live their whole lives in terror of attack.

One often finds these characteristics in company with paresis or hears the aberrative personality has actually contracted a dreadful disease to add to his repulsiveness.

The auditor should not err in thinking that these people always present a repulsive appearance; repulsive conduct precedes a repulsive appearance. At first they operate only mentally in trying to make everyone afraid. Then this begins to show up more and more in their own MEST and finally will demonstrate itself in their personal appearance. Thus one can mark the state of decay of these aberrative personalities.

Now and then some violent man in one country or another has undertaken programs to rid a society of these points of contagion. Kings in olden times handled the problem by de-

capitating people who continually brought them bad news – this was a very wise measure. In more recent times it has been said that Gomez, late dictator of Venezuela, discovered that the contagion point of leprosy in the country was the beggar. He found that the beggars of Venezuela were using leprosy in order to beg. People would pay in order to have the ugly thing taken away from them (the basic philosophy of the beggar is to be paid to go away). Gomez had the beggars told that they were going to be taken to a very fruitful part of Venezuela and given a colony of their own; he had them collected on a river bank and loaded aboard two large river boats. The river boats proceeded into midstream, their crews left them in skiffs and the boats blew up with a resounding explosion. This was the end of leprosy in Venezuela. I am not telling you this to advocate the immediate slaughter of the “merchants of fear”; I am merely giving you an historical note. The extreme impatience of people trying to get something done in a society will eventually center upon those who will not work and, in the case of kings or tyrants, such people have very often been done away with. Thus the precedent is very old of a society cleansing itself by removing from its ranks the non-workers.

Revolutions very often have this as an objective. The French Revolution recognized in the existing aristocracy a state of will-not-work, and saw in these people the character of the “merchant of fear,” and for several years there in France, shortly after America became free, the tumbrils formed an assembly line to the guillotine. People in societies are extremely punitive about those who will not work and about those who depend on fear for their sustenance. But society going downscale can become more and more apathetic toward the “merchant of fear” until the “merchant of fear” predominates as a class.

Just as the king or the society revolted against the “merchant of fear,” so has your pre-clear tried to get the “merchant of fear” to work and to contribute something besides bad news. This effort, of course, was bent toward an organism which was already rotten at the core. Whether the “merchant of fear” used money or beauty to excuse his own lack of labor, only added to the maybe. The law forbade the pre-clear to use the measure of the tyrant or the Gomez, for the law is utterly infatuated with such people and defends them at every turn just as such people use almost exclusively the law. As your pre-clear was balked in his natural impulse to clear the way he was brought into staring recognition of the fact that the necessary act – murder – was halted by the existence of police and courts. This brought the pre-clear to the point where he conceived himself to be put upon by the society and the law. Many of your pre-clears, as a result of this, are startled to find, when it is run on them, that they believe themselves under arrest, even though any arrest they have been subjected to was as minor as a traffic pick-up. I am not advocating, again, violence; I am merely trying to explain to you the state of mind of the pre-clear and the most aberrative person he has confronted. He wanted to, and didn't, kill these people. If your pre-clear is of the kind who produces or creates or who works and makes his way in the world in general, you can find the aberrative personality in his bank immediately by asking him – with an E-Meter, of course, because he probably won't tell you direct – if he wanted to kill anyone. The E-Meter will say that he did, and on discovery of this identity the auditor will find the aberrative personality. This even follows through with women, although women go more quickly into apathy when confronted with an aberrative personality than do men.

You should understand that the aberrative personality has not become an aberrative personality by being confronted by another aberrative personality. You are not getting here the pattern of stimulus-response, you are getting the decay of a human spirit to complete inactivity so that the entire modus operandi becomes that of the body itself, and a body, in the case of the aberrative personality, which itself is too deteriorated or exhausted to work. Not all bodies becoming so exhausted and unable to work turn into aberrative personalities, but the aberrative personality is born entirely out of the decline of the ability of the individual to produce. When the individual really recognizes his utter worthlessness to the society, he becomes an aberrative personality. Many people who cannot work physically turn to other lines of progress. They are getting on one way or another. The aberrative personality is so badly off that he can lead only a parasitic existence. You will understand, then, that people going down tone scale do not immediately and automatically become aberrative personalities, in our definition as here used. People become aberrative personalities out of a malevolence which insists on a high level of survival without the production of anything.

L. RON HUBBARD

PSYCHOSIS, NEUROSIS AND PSYCHIATRISTS

An auditor who does not understand the true character of neurosis and psychosis is likely to find himself trying to understand neurotics and psychotics and psychiatrists and to the degree of that un-understanding could become the effect of these.

If we examine the definition for operating thetan we find his highest capability is knowing and willing cause. This should tell us at once that the definition of neurosis and psychosis would be unknowing and unwilling effect, and this is the actual definition of either.

Neurosis and psychosis are different only in degree of singleness of effect. A neurotic is the subject of one or more unknown causes to which he is the unwilling effect – but he can still function to some degree, which is to say he can still be cause in other lines. A psychotic is the complete subject of one or more unknown causes to which he is the unwilling effect and any effort on his part to be cause is interfered with by the things to which he is the effect; in other words, a psychotic's outflow is cut to zero by the inflow.

Now let us examine the potential number of neuroses and psychoses in the light of the above definitions. How many aspects are there to a life unit, which is to say, a thetan? Perhaps the number is infinite but at least we can say the number of aspects is very large. There are no additional aspects in this or any other universe. In other words when you examine the aspects or abilities of a basic life unit you have examined all the aspects or abilities there are in a universe. There aren't any left over. Even if you include gods in every universe you will see that you have not escaped the potentialities of life units.

All the aspects and abilities there are are the aspects and abilities of a thetan. The only thing that can be done with these aspects or abilities is included, at least in this universe, in the formula of cause and effect. Take one ability and add to it the idea of cause and effect of the more simple variety Cause, Distance, Effect, fix it so it can never be flowed against by anything else and we have a source of neuroses. Now take a being at the effect point of this flow. If this being is the effect point of a flow he can never flow back against, we have here what we could carelessly call a neurosis. But there is no other qualification for this neurosis than that it be unwillingly received and unknown. Therefore a known „stuck flow“ at a person which he is not unwilling to receive does not cause a neurosis. Now as we make this „stuck flow“ unwillingly received, then unknown, and make it so that it bars out all back flows of whatever kind on any subject then we have psychosis.

As there are no other aspects than those of a thetan, we see at once that all neuroses and psychoses are exaggerated, concentrated abilities. The recipient, still trying to be cause, transfers himself to a false cause point. We call this dramatization. He seeks to do only the ability and no other. We have then a psychosis. As he can do no other thing, because he is

really unwilling and unknowing effect seeking to be cause by dramatizing the effect, he loses all the abilities but this one ability. This makes a peculiar and lopsided personality. People object to it partially because it is false cause and partially because it denies society all the other social abilities of the person. The psychotic himself is insufficiently willing or knowing about it to object to it.

Thus we have the standard Scientology method of eradicating one of those psychoses or neuroses. Actually we don't even use these words or admit them as any kind of irreparable state. We are not in such a business. We say we must find something the preclear can do and then improve it. Let us say that we find something the preclear can do knowingly and willingly and have the preclear do it to improve it. All you have to do is get him to reach toward the source of the cause of his condition. The lowest level cause of any difficulty is MEST, therefore the objective processes of Trio, locational, 8C, etc, work uniformly well since anybody here is to some degree the unwilling and unknowing effect of this universe.

Now where does the psychiatrist come into this? And why is he a bad fellow to have around in the society? Well in the first place, he is cognizant only of insanities. As every insanity is only an exaggerated and concentrated ability the psychiatrist can see in every ability an insanity.

There are no other aspects or abilities than those of a thetan. Any one of these can pressure, as detailed above, into an insanity. A psychiatrist or any other person totally associated with insanity then sees all abilities as a parade of insanities. Only where abilities are several and performed socially, not anti-socially, do we have sanity. The psychiatrist never, or rarely, inspects the sphere of sanity. To him, all things then, add up to madness, since every madness is compounded of abilities (disarranged as above).

Let us see a good example of this. „A“ is a fine statesman. He plays polo, has a satisfied wife, collects old cars, can do a good job of work as a carpenter, a fisherman and an ice skater. He reads detective stories and plays good poker. He is working on a plan privately to disentangle the Middle East and assist France. One day he is at his club and he is joined by „B“. „B“ is a political dilettante. He spends most of his money on maps and treatises about the Middle East. He cannot ride, sing or work and his family life is in ruins. He is obviously a neurotic at best. His ideas are disassociated, impractical but loud. Everyone at the club except „B“ knows „B“ is a poor risk.

„A“, the sane, versatile man, hears „B“, the neurotic, sounding off about the Middle East and saving France and how only „B“ could accomplish this. „A“, knowing „B's“ character, begins to wonder if he is crazy because he is interested in the middle east. In such a way, and in any line, the psychotic or neurotic is a sort of mockery of the sane ability.

Now, as an authority on man and insanity (but not an authority on sanity as is a Scientist) the psychiatrist, studying insane people runs across „B“. He classifies „B“ as a save-the-world type and notes that „B“ is fixated on France and the Middle East. Shortly thereafter the psychiatrist is called upon to render a decision about „A“. He looks in his book, finds „A“ is trying to do something about France and the Middle East and, of course classifies „A“ as insane.

Another case. George loves Norma. Norma is at first very impressed. George works hard, likes to hike, has some property he is fixing up at week-ends. Now along comes Oswald. Oswald says he loves Norma. Oswald says he is mad about Norma. This is, of course, the case. Oswald has big ideas but no job, wouldn't walk out of the building if it was on fire, gets rid of every piece of real or personal property that comes his way. George knows Oswald is „natty“. Oswald loves Norma. George begins to think he, George, must be crazy to love Norma because Oswald does.

As an authority on twisted and insane love, but not an authority on love, the psychiatrist examining Oswald finds he loves Norma's type of girl. Later, examining George, the psychiatrist finds that George is crazy because he loves the type of girl Norma is. Well, that's an exaggeration but you see where it goes. The psychiatrist, having noted that love was pretty well flung about in the insane wards, leaps to the conclusion that all love is insane because it is so common in the wards and founds in a flash of inspiration psychoanalysis which says all insanity derives from love.

We are held to mockery in all our loves and dreams by the neurotic and psychotic who specialize in mishandling these dreams and loves. And so the world goes mad.

It is not safe to have experts on insanity who are not also experts on sanity. Such persons as those who know only the insane eventually judge that everything man can do is insane and that all men are mad and then we get a society devoted entirely to the support of asylums until it is at last only an asylum itself.

The auditor should understand the mechanism behind neurosis and psychosis. He should draw it out for himself on a graph, showing cause and effect. He should understand that mechanism because it is the only thing there is to understand about neurotics and psychotics, for all else they do is gibberish and un-understandable.

If he truly understands this mechanism in all its phases then neurosis and psychosis can never make him an effect point and he can audit them with ease when he has to step out of character that far.

If the Scientologist thoroughly understands that the downfall of psychiatry which is now occurring came about because the psychiatrist never understood sanity then we won't have any future specialists in insanity beyond these data.

Society has long suspected versatility and the man of many skills. We should have realized there was something right with him.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-.rd

[PAB 144, *Psychosis, Neurosis and Psychiatrists*, 15 September 1958, is taken from this HCO B.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 FEBRUARY 1974
(Amended & Reissued 28 March 74
– only change is Series No.)

Remimeo

Expanded Dianetics Series 20

**SERVICE FACSIMILE THEORY
AND EXPANDED DIANETICS**

As a re-study of Service Facsimiles the following theory is released as background.

Note that this is background data for Class IV but is in actual practice used on Expanded Dianetics.

This sheds some light on Evil Purposes.

And a new approach comes to light for use in Expanded Dianetics.

None of this alters Class IV and none of it cancels or changes Class IV or earlier data.

AN OUTLINED NEW XDN RD

Service Facs By Dynamics and sections thereof.

How to be right on the _____ Dynamic Triple. (The exact Question needs to be worked out for various pcs.)

All L&N and therefore very dicey.

The theory is that a thetan even when pressed or suppressed to the absolute limit of near extinction will still try, even when “cooperating”, to some way be right.

A thetan cannot die. His only out is to try to stop something as he himself cannot stop living.

This gives rise to fixed ideas as he is trying to stop-therefore the ideas hold in time and continue.

His efforts to be right continue to stop *him* in a reverse flow.

This is true because he is already at near total effect. He also becomes the effect of his own fixed idea efforts to handle.

Just as a man being crushed by a house-size rock will still put his hands out to fend it off, so will a thetan continue to fend off his believed oppressions by stopping them.

Insistence on rightness is a last refuge of beingness. Thus one gets some very aberrated ones.

These he uses in situations where he thinks he might be found wrong.

These are called “Service Facsimiles”. “Service” because they “serve” him. “Facsimiles” because they are in mental image picture form. They explain his disabilities as well.

The facsimile part is actually a self-installed disability that “explains” how he is not responsible for not being able to cope. So he is not wrong for not coping.

Part of the “package” is to be right by making wrong.

The service facsimile is therefore a picture containing an explanation of self condition and also a fixed method of making others wrong.

A real handling would have to include:

- A. What disability he uses to explain how he is not responsible for not fully coping with life or given situations.
- B. A fixed postulate he uses to further assert that in actual fact he is still right.
- C. The computation as contained in B to make others wrong so as to be right.

Handling therefore would include:

- a. The disability R3 R Triple.
- b. L&N for a fixed postulate on each dynamic he uses to be right.
- c. A realization he is using this to make others wrong so he can be right.

All these conditions would have to be handled to fully handle a Service Fac to full EP.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ams.ntm.jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JANUARY AD10

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
HCO and HASI Staffs

JUSTIFICATION

When a person has committed an overt act and then withholds it, he or she usually employs the social mechanism of justification.

We have all heard people attempt to justify their actions and all of us have known instinctively that justification was tantamount to a confession of guilt. But not until now have we understood the exact mechanism behind justification.

Short of Scientology Auditing there was no means by which a person could relieve himself of consciousness of having done an overt act except to try to *lessen the overt*.

Some churches used a mechanism of confession. This was a limited effort to relieve a person of the pressure of his overt acts. Later the mechanism of confession was employed as a kind of blackmail by which increased contribution could be obtained from the person confessing. Factually this is a limited mechanism to such an extent that it can be extremely dangerous. Religious confession does not carry with it any real stress of responsibility for the individual but on the contrary seeks to lay responsibility at the door of the Divinity – a sort of blasphemy in itself. I have no axe to grind here with religion. Religion as religion is fairly natural. But psychotherapy must be in itself a completed fact or, as we all know, it can become a dangerous fact. That's why we flatten engrams and processes. Confession to be non-dangerous and effective must be accompanied by a full acceptance of responsibility. All overt acts are the product of irresponsibility on one or more of the dynamics.

Withholds are a sort of overt act in themselves but have a different source. Oddly enough we have just proven conclusively that man is basically good – a fact which flies in the teeth of old religious beliefs that man is basically evil. Man is good to such an extent that when he realizes he is being very dangerous and in error he seeks to minimize his power and if that doesn't work and he still finds himself committing overt acts he then seeks to dispose of himself either by leaving or by getting caught and executed. Without this computation Police would be powerless to detect crime – the criminal always assists himself to be caught. Why Police punish the caught criminal is the mystery. The caught criminal wants to be rendered less harmful to the society and wants rehabilitation. Well, if this is true then why does he not unburden himself? The fact is this: unburdening is considered by him to be an overt act. People withhold overt acts because they conceive that telling them would be another

overt act. It is as though Thetans are trying to absorb and hold out of sight all the evil of the world. This is wrong-headed, by withholding overt acts these are kept afloat in the universe and are themselves as withholds entirely the cause of continued evil. Man is basically good but he could not attain expression of this until now. Nobody but the individual could die for his own sins – to arrange things otherwise was to keep man in chains.

In view of these mechanisms, when the burden became too great man was driven to another mechanism – the effort to lessen the size and pressure of the overt. He or she could only do this by attempting to reduce the size and repute of the terminal. Hence, not-issness. Hence when a man or a woman has done an overt act there usually follows an effort to reduce the goodness or importance of the target of the overt. Hence the husband who betrays his wife must then state that the wife was no good in some way. Thus the wife who betrayed her husband had to reduce the husband to reduce the overt. This works on all dynamics. In this light most criticism is justification of having done an overt.

This does not say that all things are right and that no criticism anywhere is ever merited. Man is not happy. He is faced with total destruction unless we toughen up our postulates. And the overt act mechanism is simply a sordid game condition man has slipped into without knowing where he was going. So there are rightnesses and wrongnesses in conduct and society and life at large, but random, carping 1.1 criticism when not borne out in fact is only an effort to reduce the size of the target of the overt so that one can live (he hopes) with the overt. Of course to criticise unjustly and lower repute is itself an overt act and so this mechanism is not in fact workable.

Here we have the source of the dwindling spiral. One commits overt acts unwittingly. He seeks to justify them by finding fault or displacing blame. This leads him into further overts against the same terminals which leads to a degradation of himself and sometimes those terminals.

Scientologists have been completely right in objecting to the idea of punishment. Punishment is just another worsening of the overt sequence and degrades the punisher. But people who are guilty of overts demand punishment. They use it to help restrain themselves from (they hope) further violation of the dynamics. It is the victim who demands punishment and it is a wrong-headed society that awards it. People get right down and beg to be executed. And when you don't oblige, the woman scorned is sweet-tempered by comparison. I ought to know – I have more people try to elect me an executioner than you would care to imagine. And many a preclear who sits down in your pc chair for a session is there just to be executed and when you insist on making such a pc better, why you've had it, for they start on this desire for execution as a new overt chain and seek to justify it by telling people you're a bad auditor.

When you hear scathing and brutal criticism of someone which sounds just a bit strained, know that you have your eye on overts against that criticised person and next chance you get pull the overts and remove just that much evil from the world.

And remember, by and by, that if you make your pc write these overts and withholds down and sign them and send them off to me he'll be less reluctant to hold on to the shreds of them – it makes for a further blow of overts and less blow of pc. And always run responsibility on a pc when he unloads a lot of overts or just one.

We have our hands here on the mechanism that makes this a crazy universe so let's go for broke on it and play it all the way out.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 JULY 1964

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

SCIENTOLOGY III & IV

MORE JUSTIFICATIONS

The following list of Scientology Justifications was compiled by Phyll Stevens and several other Course Students and is issued to show how one can get around getting off an overt and stay sick from it.

L. RON HUBBARD

SOME FAMOUS JUSTIFICATIONS

It wasn't really an overt because....

- It wasn't me it was just my bank
- You can't hurt a thetan
- He was asking for a motivator
- He's got overts on me
- I've got a service fac on that
- His overts are bigger than mine
- My intentions were good
- He's a victim anyway
- I had by-passed charge
- I was just being self-determined
- I've come up to being overt
- It's better than suppressing
- I'll straighten it out next lifetime

- He must have done something to deserve it
- He was dragging it in
- I was in an ARC break
- He needed a lesson
- He'll have another lifetime anyway
- It's only a consideration anyhow
- It's not against my moral code
- Codes are only considerations
- They couldn't have it
- They weren't willing to experience it
- I don't see why I have to be the only one to take responsibility
- It's about time I was overt
- They are only wogs anyhow
- They are so way out they wouldn't realize it
- He's such a victim already, one more motivator won't make any difference
- They just can't have 8-C
- I can't help it if he reacts
- He's too critical
- He must have missed W/Hs
- Why should I limit my causativeness just because others can't take it
- It was my duty to tell the truth
- He must have postulated it first
- He never would have cognited if I hadn't told him
- I'll run it out later
- He'll be getting more auditing

LRH:nb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 APRIL 1965

Gen Non-Remimeo
HCO Sec Hat
D of P Hat
D of T Hat

HCO JUSTICE DATA RE ACADEMY & HGC

HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON
THE BASIS OF INSANITY

The suppressive person (whom we've called a Merchant of Fear or Chaos Merchant and which we can now technically call the *suppressive person*) can't stand the idea of Scientology. If people became better, the suppressive person would have lost. The suppressive person answers this by attacking covertly or overtly Scientology. This thing is, he thinks, his mortal enemy since it undoes his (or her) "good work" in putting people down where they should be.

There are three "operations" such a case seeks to engage upon regarding Scientology: (a) to disperse it, (b) to try to crush it and (c) to pretend it didn't exist.

Dispersal would consist of several things such as attributing its source to others and altering its processes or structure.

If you feel a bit dispersed reading this Policy Letter, then realize it is about a being whose whole "protective colouration" is to disperse others and so remain invisible. Such people generalize all entheta and create ARC Breaks madly.

The second (b) is done by covert or overt means. Covertly a suppressive person leaves the org door unlocked, loses the E-Meters, runs up fantastic bills, and energetically and unseen seeks to pull out the plug and get Scientology poured down the drain. We, poor fools, consider all this just "human error" or "stupidity". We rarely realize that such actions, far from being accidents, are carefully thought out. The proof that this is so is simple. If we run down the source of these errors we wind up with only one or two people in the whole group. Now isn't it odd that the *majority* of errors that kept the group enturbulated were attributable to a *minority* of persons present? Even a very "reasonable" person could not make anything else out of that except that it was very odd and indicated that the *minority* mentioned were interested in smashing the group and that the behaviour was not common to the whole group – meaning it isn't "normal" behaviour.

These people aren't Communists or Fascists or any other ists. They are just very sick people. They easily become parts of suppressive groups such as Communists or Fascists because these groups, like criminals, are suppressive.

The Suppressive Person is hard to spot because of the dispersal factor mentioned above. One looks at them and has his attention dispersed by their “everybody is bad”.

The Suppressive Person who is *visibly* seeking to knock out people or Scientology is easy to see. He or she is making such a fuss about it. The attacks are quite vicious and full of lies. But even here when the Suppressive Person exists on the “other side” of a potential trouble source, visibility is not good. One sees a case going *up* and *down*. On the other side of that case, out of the auditor’s view, is the Suppressive Person.

The whole trick they use is to generalize entheta. “Everybody is bad.” “The Russians are all bad.” “Everybody hates you.” “The People versus John Doe” on warrants. “The masses.” “The Secret Police will get you.”

Suppressive groups use the ARC Break mechanisms of generalizing entheta so it seems “everywhere”.

The Suppressive Person is a specialist in making others ARC Break with generalized entheta that is mostly lies.

He or she is also a no-gain-case.

So avid are such for the smashing of others by covert or overt means that their case is bogged *and won’t move under routine processing*.

The technical fact is that they have a huge problem, long gone and no longer known even to themselves which they use hidden or forthright vicious acts continually to “handle”. They do *not* act to solve the environment they are in. They are solving one environment, yesterday’s, in which they are stuck.

The only reason the insane were hard to understand is that they are handling situations which no longer exist. The situation probably existed at one time. They think they have to hold their own, with overts against a non-existent enemy to solve a non-existent problem.

Because their overts are continuous they have withholds.

Since such a person has withholds, he or she can’t communicate freely to as-is the block on the track that keeps them in some yesterday. Hence, a “no-case-gain”.

That alone is the way to locate a Suppressive Person. By viewing the case. Never judge such a person by their conduct. That is too difficult. Judge by no-case-gains. Don’t even use tests.

One asks these questions:

1. Will the person permit auditing at all? or
2. Does their history of routine auditing reveal any gains?

If (1) is “No”, one is safe to treat the person as suppressive. It is not always correct but it is always safe. Some errors will be made but it is better to make them than to take a chance on it. When people refuse auditing they are (a) a potential trouble source (connected to a Suppressive Person); (b) a person with a big discreditable withhold; (c) a Suppressive Person or

(d) have had the bad luck to be “audited” too often by a Suppressive Person or (e) have been audited by an untrained auditor or one “trained” by a Suppressive Person.

[The last category (e) (untrained auditor) is rather slight but (d) (audited by a Suppressive Person) can have been pretty serious, resulting in continual ARC Breaks during which auditing was pressed on without regard to the ARC Break.]

Thus there are several possibilities where somebody refuses auditing. One has to sort them out in an HGC and handle the right one. But HCO by policy simply treats the person with the same admin policy procedure as that used on a Suppressive Person and lets HGC sort it out. Get that difference – it’s “with the same admin policy procedure as” not “the same as”.

For treating a person “the same as” a Suppressive Person when he or she is not only adds to the confusion. One treats a real Suppressive Person pretty rough. One has to handle the bank.

As to (2) here is the real test and the only valid test: Does their history of routine auditing reveal any gains?

If the answer is **no** then *there* is your Suppressive Person, loud and very unclear!

That is the test.

There are several ways of detecting. When fair auditors or good ones have had to vary routine procedure or do unusual things on this case in an effort to make it gain, when there are lots of notes from Ds of P in the folder saying do this – do that – you know that this case was *trouble*.

This means it was one of three things: 1. a potential trouble source 2. a person with a big withhold 3. a Suppressive Person.

If despite all that trouble and care, the case did not gain – or if the case simply didn’t gain despite auditing no matter how many years or intensives, then you’ve caught your Suppressive Person.

That’s the boy. Or the girl.

This case performs continual calculating covert hostile acts damaging to others. This case puts the enturbulence and upset into the environment, breaks the chairs, messes up the rugs and spoils the traffic flow with “goofs” done intentionally.

One should lock criminals out of the environment if one wants security. But one first has to locate the criminal. Don’t lock everybody out because you can’t find the criminal.

The cyclic case (gains and collapses routinely) is connected to a Suppressive Person. We have policy on that.

The case that continually pleads “hold my hand I am so ARC broken” is just somebody with a big *withhold*, not an ARC Break.

The Suppressive Person just gets no-case-gain on routine student auditing.

This person is actively suppressing Scientology. If such will sit still and pretend to be audited the suppression is by hidden hostile acts which include:

1. Chopping up auditors;
2. Pretending withholds which are actually criticisms;
3. Giving out “data” about their past lives and/or whole track that really holds such subjects up to scorn and makes people who *do* remember wince;
4. Chopping up orgs;
5. Alter-ising technology to mess it up;
6. Spreading rumours about prominent persons in Scientology;
7. Attributing Scientology to other sources;
8. Criticizing auditors as a group;
9. Rolling up Dev-T, off policy, off origin, off line;
10. Giving fragmentary or generalized reports about entheta that cave people in – and isn’t actual;
11. Refusing to repair ARC Breaks;
12. Engaging in discreditable sexual acts (also true of potential trouble sources);
13. Reporting a session good when the pc went bad;
14. Reporting a session bad when the pc went up in tone;
15. Snapping terminals² with lecturers and executives to make critical remarks or spread ARC Break type “news” to them;
16. Failing to relay comm or report;
17. Making an org go to pieces (note one uses “making” not “letting”);
18. Committing small criminal acts around the org;
19. Making “mistakes” which get their seniors in trouble;
20. Refusing to abide by policy;
21. Non-compliance with instructions;
22. Alter-is of instructions or orders so that the programme fouls up;
23. Hiding data that is vital to prevent upsets;
24. Altering orders to make a senior look bad;
25. Organizing revolts or mass protest meetings;
26. Snarling about Justice.

² Comment by the Editor (Chris): A lecturer or exec are terminals (a source) someone making critical remarks or spreading ARCX type news, steals the attention of the group from the "source" to him/herself, i.e. makes himself the terminal. So it snaps the groups attention off of what was trying to be communicated and onto the other person. Or if no group is involved it causes a sudden shift of attention in the source.

And so on. One does not use the catalogue, however, one only uses this *one* fact – *no case gain by routine auditing over a longish period*.

This is the fellow that makes life miserable for the rest of us. This is the one who overworks executives. This is the auditor killer. This is the course enturbulator or pc killer.

There's the cancer. Burn it out.

In short, you begin to see that it's this one who is the only one who makes harsh discipline seem necessary. The rest of the staff suffers when one or two of these is present.

One hears a whine about "process didn't work" or sees an alter-is of tech. Go look. You'll find it now and then leads to a Suppressive Person inside or outside the org.

Now that one knows who it is, one can handle it.

But more than that, I can now crack this case!

The technology is useful in all cases, of course. But only this cracks the "no-gain-case".

The person is in a mad, howling situation of some yesteryear and is "handling it" by committing overt acts today. I say condition of yesteryear but the case thinks it's *today*.

Yes, you're right. They are nuts. The spin bins are full of either them or their victims. There's no other real psycho in a spin bin!

What? That means we've cracked insanity itself? That's right. And it's given us the key to the Suppressive Person and his or her effect on the environment. *This* is the multitude of "types" of insanity of the 19th century psychiatrist. All in one. Schizophrenia, paranoia, fancy names galore. Only one other type exists – the person the Suppressive Person got "at". This is the "manic-depressive" a type who is up one day and down the next. This is the Potential Trouble Source gone mad. But these are in a minority in the spin bin, usually put there by Suppressive Persons and not crazy at all! The real mad ones are the Suppressive Persons. They are the only psychos.

Over simplification? No indeed. I can prove it! We could empty the spin bins now. If we want to. But we have better uses for technology than saving a lot of Suppressive Persons who themselves act only to scuttle the rest of us.

You see, when they get down to no-case-gain where a routine process won't bite, they can no longer as-is their daily life so it all starts to stack up into a horror. They "solve" this horror by continuous covert acts against their surroundings and associates. After a while the covert ones don't seem to hold off the fancied "horror" and they commit some senseless violence in broad daylight – or collapse – and so they can get identified as insane and are lugged off to the spin bin.

Anybody can "get mad" and bust a few chairs when a Suppressive Person goes too far. But there's traceable sense to it. Getting mad doesn't make a madman, it's damaging actions

that have no sensible detectable reasons that's the trail of madness. Any thetan can get angry. Only a madman damages without reason.

All actions have their lower scale discreditable mockery. The difference is, does one get over his anger? The no-case-gain of course can't. He or she stays misemotional and adds each new burst to the fire. It never gets less. It grows. And a long way from all Suppressive Persons are violent. They are more likely to look resentful.

A Suppressive Person can get to one solid *dispassionate* state of damaging things. Here is the accident prone, the home wrecker, the group wrecker.

Now here one must realize something. The Suppressive Person finds outlet for his or her unexpressed rage by carefully needling those they are connected with into howling anger.

You see the people around them get dragged into this long gone incident by mistaken identity. And it is a maddening situation to be continually mix-identified, accused, worked on, doubled crossed. For one is *not* the being the Suppressive Person supposes. The Suppressive Person's world is pretty hard to live around. And even ordinarily cheerful people often blow up under the strain.

So be careful who you call the Suppressive Person. The person connected with a Suppressive Person is *liable to be only visible rage in sight!*

You have some experience of this – the mousey little woman who rarely changes expression and is so righteous connected to somebody who now and then goes into a frenzy.

How to tell them apart? Easy! Just ask this question:

Which gets a case gain easily?

Well, it's even simpler than that! Put the two on an E-Meter. Don't do anything but read the dial and needle. The Suppressive one has the high stuck T.A. The other has a lower T.A. Simple?

Not all Suppressive Persons have *high* T.A. The T.A. can be anywhere especially very low (1.0). But the needle is weird. It is stuck tight or it RSeS without reason (the pc wearing no rings to cause an RS).

Suppressive Persons also can have the "dead" thetan clear read!

You see people *around* a Suppressive Person Q and A and disperse. They seek to "get even" with the Suppressive Person and often exhibit the same symptoms *temporarily*.

Sometimes *two* Suppressive Persons are found together. So one can't always say which is the Suppressive Person in a pair. The usual combination is the Suppressive Person and the Potential Trouble Source.

However you don't need to guess about it or observe their conduct.

For this poor soul can no longer as-is easily. Too many overt. Too many withholds. Stuck in an incident that they call "present time". Handling a problem that does not exist. Supposing those around are the personnel in their own delirium.

They look all right. They sound reasonable. They are often clever. But they are solid poison. They can't as-is anything. Day by day their pile grows. Day by day their new overts and withholds pin them down tighter. They aren't here. But they sure can wreck the place.

There is the *true* psycho.

And he or she is dying before your very eyes. Kind of horrible.

The resolution of the case is a clever application of problems processes, never O/W. What *was* the condition? How did you handle it? is the key type of process.

I don't know what the percentage of these are in a society. I know only that they made up about 10% of any group so far observed. The data is obscured by the fact that they ARC Break others and make them misemotional – thus one of them seems to be, by contagion, half a dozen such.

Therefore simple inspection of conduct does not reveal the Suppressive Person. Only a case folder puts the seal on it. No-Case-Gain by routine processes.

However this test too may soon become untrustworthy for now we can crack them by a special approach. However we will also generally use the same approach on routine cases as it makes cases go upward fast and we may catch the Suppressive Person accidentally and cure him or her before we are aware of it.

And that would be wonderful.

But still we'll have such on our lines in Justice matters from now on. So it's good to know all about them, how they are identified, how to handle.

HCO must handle such cases as per the HCO Justice Codes on Suppressive Acts when they blow Scientology or seek to suppress Scientologists or orgs. One should study up on these.

The Academy should be careful of this and report them to HCO promptly (as they would potential trouble sources or withholds that won't be delivered). The Academy *must not* fool about with Suppressive Persons. It's a sure way to deteriorate a course and cave in students.

POLICY

When an Academy finds it has a Potential Trouble Source, a “withholdy case that ARC Breaks easily” or a Suppressive Person enrolled on a course or a blow the Academy *must* call for HCO Department of Inspection & Reports, Justice section. This can be any HCO personnel available, even the HCO Sec.

The HCO representative must wear some readily identified HCO symbol and must take a report sheet with a carbon copy on a clip board.

HCO must have present other staff adequate to handle possible physical violence.

The student, if still present, must be taken to a place where an interview will not stop or enturbulate a class, by Tech Division personnel. This can be any Tech Division office, empty auditing room or empty classroom. The point is to localize the commotion and not stir up the whole Tech Division.

If Tech Division personnel is not available HCO can recruit “other staff” anywhere by simply saying “HCO requires you” and taking them into the interview place.

HCO has a report sheet for such matters, original and one copy for Justice files.

The HCO representative calls for the student’s folder and looks it over quickly for TA action. If there is none (less than 10 divs/sess) that’s it. It is marked on the report sheet, “No TA action in auditing” or “Little TA”. HCO is not interested in what processes were run. Or why there is no TA. If the course requires no meters the folder is inspected for alter-is (which denotes a rough pc) or no case changes.

If there are no TA notations in the folder HCO should put the person on a meter, making sure the person is not wearing a ring. One asks no questions, merely reads the TA position and notes the needle and marks these in the report sheet. The Tone Arm will be very high (5 or above) or very low (2 or less) or dead thetan (2 or 3) and the needle would be an occasional RS or stuck or sticky if the person is a Suppressive Person. This is noted in the report sheet.

If the folder or the student in question says he has had no case gain this is again confirming of a Suppressive Person.

If two of these three points (folder, meter, statement) indicate a Suppressive Person, HCO is looking for *two* possible students when so called in – the one who caused the upset and that student’s coach or student’s auditor. There very likely may be a Suppressive Person on the course that is not this student. Therefore one looks for that one too, the second one.

If a bit of questioning seems to reveal that the student’s auditor was responsible, test that student too, and enter it on a second HCO report form. And order the other one to auditing at the student’s own expense.

In short be alert. There’s been an upset. There may be other persons about who caused it. Don’t just concentrate on the student. There is a condition on the course that causes upsets. That is really all one knows.

When one walks in on it, find out why and what.

If the HCO tests indicate some doubt about either student being a Suppressive Person, HCO asks about a possible withhold and enters any result on the sheet and sends the students and sheet separately to the Tech Division, Dept of Estimation. The procedure is the same for a Suppressive Person but is “a withholdy pc who ARC Breaks easily” or simply “a withholdy pc” if no ARC Breaks are noted. “Auditing recommended”.

But there is a third category for which HCO is very alert in this interview. And that is the **Potential Trouble Source**.

For this person may only be audited further if he or she disconnects or handles the Suppressive Person or group to which he or she is connected and can’t be sent to the HGC or back to the course either until the status is cleared up.

If this seems the case, there is no point in continuing the person in the Tech Division and HCO takes over fully, applying the policy related to Potential Trouble Sources.

This type of case will probably not be dangerous but quite co-operative, and probably dazed by having to *do* something about his situation. He or she has been hammered with invalidation by a Suppressive Person and may be rather wobbly but if the Justice steps are taken exactly on policy there should be no trouble. HCO can take a Potential Trouble Source (but never a Suppressive Person) out of the Tech Division premises and back to HCO to complete such briefing. Remember, it is all one to us if the Potential Trouble Source handles it or not. Until it's handled or disconnected we don't want it around as it's just more trouble and the person will cave in if audited under those conditions (connected to a Suppressive Person or group).

A Suppressive Person found in an Academy is ordered to HGC processing always. And always at his or her own expense.

If the Suppressive Person won't buy auditing, or co-operate, HCO follows steps A to E in policy on Suppressive Persons in the Justice Codes; HCO may be assisted in this by Tech personnel.

The point is, the situation must be handled fully there and then. The student buys his auditing or gets A to E. There is *no* "We'll put you on probation in the course and if..." because I've not found it to work. Auditing or Suppressive Person A to E. Or both.

THE BLOWN STUDENT

The student however may have blown off the premises or he has gone entirely. On a minor, momentary blow, where all it took was the student's auditor and a few words to get the student back, the matter is not a real blow.

But where the student leaves the premises in a blow or doesn't turn up for class, the Tech Division must send an Instructor and the student's auditor over to HCO Department of Inspection and Reports. An HCO representative should go with them at once to pick up the student.

The student is brought back with as little public commotion as possible and the procedure of HCO checkout, etc is followed as above.

THE GONE STUDENT

Where the student can't be gotten back (or in all such cases) the real cause may be a Suppressive Person in the Course itself, not the blown student or the upset student.

If the Suppressive Person is on the course (and is not the blown student) HCO will want to know this. In all such cases the one who caused the [enturbulated³] environment may not be the culprit.

The HCO representative calls for the blown student's case folder and looks for TA. If there is none or for some reason the student wasn't audited, or if no meters were used on that course, HCO seeks to find out what the case's responses were to processing.

If the case seemed to change or improve yet the student is gone, HCO looks over the blown student's ex-auditor for suppressive characteristics such as satisfaction the pc blew, critical statements about tech or instructors, case rough or difficult, lies about the circumstances, etc. and if such signs are present, HCO orders the blown student's ex-auditor to the HGC at the student's own expense.

If this interview with the blown student's auditor seems to indicate a Suppressive Person beyond any doubt HCO orders the student to the HGC at the student's own expense.

The blown student's course auditor will not be found usually to be a Potential Trouble Source as these are seldom bad or rough auditors, so questions about this possibility don't really apply.

But if this student (the blown student's auditor) is Suppressive, it's HGC or A to E. If the student gives on A to E he or she may be returned to course or to the HGC as HCO deems best.

In all such cases where a Suppressive Person is found, watch out for legal repercussions by having reliable witnesses present during such negotiations or upsets and take liberal notes for possible Comm Ev. This is why there also must be an HCO representative handling it.

If there is no agreement to be audited and the student who is found to be a Suppressive Person will not respond to A to E (because student has blown and can't be found or because the student flatly refuses), the student is considered terminated.

A waiver or quit claim is given or sent the student stating:

Date:

Place:

I having refused to abide by the Codes of (name and place of org) do hereby waive any further rights I may have as a Scientologist and in return for my course fee of I do hereby quit any claim I may have on (name of org) or any Scientologist personnel or any person or group or organization of Scientology.

³ Editor's note

Signed

2 Witnesses

Only when this is signed the student may have his course fee returned, but no other fees as he accepted that service.

The ex-student should realize this makes him Fair Game and outside our Justice Codes. He may not have recourse of any kind beyond refund. And after signing can only return to Scientology as per policy on Fair Game.

The HGC audits such a Suppressive Person sent to it on special processes specially issued by HCO B for Suppressive Persons. It will be found that adherence to these policies will make Academies very calm.

Note: Nothing in this policy letter waives or sets aside any policy concerning the auditing of known institutional cases in an HGC. Persons with histories of institutionalized insanity may not be audited in HGC.

L. RON HUBBARD

P.S. If you've wondered if you are a Suppressive Person while reading this – you aren't! A Suppressive Person never does wonder, not for a moment! **They know they're sane!**

LRH:wmc.cden

Cancellation of Fair Game: The practice of declaring people **Fair Game** will cease. **Fair Game** may not appear on any Ethics Order. It causes bad public relations. This P/L does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an SP. [From HCO P/L 21 October 1968, Volume 1, page 489.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 AUGUST 1965

Remimeo
Ethics Hats
Executive Hats

**SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS,
MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF**

It is interesting in the detection of Suppressive Persons that they use “policy” to prevent purpose.

In one org which went into a serious decline a Suppressive Person was in a high position.

Every time org personnel returned from Saint Hill and proposed that the org get going, they were told by this SP that their proposals were “against policy”.

Not one of these people, hearing this, ever alerted to a glaring fact. The SP in this case was renowned for never being able to pass a bulletin, tape or policy letter!

So how would that person have known **what** was against policy for that person **never** was known to pass a hat check!

So that person’s statement that, “it’s against policy” was obviously false since the person was incapable of passing hat checks or bulletins and wouldn’t ever have known what any policy was for or against anything.

Thus we see one of the characteristics of an SP is:

- 1. The negation of policy without knowing it and the use of “policy” to prevent success in Scientology is the primary tool of the SP against orgs.**

Dissemination is a prime target of the SP.

Magazines ordinarily have half a dozen SPs on their lines. These people write in and complain about ads. If you don’t watch it these half dozen become “everybody” and the mag is beaten down into not advertising.

“Soft sell” is another recommendation of the SP.

And “build it quietly” and “get only decent people” are all part of this.

When somebody is demanding less reach, that person is an SP.

Therefore we have another characteristic:

2. SPs recommend ineffective dissemination and find fault with any being done.

A Suppressive will try to sell off the property or buildings of an org and in one case tried to give them away when temporarily in charge.

3. A suppressive will try to get rid of an org.

Good staff members are a prime target for SPs. In one org where an SP got a foothold 60% of the staff was gotten rid of and the org almost crashed.

They do it by making people too dissatisfied to produce and so make it impossible for the org to earn.

4. An SP will seek to upset and get rid of the best staff members.

Bad news, particularly if false, is the only comm line of the SP.

The executive who is getting bad news as a steady diet on his lines has SPs about.

5. Entheta is the sole stock in trade of the SP.

The triumph an SP feels in not getting rid of things the auditor has tried to ease is quite malevolent.

6. An SP is satisfied with auditing only when he gets worse.

7. SPs are happy when their pcs get worse and sad when their pcs get better.

8. An SP in an examiner post will only declare released the bad result cases and will not pass actual releases but will ARC break them.

9. Covert invalidation is the level of an SP's social intercourse.

An SP can only restimulate another, he has no power of his own.

10. An SP deals only in restimulation, never easing or erasing.

11. The persons around an SP get so restimulated they can't detect the real SP.

The whole rationale of the SP is built on the belief that if anyone got better, the SP would be for it as the others could overcome him then.

He is fighting a battle he once fought and never stopped fighting. He is in an incident. Present time people are mistaken by him for past, long gone enemies.

Therefore he never really knows what he is fighting in present time, so just fights.

12. The SP is sure everyone is against him personally and if others became more powerful they would dispose of him.

The SP usually commits continuing overt. These are hidden.

I have had two or three SPs blow up and shout or snarl at me. When I investigated I found, in these cases, they were committing daily crimes of some magnitude.

13. An SP commits hidden overt continuously.

-
14. Back of a crime you will find SP characteristics.

-
15. Because an SP uses generalities in his speech “everybody” “they”, etc., the SP is hard to detect.

SPs have an experiential track that is poor. SPs know how to needle and commit overt and hold others back.

When released, the SP has so little decent background experience that he or she has a very hard time.

16. Releasing an SP does not make a worthwhile person. It only makes a person who can now learn to get along in life.

“A cleared cannibal is a cleared cannibal.”

SPs don’t get case gains. Sometimes they pretend them. They are held back by their continuing overt. If we were found by them to be decent, their past conduct would swell up and engulf them.

They are in a continued PTP of their fight with Mankind. And they follow the rule that pcs with PTPs get no case gains.

Real SPs comprise about 2½ per cent of the population. By restimulating others they make another 17½ per cent into Potential Trouble Sources. Therefore about 20% of the population is Ethics type.

We must not allow this 20% to prevent the 80% from crossing the bridge.

We are no enemy of the SP. But he can't have friends, can he?

So we handle the SP and his PTS's and carry on with our job.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mh.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 DECEMBER 1973

Remimeo
All Levels
Add Level II Checksheet
Ethics Officers
Masters at Arms
C/Ses

**THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H
AND CONTINUOUS OVERT
WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS
AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS**

Reference: (1) Tape List and HCOB List of Level II,
Page 4 HCO PL 26.1.72, Issue VI, concerning Withholds and Overts.
(2) "Admin Know-How – Alter-Is and Degraded Beings", HCO B 22 Mar 67.

There are two *special* cases of withholds and overts. They do not occur in all cases by a long ways. But they do occur on a few cases. These are **Continuous Missed Withholds and Continuous Overts**.

This is not quite the same as "The Continuing Overt Act" HCO B 29 September 65. In that type the person is repeating overt acts against something usually named.

THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H

A Continuous Missed Withhold occurs when a person feels some way and anyone who sees him misses it.

Example: A doctor feels very unconfident of his skill. Every patient who sees him misses the fact that he is not confident. This reacts as a missed withhold.

It is of course based upon some bad incident that destroyed his confidence (usually of an engramic intensity).

But as the person actively withholds this, then those seeing him miss the withhold.

This could work in thousands of variations. A woman feels continuous disdain for her child but withholds it. The child therefore continuously misses a withhold. All the phenomena of the missed w/h would continuously react against the child.

Probably all dishonest social conduct brings about a Continuous Missed Withhold. The politician who hates people, the minister who no longer believes in God, the mechanic who privately believes he is a jinx on machinery, these all then set up the phenomena of missed withholds on themselves and can dramatize it in their conduct.

THE CONTINUOUS OVERT

A person who believes he is harmful to others may also believe that many of his common ordinary actions are harmful.

He may feel he is committing a Continuous Overt on others.

Example: A clothing model believes she is committing a fraud on older women by displaying clothing to them in which they will look poorly. In her estimation this is a Continuous Overt Act. Of course all older women miss it on her.

Appearance, just being alive, can be considered by some as an overt.

Missed withhold phenomena will result.

DEGRADED BEINGS

The Continuous Withhold and Continuous Overt are probably a basis of feeling degraded.

Degraded Beings, as described in "Admin Know-How – Alter-Is and Degraded Beings", HCO B 22 Mar 67, are that way at least in part because they have some Continuous Missed Withhold or a fancied Continuous Overt Act.

This makes them feel degraded and act that way.

HANDLING

One can add to any program a check for a Continuous Missed Withhold or Continuous Overt as an additional version of rudiments.

A master question, which could be broken down into three lists which would have to be done by the laws of L&N, would be, "When anyone looks at you what feeling (action, attitude) of yours do they miss?" Then, "When was it missed?" "Who missed it?" and "What did he do that made you believe it had been missed?"

Another approach, less dangerous in that lists aren't made, would be:

For Continuous Missed Withhold the question could be, "Is there some way you feel that others don't realize?" And with 2WC uncover it. Then ask, "Who misses this?" with answer, followed by, "When has someone missed it?" with E/S to an earlier time. Followed by,

“What did he (or she) do that made you think he (or she) knew?” This will key it out and can change behavior.

For Continuous Overt Act it would be, “Is there something you do that others do not know about?” With 2WC to cover it and get what it is. Then ask, “Who has not found out about it?” with an answer. And then, “When did someone almost find out?” “What did he (or she) do that made you think he (or she) knew?”

Each of the above questions should be F/Ned.

MOTION

People who have Continuous Withholds or Overts tend to be very slow, flabby and impositive. They have to be very careful. And they make mistakes. Slowness or robotness are keys to the presence of Continuous Missed Withholds or Overts.

PTS

Quite often a case is **falsely labeled PTS** when in fact it is really a matter of Continuous Missed Withholds and Continuous Overts.

When a “PTS” person does not respond to PTS handling easily then you know you are dealing with Continuous Missed Withholds and/or Continuous Overts.

SUMMARY

These conditions are not present in all cases. When they are you have a Degraded Being. When a “PTS” person does not respond to PTS handling, try Continuous Missed Withholds and Continuous Overts. You can prevent blows, handle much HE and R and change character in this way.

LRH:nt.rd

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Remimeo
Class VIIIs
Class VIII Chksheet

C/S Series 22

PSYCHOSIS

Through a slight change of procedure on certain preclears I have been able to view the underlying motives and mechanisms of psychosis.

Very possibly this is the first time the mechanisms which bring about insanity have been fully viewed. I must say that it requires a bit of confronting.

The alleviation of the condition of insanity has also been accomplished now and the footnote in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* concerning future research into this field can be considered fulfilled.

The things a C/S should know about insanity are as follows:

HIGHER PERCENT

About 15% to 20% of the human race apparently is insane or certainly a much higher percent than was estimated.

The truly insane do not necessarily act insane visibly. They are not the psychiatric obvious cases who go rigid for years or scream for days. This is observed only in the last stages or during temporary stress.

Under apparent social behavior the continual crimes knowingly committed by the insane are much more vicious than ever has been catalogued in psychiatric texts.

The actions of the insane are not "unconscious". They are completely aware of what they are doing.

All insane actions are entirely justified and seem wholly rational to them. As they have no reality on the harmful and irrational nature of their conduct it does not often register on an E-Meter.

The product of their post duties is destructive but is excused as ignorance or errors.

As cases in normal processing they roller coaster continually.

They nearly always have a fixed emotional tone. It does not vary in nearly all insane people. In a very few it is cyclic, high then low.

All characteristics classified as those of the “suppressive person” are in fact those of an insane person.

The easiest ways for a C/S to detect the insane are:

1. Pretending to do a post or duties, the real consistent result is destructive to the group in terms of breakage, lost items, injured business, etc.
2. The case is no case gain or roller coaster and is covered under “PTS symptoms”.
3. They are usually chronically physically ill.
4. They have a deep but carefully masked hatred of anyone who seeks to help them.
5. The result of their “help” is actually injurious.
6. They often seek transfers or wish to leave.
7. They are involved in warfare with conflicts around them which are invisible to others. One wonders how they can be so involved or get so involved in so much hostility.

TYPES

The German psychiatric 1500 or so “different types of insanity” are just different symptoms of the same cause. There is only one insanity and from it springs different manifestations. Psychiatry erred in calling these different types and trying to invent different treatments.

DEFINITION

Insanity can now be precisely defined.

The definition is:

Insanity is the overt or covert but always complex and continuous determination to harm or destroy.

Possibly the only frightening thing about it is the cleverness with which it can be hidden.

Whereas a sane person can become angry or upset and a bit destructive for short periods, he or she recovers. The insane mask it, are misemotional continuously and do not recover. (Except by modern processing.)

THE NATURE OF MAN

Man is basically good. This is obvious. For when he begins to do evil he seeks to destroy his memory in order to change and seeks to destroy his body. He seeks to check his evil impulses by inhibiting his own skill and strength.

He can act in a very evil fashion but his basic nature then makes it mandatory that he lessens himself in many ways.

The towering “strength” of a madman is a rarity and is compensated by efforts at self-destruction.

Man’s mortality, his “one life” fixation, all stem from his efforts to check himself, obliterate his memory in a fruitless effort to change his conduct and his self-destructive habits and impulses and losses of skills and abilities.

As this rationale proves out completely in processing and fits all cases observed, we have for the first time proof of his actual nature.

As only around 20% are insane, and as those who previously worked in the mental field were themselves mainly insane, Man as a whole has been assigned an evil repute. Governments, where such personalities exist, listen to the opinion of the insane and apply the characteristic of 20% to the entire hundred percent.

This gives an 80% wrong diagnosis. Which is why mental science itself was destructive when used by states.

TECHNIQUES

The only technique available at this writing which will benefit the insane is contained in all the overt-motivator sequences and Grade II technology.

At Flag at this writing new improvement on this exists but it is so powerful that slight errors in use can cause a psychotic break in the insane. It therefore will only be exported for use by specially trained persons and this programming will require quite a while.

Meanwhile it helps the C/S to know and use these firm rules:

Always run Dianetic Triples.

Never run Singles. The overt side (Flow 2) is vital. If you only run Flow 1 Motivators, the pc will not recover fully. Further running Flow 1 (Motivator only) any psychotic being processed will not recover but may even trigger into a psychotic break. If one never ran anything but motivators, psychotic manifestations would not erase.

Depend on Expanded Grade II technology to ease off or handle the insane.

Don’t keep asking what’s been done to him as he’ll trigger.

A new discovery on this is that when you run out the motivator the person gets a higher reality on his overt. If you ran out all his motivators he would have no reason for his overt. If these are not then run out he might cave himself in.

PATTERN OF BEHAVIOR

The **apparent** pattern of insane behavior is to come in (ask for processing, go on staff, etc) with the advertised intention of being helped or helping, then mess up either as a pc or on post, then state how bad it all is and leave. It looks obvious enough. He came, found it bad, left.

That is only the **apparent** behavior. **Apparent reasons.**

Based on numerous cases, this is the real cycle. Hearing of something good that might help these hateful awful rotten nasty people, the psycho comes in, wrecks this, upsets that, caves in this one, chops up that one and **When somebody says “No!”** the psychotic either

- (a) Caves himself in physically or
- (b) Runs away.

The psychotic is motivated by intent to harm.

If he realizes he is harming things he shouldn't, he caves himself in. If he is afraid he will be found out, he runs.

In the psychotic the impulse is quite conscious.

CONCLUSION

None of this is very nice. It is hard to confront. Even I find it so.

Freud thought all men had a hidden monster in them for he dealt mainly with the psychotic and their behavior was what he saw.

All men are not like this. The percentage that are is greater than I supposed but is a long way from all men.

Sometimes one only becomes aware of these when things are getting worked on and improved. They stay on as long as it can be made bad or there is hope it can be destroyed. Then when attention is given to improvement they blow.

Artists, writers often have these types hanging around them as there is someone or something there to be destroyed. When success or failure to destroy or possible detection appears on the scene they blow, often as destructively as possible.

Orgs are subjected to a lot of this. A psychotic sometimes succeeds in blowing off good staff. And then sooner or later realizes how evil he is acting and sickens or leaves.

The society is not geared to any of this at all. The insane walk around wrecking the place and decent people think it's "human nature" or "inevitable" or a "bad childhood".

As of this writing the insane can be handled. The proof of any pudding is the processing. And this is successful. It is also rather swift. But, as I say, it is so swift the special technique has to be done by the specially trained flubless auditor.

For a long while I've realized that we would have to be able to handle insane people as the psychiatrist is fading. I have had opportunity to work on the problem. And have it handled. Until it is fully released, the C/S will benefit greatly from knowing the above as these come on his lines far more often than he has suspected.

The insane can be helped. They are not hopeless.

I trust this data will be of use.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rr.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 MAY 1977
Issue II

Remimeo
Ex Dn Course
Ex Dn Auditors
Ex Dn C/Ses

Expanded Dianetics Series 29

PSYCHOSIS, MORE ABOUT

(Excerpted from HCOB 17 June 1971)

All aberration is to a greater or lesser degree nonsurvival.

To be rid of major aberrations is to have a new life.

To understand this one must understand the most severe aberration which is psychosis.

The actual basis of all psychosis is motive. It is **not** competence or incompetence.

Below all psychotic conduct lies an evil purpose.

Because psychiatry and psychology did not have this single technical fact they defined psychosis as "incompetence," had the wrong target and so could not and never did understand psychosis and were thereby led into atrocities such as shocks and brain surgery and, in the country where these subjects originated (Germany), slaughtered 300,000 insane in gas chambers some time before Hitler came to power.

A true psychotic can be brilliant or stupid, competent or incompetent. It is his general motive or purpose that determines whether or not he is insane or sane.

Famous psychotics like Napoleon, Ivan the Terrible, Stalin and Hitler were all quite brilliant yet wound up destroying everything in sight including their own people.

They had a destructive basic purpose. Every psychotic has one. It is usually covert, hidden, but in full play against his unsuspecting friends.

The sole difference in motive is whether it is destructive or constructive.

Everyone has a basic purpose. The psychotic has a destructive one.

The test of a personality then, is whether the result of a person's activity is destructive or constructive.

Man is basically good. When he finds he is being too destructive he recognizes he is bad for others and seeks to leave. He will also try to become less powerful, ill or to kill himself.

The progress of psychosis then begins with a belief something is evil. This is followed with an effort to stop it. This stop becomes general. A basic purpose is then formed which contains an evil intent.

The being then goes on from disaster to disaster, seeking overtly or covertly to destroy everything around him.

At a guess about 15% to 25% of living human beings are psychotic and bring covert disaster to those around them and themselves.

The evil purpose is expressed by committing harmful acts and withholding them.

Ordinary overt/withhold processes, as in Grade II Expanded, can handle this condition providing the person can be audited and providing the evil purpose is also brought to view.

About one-third of the psychotics handled in this way recover their sanity fully and lead constructive decent lives. Two-thirds are either so far gone or irresponsible hard to audit that they improve but are of little use.

Those already subjected to the brutalities of psychiatric “treatment” or psychological “counseling” are the most difficult.

Those who have been on drugs, particularly LSD 25 as developed by psychiatry “so their nurses would be able to experience what being insane feels like” around 1950, are very difficult cases.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Excerpted by

FMO 1709 I/C

LRH:RS:lf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 AUGUST 1976

Remimeo
All Sec Checkers
All HCO Personnel
All Meter Operators

R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN

(INTEGRITY PROCESSING CHECKSHEETS)
(PTS PROCESSING CHECKSHEETS)
(EXPANDED DIANETICS CHECKSHEETS)
(METER OPERATION CHECKSHEETS)
(VARIOUS RUNDOWN CHECKSHEETS)

The violent left right ragged motion of the needle which sometimes occurs on a pc's meter is called "A Rockslam" or "R/S." The term was taken from a process in the 50s which sought to locate "A rock" on the pc's early timetrack; the "slam" is a description of the needle violence, meaning it "slams" back and forth. For a time all left right motions of the needle were considered and called "Rockslams" until it was found that a *smooth* left right flow was a symptom of release or key out and this became the "Floating Needle." There is yet another left right motion of the needle called the "Theta Bop." This occurs when the person has or is trying to exteriorize. "Theta" is the symbol for the person as a spirit or goodness; "bop" is an electronic term for a slight hitch in the sweep of a needle. A "Theta Bop" hitches evenly at each end of the sweep left and right and is very even in the middle of the sweep.

Neither the "Floating Needle" nor the "Theta Bop" can be confused with a "Rockslam." The difference of the Rockslam is uneven, ragged agitation left and right; even the distances traveled left and right are likely to be different in each swing from the last.

A "Rockslam" can be caused sometimes by leaving rings on the pc's fingers or by a short circuit in the meter or by the cans (electrodes) touching something like a dress. These are the mechanical considerations and must be ruled out before the pc can be considered to have "Rockslammed." If the pc is not wearing rings and if the meter needle is calm with the lead unplugged, if the lead is okay, and if the pc is not jiggling the ends of the cans against his clothes, then the pc's Rockslam is caused by the pc's bank.

One has to be very careful about the correctness of the pc actually having Rockslammed while on the meter that it was actually observed, that it was not mechanically caused as above. One puts the R/S down on the worksheet and also gives exactly what was asked. And also that the mechanical points were checked without distracting the pc.

One must always report a Rockslam in the auditing report, note it with session date and page inside the left cover of the pc's folder and report it to ethics including the question or subject which rockslammed, phrased exactly.

Why? Because the Rockslam is the most important needle manifestation! It gives the clue to the pc's case.

In 1970 I began a full-scale research project into the subject of insanity and its relationship to cases and case gains and suppression. It was only then that the full significance of the Rockslam was unearthed. This research developed into what is now called **Expanded Dianetics**, a series of special processes and actions with their drills and training which permits the auditor to handle a specific case type. This was, by the way, Man's first system of positive detection and handling of psychosis and the first full understanding of what psychosis is.

While this bulletin is not in any way a two minute course in or a substitute for full training in Expanded Dianetics, any auditor who audits, sec checks, or handles people on a meter has to know what a Rockslam is and how it behaves and what he should do about it.

The first thing is to be able to recognize one and to quickly with the scan of the eye and unplug of the meter cord (without any distraction of or notice by the pc) make the checks for a mechanical Rockslam as given above.

You can make a meter "Rockslam" with no pc or cord connected to it by (a) turning it on; (b) put the sensitivity at perhaps 2; (c) put the needle at "set"; (d) rapidly, very rapidly, move the TA back and forth maybe a quarter of an inch and do it unevenly. *That*, if you did it very fast and unevenly, would be something that resembled a Rockslam. But no matter how fast you made your fingers move, a real R/S is a trifle faster. If you do that you will see what an R/S looks like. The needle in this experiment is not made to hit the sides of the meter.

Now if you take the same setup and smoothly slowly move the tone arm back and forth about 2 times a second without any roughness and the same distance right and left, you will have a Floating Needle. Note it very well as this comes at a time of release and is the thing a good auditor hopes to see and gives him the end-off signal for a process. It has to be well known as you **never** bypass one in a session and to do so makes an uncomfortable pc. (The pc will often cognite – and get a realization about himself or life at this point and one does not stop him from doing this.) This is the thing you indicate to the pc. You don't ever indicate Rockslams or Theta Bops. When you see it and, without stopping or interrupting the pc's cognition, you always say, "Your needle is floating."

Now the Theta Bop can also be shown to yourself by you. Set up the meter as above. Only this time, you smoothly swing it to the right and give it a tiny twitch in the same direction. Then you smoothly, at once, swing it to the left and give it a tiny twitch in the same direction. Then do it to the right. And so on. This is a Theta Bop. It is different than a Floating Needle only in that it hitches at each end of the swing. So learn to recognize it.

There is a vicious smooth right direction slash that occurs when a pc hits a certain area of the bank that is called a "Rocket Read" and there is of course the small fall, long fall (which both go to the right and indicate a charged question or reaction) and there is the gradual rise to the left. But these do not repeat back and forth which is the characteristic of the Rockslam, Floating Needle and Theta Bop.

All right, so we know exactly what it looks like when we talk about a **Rockslam** as a read of the meter. We know how it can be mechanically caused. And we know what we have to record and report when it is seen.

But exactly *what* does a Rockslam mean with regards to the pc?

If you don't know this you can miss on the pc, on the case, on the org and humanity.

A Rockslam means a hidden evil intention on the subject or question under discussion or auditing.

Two things underlie insanity, or to be more specific, there are two causes and conditions both of which have been lumped together by man and called insanity. He could not of course define it as he didn't know what caused it.

The first of these two things does not concern us overly much here and is the subject of a separate checksheet training and is called PTS or Potential Trouble Source handling. A "PTS" is a person who has been or is connected with somebody who has evil intentions. A PTS can feel uncomfortable in life or be neurotic or go insane because of the actions upon him of a person with evil intentions. Most of the people in institutions are probable PTSes.

The second of these two things is insanity caused to the individual himself (let alone others) by hidden evil intentions.

The extent of these intentions and what the person will do (and hide) in order to carry them out is quite shocking. These people are covert or overt criminals and many of them are insane – meaning beyond all rationality in their acts. Because their evil intentions are hidden and because they are often very plausible such individuals are what make "behavior so mysterious" and "man looks so evil when you see what mankind does" and all sorts of fallacies.

It is this last type, the chronic, heavy Rockslammer, which Expanded Dianetics handles.

One Rockslam doesn't make a psychotic. Or a total menace to everyone. But it does mean there could be more and it might in rare cases mean you have, seeing enough of these R/Ses, a very dangerous person on your hands and in your vicinity. And that person must be handled by Expanded Dianetics.

You won't see a great many Rockslams in auditing people so you could be totally thrown off by surprise when you see one. And mess it all up because you are surprised. So know what it is and don't get all quivery and make mistakes and blow your confront. Just carry on.

If you don't note the **exact** question that was asked and the **exactly** worded statement the pc made when the R/S was seen, you can muck it up for the Expanded Dianetics guys. They won't be able to get it turned back on again easily and will lose a lot of time. So you have to be sure your auditing report is accurate, that the R/S is written **big** on the column and circled and, no matter what else you do in the session, you have to get it recorded in the left front cover of the folder giving the date and page of the session and you have to report it to Ethics. And also you don't third party the pc and give him a bad time in the session because of it.

Now R/Ses most easily turn on during Sec Checks or Integrity Processing or when pulling withholds or trying to investigate something. So the people who see these most often are those engaged in that activity and not routine auditing (when they can also but more rarely turn on). Further the most likely person to collide with “needing to be sec checked” is an R/Ser, which again increases the numbers of R/Ses seen in these activities compared to routine auditing. But a very heavy R/Ser will also turn them on in routine auditing.

It is the exact *point* of the R/S in the session, the exact question that was asked and the exact subject or phrase where the R/S turned on that are important. And these are very important as then the person can be fully handled with a full Expanded Dianetics rundown by a qualified Expanded Dianetics Specialist. When, of course, the person gets to that point on his grade chart. (The grade chart points are after Dianetics (like Drug RDs etc) but before Grades, after Grades but before Power, after Power but before Solo, and after OT III or after any single grade above OT III. These are the only points where Expanded Dianetics can be delivered and the R/S fully and completely handled.)

Now here is how you can turn off an R/S and mistakenly think it is handled:

1. The overt-motivator sequence has two sides. One is what the person has done (overt) and what is done to the person (motivator). You can ask, when the person R/Ses on something, if anyone has ever **invalidated** him on that subject or action. He will find some and the R/S will turn off **and won't even be faintly handled but only submerged**. One can believe he had “handled” the R/S. Not true. He has just turned it off and maybe made it harder to find next time. One can ask what the person has done **to** the subject mentioned and while this may unburden the case and make the person a bit better, the R/S is **not** handled, only turned off or submerged. It's almost as if there are so many overts and motivators on this subject or in this area that the push-pull of it makes the needle go wild (R/S). And indeed, this may be the energy cause, in the bank, of the needle reaction.

But neither overt nor motivator handles an R/S finally because the **cause** of the R/S is an **intention** to harm and it isn't all that likely the basic intention will be reached.

2. Another apparent way the R/S can get “handled” and isn't is to take the R/Ser earlier-similar on the subject of the R/S. The R/S will probably cease, go “clean.” But in actual fact it is still there, hidden.
3. The third way an R/S can be falsely “handled” is to direct the person's attention to something else. If, when this is done, the exact subject of the R/S is not noted by the auditor, it will be difficult to find it again when the person goes into Expanded Dianetic auditing.
4. Yet another, and probably the last way to falsely “handle” an R/S is to abuse the person about his conduct or behavior or the R/S, or to “educate” him to do better, or to “modify” his behavior with shocks or surgery or other tortures like the psychiatrists do. In other words one can seek to suppress the R/S in numerous ways. Maybe the R/S won't occur (being too overburdened now) but it is still there, buried very deep and possibly beyond reach now.

So if you understand the above four points you will see that although you can ease off the R/S, you have not handled it. It has merely gone out of sight.

All right, what then **does handle** an R/S?

I warned you that this isn't a two minute course on Expanded Dianetics and it isn't. An R/S is **handled** by a fully qualified Expanded Dianetics auditor delivering full Expanded Dianetics to the person at that point on the grade chart where Expanded Dianetics is supposed to be delivered. If anyone thinks it can be done effectively any other way or if he C/Ses it to be done and the auditor is stupid enough to try to do that C/S, then it's Committees of Evidence and Suspended Certificates all around.

With that warning, and only with that warning, I can briefly state what has to be done with the case. This is not what **you** do if you are not delivering full Expanded Dianetics at the right point on the grade chart. It is a brief statement so that you can understand what lies under that R/S.

The pc with an R/S on any given subject and who R/Ses while discussing that or related subjects **has an evil intention toward the subject discussed or some closely related subject**. The pc intends that subject or area of life nothing but calculating, covert, underhanded **harm** which will be at all times carefully hidden from that subject.

Thus, the Expanded Dianetics Specialist, in handling that case (at the proper point on the grade chart) has to be able to locate each and every subject and question and R/S in that person's folder as noted by Sec Checkers and previous auditors or cramming officers or why finders. He has to have the complete list of R/S subjects. If they are noted as to session date and page and if all sec checking papers and cramming papers are in that person's folder, then the Expanded Dianetics Specialist can do a full and complete job. Otherwise he has to do a lot of other time wasting actions to get the R/Ses found and turned on again.

What the Expanded Dianetics Specialist actually does is locate **exactly** the actual evil intention for every R/S on the case and handle each one to total conclusion. When he is finished, if he has done his job well, the person's behavior will be magically improved and as to his social presence, menace and conduct, well that will be toward survival.

When you see an R/S, if you are not an Expanded Dianetic Specialist doing Expanded Dianetics at the correct point on the grade chart, you don't say, "Hey, you've got an evil intention!" and you don't ask "Say, what's that evil intention?" or do corny things like that because you'll get the pc self listing, you may get a wrong item, you won't know what to do with it and you're just likely to get the auditing room wrapped around your neck right there.

No, you quietly note it, make sure it isn't a mechanical fault, write it big on the worksheet, write down everything the pc is saying swiftly, note what question you were asking and let the pc talk and ack him and go on with what you are doing with the pc at the time. And after session you note it in the left-hand cover of the folder and send a report to Ethics.

And some day, when he's done his Drug Rundown or gotten to one of the points on the grade chart where a full XDN can be done, why then it will be handled. And a good C/S will program or tip the case for that to be done.

So that's the know-how you have to know about R/Ses to really help the guy and the society and your group.

We're not in the business of curing psychos. The governments at this writing pay the psychiatrists billions a year to torture and kill because of R/Ses they don't know anything about. The crime in the society out there is caused by people who R/S. Stalin, Hitler, Napoleon and Caesar were probably the most loaded R/Sers of all time unless it was Jack the Ripper or your local friendly psychiatrist.

So know what you are seeing when you see it and know what to do about it. And don't kid yourself. Or vilify or mow down people who R/S; we're not in that business.

And the Expanded Dianetic Specialist *and* the pc someday will love you dearly for knowing your job and doing it right.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
9 MAY 1977

Remimeo
Ex Dn Course
Ex Dn Splclsts

Expanded Dianetics Series 27

CONFESSIONALS AND EXPANDED DIANETICS

“... an Expanded Dianetics auditor has to be very expert in the handling of confessionals.” (LRH, HCOB 24 FEBRUARY 77 TECH CORRECTION ROUND-UP)

People with Evil Purposes (destructive intentions) towards an area will commit overt acts on that area in forwarding the Evil Purpose. Where a pc has R/Ses, he will have Evil Purposes and overt acts. By locating and running out the Evil Purposes with full Ex Dn one can relieve the tendency to continue to commit the overt acts.

The actions which most often turn on R/Ses or even cause an Evil Purpose to pop into view are confessionals and pulling overt acts and withholds. Just pulling the overt acts would not handle fully. One must locate the underlying Evil Purpose and run it with full Ex Dn before an R/S can be considered handled.

Ex Dn uses confessional to help turn on R/Ses in areas where they are suspected and to expose Evil Purposes for running. A really searching confessional can follow right down the trail of a pc's most basic aberrations to the R/S and underlying Ev Purp.

Caution: That one has overt acts or EVPs that one has an R/S on does not make one a psychotic.

C/Sing CONFESSIONALS IN EX DN

Confessionals would be part of “right side” handling as it is used to locate R/Ses and Ev Purps. By folder study the C/S establishes areas and terminals where the pc is failing in life or at least having great difficulty. It could be areas or terminals he totally avoids also. It could be areas of anti-social or compulsive behavior, areas which often show up in O/Ws but basically it's areas of aberration for the pc. From these the C/S or the auditor can propose a confessional to dig into the area, getting off O/Ws and seeing if one can get an R/S to turn on or an Ev Purp to pop up. These confessionals need not be long for each area but must be well-worded and expertly delivered so nothing is missed. A miss on something like this could be quite explosive.

Where an Ev Purp or R/S turns up the exact wording of what is occurring must be clearly noted and circled in red for Ex Dn handling. This includes marking the Ev Purp or R/S clearly on the Folder Summary and Program. The exact data is vital. When the short confessional is completed the Ev Purps or R/Ses are then handled and the cycle is continued until the pc's areas of major aberration have been checked and handled. Where R/Ses and Ev Purps

have already been noted in the folder they are of course handled and any further address to the same area depends on whether the pc is now “sane” on that area.

Confessionals done on R/Ses should be directed at getting overts, W/Hs, evil thoughts, intentions and motives with regard to the subject area. Where the area of a reported or suspected R/S is not yielding something because either the pc “can’t think of anything” or the read has been submerged, the area can be checked over with the buttons “suppress”, “careful of” and “didn’t reveal”.

Already existing confessional lists can be used where applicable and any previous confessional auditing that the pc has received should be carefully checked to see if it was effective and what was uncovered that would give clues to hot areas.

Ex Dn handles the R/Ses and Ev Purps. Confessionals help find the R/Ses and Ev Purps to handle. It’s the Ev Purps and R/Ses we must handle in order to have an Ex Dn Completion of a sane person. That’s all there is to it.

W/O John Eastment
CS-4/5

Approved by
L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:JE:lf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 SEPTEMBER 1965

Remimeo
Franchise
Students
BPI

Issue II

All Levels

THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT

Pity the poor fellow who commits daily harmful acts.

He'll never make it.

A criminal pilfering the cash box once a week has himself stopped cold as far as case gains are concerned.

In 1954 I counted some noses. I checked up on 21 cases who had never had any gains since 1950. 17 turned out to be criminals! The other 4 were beyond the reach of investigation.

That gave me my first clue.

For some years then, I watched for no-gain cases and carefully followed up those that I could. They had major or minor criminal backgrounds.

This gave the 1959 breakthrough on the meter checks (Sec Checking).

Following it further since 1959 I have finally amassed enough histories to state:

The person who is not getting case gains is committing continuing overts.

While this sounds like a very good "out" for us, we assume that the auditor at least tried *something* sensible.

Today – the running of a pc by grades is a saving grace for merely "tough cases". Directors of Processing are doing well with the modern graded process approach, level by level, and the D of P Washington has just told me they were cracking cases with the lowest grade processes DC had never been able to handle well before.

So, given processing by Grades (the best case approach we've ever had), we crack the rough ones.

But will that be *all* cases?

There's still one. The case who continually commits overts before, during and after processing.

He won't make it.

One thing helps this, however.

You have seen the Ethics Codes appear.

By putting a bit of control in the Scientology environment we have enough threat to restrain dramatization.

The phenomena is this: The reactive bank can exert stress on the pc if it is not obeyed. Discipline must exert just a shade more stress *against* dramatization than the bank does. This checks the performance of the continual overt long enough to let processing bite.

Not everyone is a continuous overt committer by a thousand to one. But this phenomenon is not confined to the no-gain case.

The *slow* gain case is also committing overts the auditor doesn't see.

Therefore a little discipline in the environment speeds the *slow* gain case, the one we're more interested in.

The no-gain case, frankly, is one I am not panting to solve. If a fellow wants to sell his next hundred trillion for the sake of the broken toy he stole, I'm afraid I can't be bothered. I have no contract with any Big Thetan to save the world complete.

It is enough for me to know:

1. Where bottom is, and
2. How to help speed slow gain cases.

Bottom is the chap who eats your lunch apple and says the children did it. Bottom is the fellow who sows the environment with secret suppressive acts and vicious generalities.

The slow gain case responds to a bit of "keep your nose clean, please, while I apply the thetan-booster."

The fast gain case does his job and doesn't give a hoot about threatened discipline if it's fair. And the fast gain case helps out and the fast gain case can be helped by a more orderly environment. The good worker works more happily when bad workers see the pitfalls and desist from distracting him.

So we all win.

The no-gain case? Well, he sure doesn't deserve any gain. One pc in a thousand. And he yaps and groans and says "Prove it works" and blames us and raises hell. He makes us think we fail.

Look down in our Sthil files. There are actually thousands upon thousands of Scientologists there who each one comment on how wonderful it is and how good they feel. There are a few dozen or so who howl they haven't been helped! What a ratio! Yet I believe some on staff think we have a *lot* of dissatisfied people. These no-gain characters strew so much entheta around that we think we fail. Look in the Saint Hill files sometime! Those many thousands of reports continue to pour in from around the world with hurrah! Only the few dozen groan.

But long ago I closed my book on the no-gain case. Each of those few dozen no-gains tell frightening lies to little children, pour ink on shoes, say how abused they are while tearing the guts out of those unlucky enough to be around them. They are suppressive persons, every

one. I know. I've seen them all the way down to the little clinker they call their soul. And I don't like what I saw.

The people who come to you with wild discreditable rumours, who seek to tear people's attention off Scientology, who chew up orgs, are suppressive persons.

Well, give them a good rock and let them suppress it!

I can't end this HCO B without a confession. I know how to cure them rather easily.

Maybe I'll never let it be done.

For had they had their way we would have lost our chance. It's too near to think about.

After all, we have to earn our freedom. I don't care much for those who didn't help.

The rest of us had to sweat a lot harder than was necessary to make it come true.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

Remimeo

ROBOTISM

(Reference HCOB 28 Nov 1970, C/S Series 22, "Psychosis".)

A technical advance has been made in relation to the inactivity, slowness or incompetence of human beings.

This discovery proceeds from a two and a half year intense study of aberration as it affects the ability to function as a group member.

The ideal group member is capable of working causatively in full cooperation with his fellows in the achievement of group goals and the realization of his own happiness.

The *primary* human failing is an inability to function as himself or contribute to group achievements.

Wars, political upsets, organizational duress, growing crime rates, increasingly heavy "justice", growing demands for excessive welfare, economic failure and other age long and repeating conditions find a common denominator in the inability of human beings to coordinate.

The current political answer, in vogue in this century and growing, is totalitarianism where the state orders the whole life of the individual. The production figures of such states are very low and their crimes against the individual are numerous.

A discovery therefore of what this factor is, that makes the humanoid the victim of oppression, would be a valuable one.

The opening lines of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* comment on Man's lack of an answer for himself.

The group needs such an answer in order to survive and for its individual members to be happy.

SCALE

	Pan-determined
	Self-determined
Robot	Other-determined
band	Oblivious
	Insane

NEEDING ORDERS

The exact mechanism of needing orders is to be found as an outgrowth of the mental condition outlined in HCOB 28 Nov 1970, "Psychosis".

The individual with an evil purpose has to withhold himself because he may do destructive things.

When he fails to withhold himself he commits overt acts on his fellows or other dynamics and occasionally loses control and does so.

This of course makes him quite inactive.

To overcome this he refuses any responsibility for his own actions.

Any motion he makes must be on the responsibility of others.

He operates then only when given orders.

Thus he *must* have orders to operate.

Therefore one could term such a person a *robot*. And the malady could be called *robotism*.

PERCEPTION

Studies of perception undertaken since HCOB 28 Nov 70 reveal that sight, hearing and other channels of awareness *decrease* in proportion to the number of overt acts – and therefore withholds – which the person has committed on the whole track.

By relieving these sight has been remarkably brightened.

Therefore a person who is withholding himself from committing overt acts because of his own undesired purposes has very poor perception.

He does not *see* the environment around him.

Thus, combined with his unwillingness to act on his own initiative, there is a blindness to the environment.

OVERT PRODUCTS

(see P/L 14 Nov 70, Org Series 14)

Since he does not act upon orders he is taking responsibility for, he executes orders without fully understanding them.

Further he executes them in an environment he does not see.

Thus when forced to produce he will produce overt products. These are called so because they are not in actual fact useful products but something no one wants and are overt acts in themselves – such as inedible biscuits or a "repair" that is just further breakage.

SLOWNESS

The person is slow because he is moving on other-determinism, is carefully withholding himself and cannot see anyway.

Thus he feels lost, confused or unsafe and cannot move positively.

Because he produces overt products he gets slapped around or goes unthanked and so begins a decline.

He cannot move swiftly and if he does has accidents. So he teaches himself to be careful and cautious.

JUSTICE

Group justice is of some use but all it really does is make the person withhold himself even harder and while a necessary restraint, nevertheless does not itself bring a lasting improvement.

Threats and “heads on a pike” (meaning examples of discipline) do however jar the person into giving his attention and channeling his actions into a more desirable path from the group viewpoint.

Justice is necessary in a society of such people but it is not a remedy for improvement.

MALICE

Despite the viciousness of the truly insane, there is little or no real malice in the robot.

The truly insane cannot control or withhold their evil purposes and dramatize them at least covertly.

The insane are not always visible. But they are visible enough. And they *are* malicious.

The robot on the other hand does control his evil impulses to a great extent.

He is not malicious.

His danger mainly stems from the incompetent things he does, the time of others he consumes, the waste of time and material and the brakes he puts on the general group endeavor.

He does not do all these things intentionally. He does not really know he is doing them.

He looks in wounded surprise at the wrath he generates when he breaks things, wrecks programs and gets in the way. He does not know he is doing these things. For he cannot see that he is. He may go along for some time doing (slowly wasteful) well and then carelessly smashes the exact thing that wrecks the whole activity.

People suppose he cunningly intended to do so. He seldom does.

He winds up even more convinced he can't be trusted and that he should withhold harder!

FALSE REPORTS

The robot gives many false reports. Unable to *see*, how can he know what is true?

He seeks to fend off wrath and attract good will by "PR" (public relations boasts) without realizing he is giving false reports.

MORALE

The robot goes into morale declines easily. Since production is the basis of morale, and since he does not really produce much, left to his own devices, his morale sags heavily.

PHYSICAL INERTIA

The body is a physical object. It is not the being himself.

As a body has mass it tends to remain motionless unless moved and tends to keep going in a certain direction unless steered.

As he is not really running his body, the robot has to be moved when not moving or diverted if moving on a wrong course.

Thus anyone with one or more of such beings around him tends to get exhausted with shoving them into motion or halting them when they go wrong.

Exhaustion only occurs when one does not understand the robot.

It is the exasperation that exhausts one.

With understanding one is not exasperated because he *can* handle the situation. But only if he knows what it is.

PTS

Potential Trouble Sources are not necessarily robots.

A PTS person generally is withholding himself from a Suppressive Person or group or thing.

Toward that SP person or group or thing he is a robot! He takes orders from them if only in opposites.

His overts on the SP person make him blind and non-self-determined.

BASIC WHY

The basic reason behind persons who cannot function, are slow or inactive or incompetent and who do not produce is

Withholding self from doing destructive things, and thus unwilling to take responsibility and therefore needing orders.

The exact wording of this **why** must be done by the individual himself after examining and grasping this principle.

If one writes this principle down on the top of a sheet and then asks the person to word it exactly as it applies to himself one will attain the individual why for inaction and incompetence. It will produce GIs and F/N at the Examiner.

PROCESSING

Physical work in the physical universe, general confronting, reach and withdraw; and Objective Processes go far in remedying this condition.

Touch assists regularly and correctly given to proper End Phenomena will handle illnesses of such persons.

Word Clearing is vital tech to open the person's comm lines, wipe out earlier misunderstandings and increase his understanding.

PTS tech will handle the person's robotism toward SP individuals, groups or things. To this and the PTS Rundown can be added the **why** above as it relates to the things or beings found as suppressive as a last step.

The why above can be used in Danger Formula work such as HCO P/L 9 April 72, Correct Danger Formula, and HCO P/L 3 May 72, "Ethics and Executives". Other individual whys can exist in these instances.

EXPANDED DIANETICS

The miracle of well done perfectly executed Expanded Dianetics eradicates both insanity and robotism. Drug handling and other actions may be necessary.

END PRODUCT

The end product when one has fully handled robotism is not a person who cannot follow orders or who operates solely on his own.

Totalitarian states fear any relief of the condition as they foolishly actively promote and hope for such beings. But this is only a deficiency in their own causes and their lack of

experience with fully self-determined beings. Yet education, advertising and amusements have been designed only for robots. Even religions existed to suppress “Man’s Evil Nature”.

Lacking any examples or understanding many have feared to free the robot to his own control and think even with horror on it.

But you see, beings are **not** basically robots. They are miserable when they are.

Basically they prosper only when they are self-determined and can be pan-determined to help in the prosperity of all.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.bh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 FEBRUARY 1977
(Also published as HCO PL, same date.)

Remimeo
EDs. COs
HESes. S/Cs
HCOs
HASes
Sec Checkers
Case Supervisors
Staff Section Officers

C/S Series 100

JOKERS AND DEGRADERS

It is an old principle that people who do not understand something occasionally make fun of it.

A recent investigation however into the backgrounds and case condition of a small handful of people who were joking about their posts and those around them showed a somewhat more sinister scene.

Each of these persons fell into one or more of the following categories:

1. Were rock slammers. (Some List 1.)
2. Were institutional type cases.
3. Were "NCG" (meaning no case gain) (the only cause of which is continuous present time overts).
4. Were severely PTS (Potential Trouble Source) (connected to rock slammers).

It might be supposed that misunderstood word phenomena could also be part of this. The rebellious student in universities is usually handled by clearing up his misunderstandings or curing his hopelessness for his future. However, the investigation did not find that any of these jokers or degraders were acting that way solely because of misunderstood words, but the possibility cannot be ruled out.

The four categories above were, however, fully verified.

All the persons investigated were found to be the subject of declining statistics, both having them and causing them. Their areas were enturbulated. At least one of the jokers was physically driving basic course students out of an org.

In some cultural areas, wit and humor are looked upon as a healthy release. However, in the case of orgs, this was not found to be the case. Intentional destruction of the org or fellow staff members was the direct purpose.

Therefore all executives, HCO personnel and Case Supervisors as well as Qual personnel and Staff Section Officers have a valuable indicator. Where they have a joker or degrader on their hands they also have one or more of the above four conditions in that person.

This opens the door to handling such people.

Properly assigned and then fully done conditions are the correct ethics handlings.

Correctly done Expanded Dianetics, which includes Confessionals and fully done PTS handlings are the case remedies.

Where ethics tech itself is not known or neglected and where there are no HCOs one can, of course, not expect the matter to be handled. And this would be too bad because the case gain and life improvement available in proper ethics handlings, when fully followed through, can be quite miraculous.

Where rock slammers have been undermining the tech and it is not fully known or used or is altered into unworkability one cannot expect Confessionals to be properly done or Expanded Dianetics to be known and properly applied.

The joker is advertising his symptoms. He is also advertising an area of the org where there is enturbulation and down statistics as well as staff members being victimized.

Therefore this is an administrative and technical indicator which cannot be overlooked and should be followed up.

Spotted, investigated and handled, this can be the beginning of an upward spiral for an organization.

Where someone is driving ethics out, tech is not likely to go in. You have to get in ethics and tech before you can begin to get in admin.

The next time you, as an executive, wonder why you are working so hard, look for the joker in the deck.

Humor is one thing. Destroyed orgs and human beings are quite something else.

It is our business to get the show on the road and get the job done.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:lf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 MARCH 1977

Remimeo

Expanded Dianetics Series 25

THE GAMBLER

An obsessive gambler is a psychotic just like a drug addict or an alcoholic.

They are handled the way you handle any other psychotic. They don't have to do anything for real in life because it all depends on chance and never on themselves. So you have them on the minus effect scale.

Life isn't real to a psychotic gambler and therefore they never really buckle down to anything. Consequences are unreal to them and criminal acts are incomprehensible as nothing is real anyway.

Getting off overts is nothing to such people because they are not there and take no responsibility for them. Everything else is responsible – not them. Thus you have to find the trail to the R/Ses on the subject and discharge those.

This aspect of such a case is the emergency number one handling.

It has to be recognized for what it is – **Psychosis**.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:if

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 MAY 1962

Central Orgs
Tech Depts

VERY IMPORTANT

E-METER READS

PREPCHECKING

HOW METERS GET INVALIDATED

Due to the fantastic number of instant needle reactions missed by poorly trained auditors, it would be well to check this question out on *any* preclear who has been previously audited:

“Has any auditor ever failed to find a meter read on you that you thought should have reacted?”

Or any version thereof.

“As an auditor have you ever deliberately ignored a significant meter response?”

Or any version thereof.

“Have you ever invalidated an E-Meter?”

Or any version thereof.

“As a preclear have you ever successfully persuaded an auditor the meter was wrong?”

Or any version thereof.

“Have you ever attempted to invalidate a meter read in order to keep something secret?”

Or any version thereof.

Pcs who have routinely had meter reads missed on them become so unconfident of the meter that they are perpetually ARC broke. Only ARC breaks stop a meter from reacting. Therefore this unconfidence in the meter can cancel meter reads!

It is utterly *fatal* to pass up an instant reaction on a pc. It invalidates the meter and may cancel further reads.

Meters work. They work every time. Only auditors fail by failure to use the meter reactions to guide a session. Only the auditing question or the auditor's inability to read can be wrong.

Because of bad metering many pcs get the secret opinion that meters do not in fact work. This is caused by sloppy auditors who miss instant reads and fail to clean up hot questions.

If the pc knows it is hot and the auditor fails to see the meter react, the pc thinks he can “beat the meter” and is thereafter harder to audit because of this specific phenomenon.

This is exactly how meters get invalidated – auditors who fail to read them and meters that aren’t Mark IVs. There have been plenty of both in the past, so clean up the above question. It’s all that keeps some pcs from winning.

And, oh yes, don’t miss meter reads! And, oh very yes, be sure you are well trained on meters!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.cden

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 interfering 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. Watching 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't – 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 fact, 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 have 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 ques-
tion: 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 dur-
ing 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 found out about your opinions with Gernie? What do you think? Something going on here.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I'm trying to get to the bottom of it.

PC: *Yeah. I – I – I don't know – I – my considerations at the time or my considerations now?*

LRH: Your considerations at the time.

PC: *At the time. 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? I...*

LRH: Just a moment ago.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Let me check this

...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... again. Hm? Have you withheld anything from me? Well, this – 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 otherwise.*

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.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 MAY 1962

Central Orgs
Franchise

E-METER

INSTANT READS

An instant read is defined as that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor.

The reaction of the needle may be any reaction except „nul”. An instant read may be any change of characteristic providing it occurs instantly. The absence of a read at the end of the major thought shows it to be nul.

All *prior* reads and *latent* reads are ignored. These are the result of minor thoughts which may or may not be restimulated by the question.

Only the instant read is used by the auditor. Only the instant read is cleared on rudiments, What questions, etc.

The instant read may consist of any needle reaction, rise, fall, speeded rise, speeded fall, double tick (dirty needle), theta bop or any other action so long as it occurs at the exact end of the major thought being expressed by the auditor. If no reaction occurs at exactly that place (the end of the major thought) the question is nul.

By „*major thought*” is meant the complete thought being expressed in words by the auditor. Reads which occur prior to the completion of the major thought are „prior reads”. Reads which occur later than its completion are „latent reads”.

By „*minor thought*” is meant subsidiary thoughts expressed by words within the major thought. They are caused by the reactivity of individual words within the full words. They are ignored.

Example: „Have you ever injured dirty pigs?”

To the pc the words „you”, „injured” and „dirty” are all reactive. Therefore, the minor thoughts expressed by these words also read on the meter.

The major thought here is the whole sentence. Within this thought are the minor thoughts „you”, „injured” and „dirty”.

Therefore the E-Meter needle may respond this way: „Have you (fall) ever injured (speeded fall) dirty (fall) pigs (*fall*)?”

Only the major thought gives the instant read and only the last *fall* (bold-italic type in the sentence above) indicates anything. If that last reaction was absent, the whole sentence is nul despite the prior falls.

You can release the reactions (but ordinarily would not) on each of these minor thoughts. Exploring these prior reads is called „compartmenting the question”.

Paying attention to minor thought reads gives us laughable situations as in the case, written in 1960, of „getting P.D.H.ed by the cat”. By accepting these prior reads one can prove anything. Why? Because *Pain* and *Drug* and *Hypnosis* are minor thoughts within the major thought: „Have you ever been P.D.H.ed by a cat?” The inexpert auditor would believe such a silly thing had happened. But notice that if each minor thought is cleaned out of the major thought it no longer reacts as a whole fact. If the person on the meter *had* been P.D.H.ed by a cat, then only the discovery of the origin of the whole thought would clean up the whole thought.

Pcs also think about other things while being asked questions and these random personal restimulations also read before and after an instant read and are ignored. Very rarely, a pc’s thinks react exactly at the end of a major thought and so confuse the issue, but this is rare.

We want the read that occurs instantly after the last syllable of the major thought without lag. That is the only read we regard in finding a rudiment in or out, to find if a goal reacts, etc. That is what is called an „instant read”.

There is a package rudiment question in the half truth, etc. We are doing four rudiments in one and therefore have four major thoughts in one sentence. This packaging is the only apparent exception but is actually no exception. It’s just a fast way of doing four rudiments in one sentence.

A clumsy question which puts „in this session” at the end of the major thought can serve the auditor badly. Such modifiers should come before the sentence, „In this session have you.....?”

You are giving the major thought directly to the reactive mind. Therefore any analytical thought will not react instantly.

The reactive mind is composed of:

1. Timelessness.
2. Unknownness.
3. Survival.

The meter reacts on the reactive mind, never on the analytical mind. The meter reacts instantly on any thought restimulated in the reactive mind.

If the meter reacts on anything, that datum is partly or wholly unknown to the preclear.

An auditor’s questions restimulate the reactive mind. This reacts on the meter.

Only reactive thoughts react instantly.

You can „groove in” a major thought by saying it twice. On the second time (or third time if it is longer) you will see only the instant read at the exact end. If you do this the prior reads drop out leaving only the whole thought.

If you go stumbling around in rudiments or goals trying to clean up the minor thoughts you will get lost. In sec checking you can uncover material by „compartmenting the question”

but this is rarely done today. In rudiments, What questions, et al, you want the instant read only. It occurs exactly at the end of the whole thought. This is your whole interest in cleaning a rudiment or a What question. You ignore all prior and latent reactions of the needle.

The exceptions to this rule are:

1. „Compartmenting the question”, in which you use the prior reads occurring at the exact end of the minor thoughts (as above in the pigs sentence) to dig up different data not related to the whole thought.
2. „Steering the pc” is the only use of latent or random reads. You see a read the same as the instant read occurring again when you are not speaking but after you have found a whole thought reacting. You say „there” or „that” and the pc, seeing what he or she is looking at as you say it, recovers the knowledge from the reactive bank and gives the data and the whole thought clears or has to be further worked and cleared.

You can easily figure-figure yourself half to death trying to grapple with meter reads unless you get a good reality on the instant read which occurs at the end of the whole expressed thought and neglect all prior and latent reads except for steering the pc while he gropes for the answer to the question you asked.

That’s the whole of reading an E-Meter needle.

(Two Saint Hill lectures of 24 May 1962 cover this in full.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

[HCO B 21 July 1962, Instant Reads, adds to this HCO B.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 MAY 1962

Franchise
Central Orgs
Tech Depts
IMPORTANT

**TRAINING DRILLS
MUST BE CORRECT**

TRs which give an incorrect impression of how auditing is done may not be taught.

All TRs must contain the correct data of auditing.

This is vital. There have been two broad instances where TRs gave an impetus to improper auditing which all but crippled the forward advance of Scientology.

These were:

Upper Indoc TRs which caused students to conceive that the CCHs were run without 2-way comm and with a militant, even vicious attitude. (See HCO Bulletins of April 5 and 12, 1962.)

E-Meter Needle drills which caused the student to believe that every action of the needle was a *read* and prevented three-quarters of all Scientologists from ever getting rudiments in or questions cleared (see HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962 and 2 Saint Hill Lectures of May 24, 1962).

In the matter of the CCHs, we were deprived of their full use for 5 years and extended the time in processing 25 times more than should have been consumed for any result. This came from TRs 6-9 which are hereby scrapped.

In the matter of the E-Meter it is probable that all auditing failures and widely extended false ideas that Scientology did not work stem from the improper conception of what action of the needle one cleaned up. This came from needle reading TRs where instructors had students calling off *every* activity of the needle as a *read*, whereas only the needle action at the exact end of the question was used by the auditor. Auditors have thought all needle actions were reads and tried to clean off all needle actions except, in some cases, the end actions. This defeated the meter completely and upset every case on which it was practised. This accounts for all auditing failures in the past two years.

CCHs must be taught exactly as they are used in session, complete with two-way comm-and no comm system added, please.

E-Meter drills must be used which stress only meaningful and significant instant reads coming at the *end* of the full question.

Other actions of the needle may be shown to a student only if they are properly called *prior* and *latent* reads, or meaningless action. From his earliest training on meters the student must be trained to consider a *read* only what he would take up in session and clear or use, and must be taught that mere actions of the needle are neglected except in steering the pc, fishing or compartmenting questions.

Only teach proper use. Only use TRs which exactly parallel use of Scientology in session and do not give an impression that something else is used.

I have seen clearly that Scientology's effectiveness could be destroyed by teaching via TRs which can be interpreted by a student as the way to audit when in fact one does not audit that way or use the data in auditing.

There are many valuable TRs. There will be many more valuable TRs. But an *invalid TR* is one which gives a wrong impression of auditing. These must be kept out of all training.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd

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

Franchise

REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS
HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN

I am in a hurry to get this bulletin to you and to get it into use for all except CCH sessions.

For a long time I've been urging you to get rudiments in. For the past ten days I have been working hard to analyze and resolve why you sometimes cannot.

Just as an E-Meter can go dead for the auditor in the presence of a monstrous ARC break, I have found it can go gradually dull in the presence of out rudiments. If you fail to get one **in** then the outness of the next one reads faintly. And if your TR1 is at all poor, you'll miss the rudiment's outness and there goes your session.

To get over these difficulties, I have developed a Model Session that can be used, in the rudiments, as a series of repetitive processes.

Then, with this, I've developed Repetitive Rudiments.

The auditor at first does *not* consult the meter, but asks the rudiments question of the pc until the pc says there is no further answer. At this point the auditor says, "I will check that on the meter." And asks the question again. If it reads, the auditor uses the meter to steer the pc to the answer, and when the pc finds the answer, the auditor again lays the meter aside and asks the question of the pc as above until the pc has no answer. The auditor again says, "I will check that on the meter" and does so.

The cycle is repeated over and over until the meter is clean of any instant read (see HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962 for Instant Read).

The cycle:

1. Run the rudiment as a repetitive process until pc has no answer.
2. Consult meter for a hidden answer.
3. If meter reads use it to steer ("that" "that" each time the meter flicks) the pc to the answer.
4. Lay aside the Meter and do 1 and 2 and 3.

The process is flat when there is no instant read to the question.

One does not "bridge out" or use "two more commands". When the meter test of the question gets no instant read, the auditor says, "Do you agree that that is clean?" covertly looking at the needle as he or she says "clean". If the question really isn't clean, there will be

an instant read on “Do you agree the question is clean?” If there is such a read, do 1, 2 and 3 again.

The trick here is the definition of “In Session”. If the pc is in session the meter will read. If the pc is partially out the meter will read poorly, and the rudiment will not register and the rudiment will get missed. But with the pc in session the meter will read well for the auditor. Thus you get the pc to talk to the auditor about his own case, the definition of “in session”, before consulting the meter by using the repetitive process.

What a relief to the pc to have his rudiments in! And goodbye ARC breaks and no auditing results!

Use this system *always* on the beginning rudiments for every type of session.

Use this system on the Middle Rudiments in a havingness and sometimes on the Prepcheck type of session. But seldom on a Routine 3 (goals) type of session.

Use this system always on the End Rudiments of a havingness session. Do not use it on the End Rudiments of a Prepcheck or Routine 3 type of session unless the session has been full of screaming pc (which with this system it won't be).

- Havingness Type Session:

Repetitive Rudiments System on Beginning, Middle and End Rudiments.

- Prepcheck Type Session:

Repetitive Rudiments on Beginning and sometimes Middle Rudiments. Ask End Rudiments against meter as in step 2 and 3 of cycle (Fast Checking, see below).

- Routine 3 Type Session:

Use Repetitive Rudiments on Beginning Rudiments. Use 2 and 3 only (Fast Checking) for Middle and End Rudiments unless Session very rough.

So that's where Repetitive auditing processes wind up. Addressed to rudiments!

A tip – you can ARC break a session by overuse of Middle Rudiments on Routine 3 processes. Never use the Middle Rudiments just because the pc is talking about his or her own case. That's the definition of In Session. Use Middle Rudiments in Routine 3 when you have not had *any* meter needle response on three goals read three times (not one goal read disturbed the needle). Then get your Middle Rudiments in and cover the first consecutive nul goal above (the three that gave no response). Don't use Middle Ruds just because 3 goals went nul. Only if no reading of a goal disturbed the needle for three goals in a row. Also use Middle Ruds when the pc “can't think of any more” in listing of goals or items. Don't use every time you shift lists now. Only if the pc “can't list more”.

In Prepchecking use Middle Ruds Repetitively after 3 Zero questions have each been nul on a list of Zeros and recheck those Zeros if Middle Ruds were out. Use Middle Ruds after each What question was nulled and check the What question again and rework it if alive. Also check the Zero questions if a What went nul. If a Zero advanced to a What, both What and Zero must be checked for nullness and found nul before leaving them.

One Middle Rudiments use may suffice for both unless one was found still alive after the Middle Ruds were gotten in. Repair it and recheck if so.

FAST CHECKING

A *Fast Check* on the Rudiments consists only of steps 2 and 3 of the cycle done over and over.

Watching the meter the auditor asks the question, takes up only what reads and, careful not to Q and A, clears it. One does this as many times as is necessary to get a clean needle. But one still says, "Do you agree that that is clean?" and catches up the disagreement by getting the additional answers. When both the question and the agreement are seen to be clean, the question is left.

In using Fast Checking **never say, "that still reads."** That's a flunk. Say, "There's *another* read here."

You cannot easily handle a transistor type meter more sensitive than a Mark IV. The needle would be so rapid in its swings you would find it nearly impossible to keep it centred. Therefore a more sensitive meter was no answer. The TR 1 of many auditors lacks any great impingement. And this is remediable only when "altitude" can also be remedied. There had to be a better answer to getting out rudiments to read better on a Meter for all auditors and all pcs. Repetitive Rudiments is the best answer to this.

(Note: I am indebted to Mary Sue, when I was working on this problem, for calling my attention back to this system which I originally developed for Sec Checking and where it worked well.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 JULY 1962

Sthil Students
CenOCon
All Sthil Grads

URGENT

AUDITING ALLOWED

I want every auditor auditing to be perfect on a meter. To be otherwise can be catastrophic.

By perfect is meant:

1. Auditor never tries to clean a clean read;
2. Auditor never misses a read that is reacting.

One mistake on M.S. or TRs may not ruin a session. One mistake on a meter read can ruin a session. That gives you the order of importance of *accurate* never-miss meter reading.

All bad auditing results have now been traced to inaccuracy in meter reading. Other aspects of a session should be perfect. But if the session, even vaguely following a pattern session, comes to grief, **it is only meter reading accuracy that is at fault.**

I have carefully ferreted this fact out. There is only one constant error in sessions that produce no results or poor results; inaccurate meter reading. This is also true for student and veteran auditors alike.

When an auditor starts using unusual solutions, he or she was driven to them by the usual solution not working. The usual solution always works unless the meter needle reading is inaccurate.

If an auditor is using unusual solutions, then **that auditor's meter reading is inaccurate.** Given this, consequent ARC breaks and failures drive the auditor to unusual solutions.

A D of P who has to dish out unusual solutions has auditors who are missing meter reads.

Meter reading must be *perfect* every session. What is perfect?

1. Never try to clean a read that is already clean.
2. Never miss an instant reaction of the needle.

If you try to clean a clean rudiment, the pc has the missed withhold of *nothingness*. The auditor won't accept the origination or reply of *nothingness*. This can cause a huge ARC break, worse than missing a somethingness. A nothingness is closer to a thetan than somethingness.

If you miss an instant reaction you hang the pc with a missed withhold and the results can be catastrophic.

If you fumble and have to ask two or three times, the read damps out, the meter can become inoperative on that pc for the session.

If you miss on one rudiment, the next even if really hot can seem to be nul by reason of ARC break.

A meter goes nul on a gradient scale of misses by the auditor. The more misses, the less the meter reads.

Meter perfection means only accurate reading of the needle on instant reads. It is easily attained.

An auditor should never miss on a needle reaction. To do so is the basis of all unsuccessful sessions. Whatever else was wrong with the session, it began with bad meter reading.

Other auditing actions are important and must be done well. But they can all be overthrown by *one* mistake in metering.

1. Never clean a clean needle.
2. Never miss a read.

Unless metering perfection is attained by an auditor, he or she will continue to have trouble with preclears.

The source of all upset is the missed withhold.

The most fruitful source of missed withholds is poor metering.

The worst TR 4 is failure to see that there is nothing there or failing to find the something that is there on an E-Meter.

This is important: Field Auditors, Academies and HGCs are all being deprived of the full benefit of processing results by the one read missed out of the 200 that were not missed. It is that critical!

A good pro, by actual inspection, is at this moment missing about eight or nine reads per session, calling one that is clean a read and failing to note a read that read.

This is the 5 to 1 ratio noted between HGC auditing and my auditing. They miss a few. I don't. If I don't miss meter reads, and don't have ARC breaky pcs, why should you? With modern session pattern and processes well learned, all you have to acquire is the ability to never miss on reading a needle. If I can do it you can.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

E-METER DRILL-22

Number: EM-22.

Name: E-Meter Hidden Date, This Life.

Purpose: To train the student auditor to locate a date on the track with the E-Meter, to increase the student auditor's reality on the factualness of an E-Meter and the factualness of the time track, and to give the student auditor a great familiarity with the E-Meter and its use.

Position: The student auditor and coach sit facing each other across a table. The student auditor handles the meter, while the coach holds the electrodes.

Commands: No set commands. "Over and under" method of questioning is used to isolate the correct date.

Training Stress: The coach is to select a date, preferably his birthday or any known anniversary. Later as the student auditor gets better, the coach is to select any date (month, day, and year) at random from the early years of his present lifetime. He does not tell the student what the date is. The student auditor, by the use of the meter, is to find the date the coach has selected, without the coach replying or saying anything at all except for coaching instructions.

A date is found by the process of elimination. The student auditor's questions are of this sort: "Is the date before 1940 A.D. . . . After 1940 A.D.?" If the needle reacts, the answer is yes. If the needle doesn't react, the answer is no. If the needle reacts on the first question, then the second question is not asked. If the needle does not react on either question, then the student auditor does not have a year even close to the right one or he has been asking the questions with poor TR-1.

After the year is found, then the student auditor locates the month of the year, "Is it before June, 1945 A.D. . . . After June 1945 A.D.?" Then the day is found, "Is it before March 15, 1945 A.D. . . . After March 15, 1945 AD.?"

As the student auditor improves, the coach should increase the difficulty of the date to be found by selecting month, day, year and also minutes and seconds.

The student auditor may use "before" and "after", but not "more than. . . . less than. . . ." for this lifetime.

The coach should flunk the student auditor for TR's 0 to 2, if poor; for ambiguous, indirect Q and A type of questions; for improper interpretation of the E-Meter reads; or for taking an excessive amount of time.

The student auditor passes this drill when he can easily, correctly, and accurately date on the E-Meter.

History: Developed as "E-Meter Hidden Body Part" by L. Ron Hubbard in November, 1958 in London, and revised in December, 1963.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 JUNE AD 13

Central Orgs
Franchise

ROUTINE 2H
ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT

This is not just a training process. It is a very valuable *unlimited* process that undercuts Repetitive Processes and produces tone arm action on cases that have none on repetitive processes.

R2H, however, is a training *must* before an auditor is permitted to run engrams. It does not have to be run on a pc before engrams are run. Only when an auditor can produce results with R2H should he or she run engrams on any pc. For R2H combines the most difficult steps of engram running, dating, assessing, locating and indicating by-passed charge. If an auditor can date skillfully and quickly handle ARC Breaks (and handle the Time Track) he or she is a safe auditor on R3R. If not, that auditor will not produce results with R3R or make any OTs.

In Academies and the SHSBC, R2H is placed after skill is attained in Model Session and repetitive processes. In auditing programming R2H comes immediately after Reach and Withdraw and the CCHs.

For sweetening a pc's temper and life, R2H has had no equal for cases above but not including level 8.

ARC stands for the Affinity–Reality–Communication triangle from which comes the Tone Scale and is best covered by the booklet "Notes on Lectures".

By-passed charge is covered very fully in recent HCOBs on ARC Breaks.

R2H BY STEPS

The auditing actions of Routine 2H are complex and must be done with great precision.

The actions are done in Routine 3 Model Session. Mid Ruds and Missed Withholds may be used.

Step One:

Tell the pc, "Recall an ARC Break."

When pc has done so acknowledge that the pc has done so. Do not ask the pc what it is. If pc says what it is, simply acknowledge. It is no business of R2H to know what the ARC Break consists of!

Step Two:

Date the ARC Break on the meter. If the pc volunteers the date *do not* verify it on the meter further. Accept it at once and write it down. The date is more important than the content of the ARC Break.

Step Three:

Assess the ARC Break for by-passed charge, using the attached list.

Find the greatest read.

The assessment is seldom gone over more than once as a whole and those that read are then read again until one remains.

This is a rapid action on the meter. Look only for tiny ticks or falls or a small left to right slash of the needle. Do not expect large reactions. The Mark V meter is indispensable.

Step Four:

Indicate to the pc what charge was missed in that ARC Break he or she has recalled.

The pc must be satisfied that that was the charge missed.

The pc may try to recall what it was that was indicated. This is not a vital part of the drill but **the pc must be satisfied that the located by-passed charge was the source of the ARC break.**

There is a danger here of a great deal of auditor ad-libbing and tanglefoot. If the pc is not satisfied and *happier* about it, the wrong by-passed charge has been found and Step Three must be re-done.

It is no part of this process to run an engram or secondary thus located.

THE ASSESSMENT FORM

This is a *sample* form. It may be necessary to add to it. Some lines of it may eventually be omitted. However, this form does work. The auditor may add a few lines to it.

In asking the questions preface the whole assessment with, "In the ARC Break you recalled _____." Do not preface each question so unless pc goes adrift.

A dirty needle means pc has started to speculate. Ask, "Have you thought of anything?" and clean needle.

- Had an engram been missed?
- Had a withhold been missed?
- Had some emotion been rejected?
- Had some affection been rejected?
- Had a reality been rejected?
- Had a communication been ignored?
- Had a similar incident occurred before?
- Had a goal been disappointed?
- Had some help been rejected?
- Was an engram restimulated?
- Had an overt been committed?
- Had an overt been contemplated?
- Had an overt been prevented?
- Was there a secret?

Routine 2H is a skilled operation. Practice gives the auditor a knack of doing it rapidly.

An ARC Break should be disposed of about every fifteen minutes of auditing time. Longer shows ineptitude.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 MARCH 1964

CenOCon

METER READS, SIZE OF

It occasionally comes to my attention that auditors entering Classes V and VI do not believe a meter can be made to read *big*.

They settle for ticks, tiny falls, etc, of the sort that can be found usually in getting Mid Ruds in. In all auditing up to Class V the usual meter needle read is around an eighth to a quarter of an inch long at sensitivity 16.

The Mark V is designed to give good serviceable reads for the lower classes of auditing and is quite wonderful at it.

But the moment you enter the wide vistas of Class V, the whole character of meter needle behaviour changes, you go from tiny read to big read.

In Classes V and VI tiny reads are used only for Mid Ruds as they were in lower levels. But in all work in goals, Case Analysis, plotting, finding items, checking things out, etc, reads are enormous.

A new horizon of metering dawns and an auditor coming up through the lower levels, entering Class V and VI work just doesn't believe it. Most of his early mistakes in checking out goals or finding the wrongnesses are entirely based on this. He thinks a tiny read is enough and he uses it. Whereas he really must never use a small read for this work.

If a goal is a real GPM it will read with great, intermittent, inconsistent slashes. If an analysis of a situation is brought to the right answer, the meter needle falls hugely.

The trouble is that the auditor just doesn't press on looking for the right answer and settles for ticks – because he can't think up the right combination. The right combination "No GPM" or "Lock on an Implant" will send the needle racing.

All mistakes on goals or situations in Classes V and VI can be traced to a failure to appreciate that metering is different at these levels.

The sensitivity at Class VI has to be kept around 4. You only use sensitivity 8 or 16 to get in Since Mid Ruds. On all R6 work you shut the meter down. You can't keep the needle at Set if you use a sensitivity higher than 4.

Here's a Class V or VI student fiasco, based on using Class III expected meter behaviour on high level work:

Auditor finds goal on list that ticks ($\frac{1}{8}$). Asks if it's the correctly worded goal. Gets a tick ($\frac{1}{16}$). Runs it on the pc. Pc collapses.

Here's the real way it should have been: Auditor finds goal on list that only ticks. Gets in Suppress and Invalidate on the list. Re-nulls. Finds another goal. Gets in Suppress on it. Gets a third of a dial instant slash (all goals and items must Instant read). Checks it out until he gets a 3" prior slash on Actual GPM. Gets a 2" slightly latent or prior slash on "correctly worded". Gives it to the pc and pc thrives.

It's not asking the right question (what it really is) that gives you ticks.

In fact a tick with a sharp edge at Class V or VI really means "wrong question asked"!

Big reads are the only reads you buy at Class V and VI. Learn the right questions to ask about the character or nature of what you're examining and you get the big falls, RRs, etc.

So it's a lack of knowledge of Track Analysis that makes the auditor fall back on small reads. And he'll fail.

The second stage of desperation enters at Class V and VI when the student, hammered by the instructors, still can't get big reads (through lack of knowledge of the track and what things can be).

The student then abandons all he knew about body motion causing needle reaction. The quickly exhaled breath, the shuffled feet, the can fling about, the stretch, the can bang, all cause big surges. So the auditor encourages the pc to shout goals and items or fling himself about so the meter will react big.

This, of course, will spin the pc, getting no charge off, running wrong goals and RIs.

By the time the student auditor is trained not to take body motion, shout or breath reads, his Track Analysis has also improved and he starts to ask the right questions and gets his big reads with the pc quiet as a lamb.

I never touch a TA during the pc's body movement. This loses TA, of course, since a pc is most likely to move when an RI starts to discharge. I never buy a goal unless I've seen it Instant read, bang on the last letter. I never ask the character of anything to Instant read, i.e. "Is this an Implant GPM", because it may go on anticipate or arrive latent.

And do I get TA on the pc! In goals finding and plotting you don't expect much TA. Yet in six consecutive sessions I built TA a few divisions more per session, from 70 TA down divisions to 103 TA down divisions in 2½ hour session, and all by never buying a tick, only big RRs or falls. Gradual build of TA shows all is well.

So Classes V and VI are not only big read classes, but they are big TA classes as well.

As you are handling the basic sources of charge on a case in Classes V and VI, you expect big meter behaviour and you get it.

Only ignorance of the track keeps the auditor in the small read, small TA departments.

If you *keep on trying* to get what it *really* is until you have it, you will *always* see a big read on what it is.

You wouldn't expect to handle high voltage wires with tiny sparks. You would expect huge arcs to crackle. Similarly with the materials of Classes V and VI.

If you don't believe a meter will read big at Classes V and VI, then you haven't learned yet to find the right things and ask the right questions.

And if you settle for ticks or have to make the pc yell items to get big reads you'll soon have a very messed up case on your hands.

So it's a different meter behaviour at the higher classes. Expect it, look for it and make it **read!**

L RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.bh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 MAY 1970

Remimeo

UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS

(With particular reference to doing
a Group Engram Intensive)

Never list a listing question that doesn't read.

Never prepcheck an item that doesn't read.

These rules hold good for all lists, all items, even **Dianetics**.

A „tick” or a „stop” is not a read. Reads are small falls or falls or long falls or long fall blowdown (of TA).

A preclear's case can be gotten into serious trouble by listing a list that doesn't read or prepchecking or running an item that doesn't read.

On a list, this is the sort of thing that happens:

The List is „Who or what would fly kites?” The C/S has said to „List this to a BD F/N Item”. So the auditor *does* list it without checking the read at all. The list can go on 99 pages with the pc protesting, getting upset. This is called a „Dead horse list” because it gave no item. The reason it didn't was that the list question itself didn't read. One does an L4 on the pc to correct the situation and gets „Unnecessary action”.

On a list that is getting no item you don't *extend*. You correctly use L4 or any subsequent issue of it. If you extend a „dead horse list” you just make things worse. Use an L4 and it will set it right.

This weird thing can also happen. C/S says to list „Who or what would kill buffaloes?” The auditor does, gets a BD F/N Item „A Hunter”. The C/S *also* says to list as a second action „Who or what would feel tough?” The auditor fails to test the Question for read and lists it. Had he tested it, the list would not have read. But the list comes up with an item, „A mean hunter”. It has stirred up charge from the first question and the item „A mean hunter” is a *wrong* item as it is a misworded variation of the first list's item! Now we have an unnecessary action *and* a wrong item. We do an L4 and the pc is still upset as maybe only one or the other of the *two* errors read.

In a Dianetic „list” one is not doing a listing action. One is only trying to find a somatic or sensation, etc. that will run. The item must read well. Or it won't produce a chain to run. In actual fact the Dn list Q does usually read but one doesn't bother to test it.

But an item that doesn't read will produce no chain, no basic and the pc will jump around the track trying but just jamming up his bank.

The moral of this story is:

Always *test* a Listing Question before letting the pc list.

Always *mark* the read it gave (SF, F, LF, LFBD) on the worksheet.

Always test an item for read before prepchecking or running recall or engrams.

Always mark the read an item gave (SF, F, LF, LFBD) on the worksheet.

CHARGE

The whole subject of „charge” is based on this. „Charge” is the electrical impulse on the case that activates the meter.

„Charge” shows not only that an area has something in it. It also shows that the pc has possible *reality* on it.

A pc can have a broken leg, yet it might not read on a meter. It would be *charged* but below the pc's reality. So it won't read.

THINGS THAT DON'T READ WON'T RUN.

The Case Supervisor always counts on the **Auditor** to test Questions and Items for read before running them.

The auditor, when a Question or Item doesn't read, can and should always put in „Suppress” and „Invalidate”. „On this (Question) (Item), has anything been Suppressed?” „On this (Question) (Item), has anything been Invalidated?” If either one read, the question or item will also read. The Case Supervisor also counts on the **Auditor** to use Suppress and Invalidate on a Question or Item. If after this there is still no read on the Question or Item, that's it. Don't use it, don't list it. Go to the next action on the C/S or end off.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dz.ka.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JULY 1971

Remimeo
Franchise
All Auditors
Level III Checksheets

Replaces HCO Bs 22 May 65 and 23 Apr 64,
and cancels HCO B 27 July 65 all on the same subject.

SCIENTOLOGY III

AUDITING BY LISTS REVISED

(Note: We now F/N everything. We do **not** tell the pc what the meter is doing. This changes „Auditing By Lists” in both respects. We do not say to the pc, „That’s clean” or „That reads”.)

AUDITING BY LISTS

(Reference: HCO B 14 Mar 71, „F/N Everything”)

Use any authorized, published **list**. (Green Form for general review, L1C for ARC Brks, L4B for listed items list errors.)

METHOD 3

Use meter at a sensitivity so meter needle is loose but it is easy to keep needle at „Set”. If sensitivity is too high the needle will be in constant motion as one tries to set the TA. If too low, the instant read will not be visible. 5 is usual for upper grade cases. 16 is usual for lower grade or Dianetic cases.

Have your meter in a position (line of sight) so you can see the list and the needle or you can see the needle and the pc. The meter position is important.

Hold the mimeoed list close beside the meter. Have your worksheet more to the right. Keep record on your worksheet. Mark the pc’s name and date on it. Mark what list it is on the W/S with Time. It remains in the folder stapled to the W/S.

Read the question on the list, note if it reads. Do **not** read it while looking at the pc, do **not** read it to yourself and then say it while looking at the pc. These are the L10 actions and

are called Method 6, not Method 3. It is more important to see the pc's cans than his face as can fiddle can fake or upset reads.

TR 1 must be good so the pc clearly hears it.

You are looking for an **Instant Read** that occurs at the end of the exact last syllable of the question.

If it does not read, mark the list X. If the list is being done through an F/N and the F/N just continues, mark the Question F/N.

If the question reads, do *not* say „That reads”. Mark the read at once (tick, SF, F, LF, LFBD, R/S), transfer the number of the Q to the W/S and look expectantly at the pc. You can repeat the Q by just saying it again if pc doesn't begin to talk. He has probably already begun to answer as the Q was live in his bank as noted by the meter.

Take down the pc's remarks in shortened form on the W/S. Note any TA changes on the W/S.

If the pc's answer results in an F/N (Cog VGIs sometimes follow, GIs always accompany a real F/N), mark it rapidly on the W/S and say, „Thank you. I would like to indicate your needle is floating.”

Do **not** wait endlessly for the pc to say more. If you do he will go into doubt and find more, also do **not** chop what he is saying. Both are TR errors that are very bad.

If there is no F/N, at the first pause that looks like the pc thinks he has said it, ask for an Earlier Similar _____ whatever the question concerned. Do **not** change the Q. Do **not** fail to repeat what the Question is. „Was there an Earlier Similar Restimulation of 'rejected affinity'?” This is the „E/S” part of it. You do *not* leave such a Question merely „clean”.

It does not matter now if you look at the pc when you say it or not. But you can look at the pc when you say it.

The pc will answer. If he comes to a „looks like he thinks he said it” and no F/N, you ask the same Q as above.

You ask this Q „Was there an earlier similar _____” until you finally get an F/N and GIs. You indicate the F/N.

That is the last of that particular question.

You mark „F/N” on the list and call the next question on the list. You call this and other questions without looking at the pc.

Those that do not read, you X as out.

The next question that reads, you mark it on the list, transfer the question number to the W/S.

Take the pc's answer.

Follow the above E/S procedure as needed until you get an F/N and GIs for the question. Ack. Indicate and return to the mimeoed list.

You keep this up until you have done the whole list in this fashion.

If you got no read on the list Question but the pc volunteers some answer to an unreading question, do **not** take it up. Just ack and carry on with your mimeoed list.

Believe your meter. Do not take up things that don't read. Don't get „hunches”. Don't let the pc run his own case by answering non-reading items and then the auditor taking them up. Also don't let a pc „fiddle the cans” to get a false read or to obscure a real one. (Very rare but these two actions have happened.)

BIG WIN

If half way down a prepared list (the last part not yet done) the pc on some question gets a wide F/N, big Cog, VGIs, the auditor is justified in calling the list complete and going to the next C/S action or ending the session.

There are two reasons for this – one, the F/N will usually just persist and can't be read through and further action will tend to invalidate the win.

The auditor can also carry on to the end of the prepared list if he thinks there may be something else on it.

GF AND METHOD 3

When a GF is taken up Method 3 (item by item, one at a time and F/Ned) it can occur that the TA will go suddenly high. The pc feels he is being repaired, that the clearing up of the first item on the GF handled it and protests. It is the protest that sends the TA up.

This is not true of any other list.

Thus a GF is best done by Method 5 (once through for reads, then the reads handled).

L1C and L4B, L7 and other such lists are best done by Method 3.

The above steps and actions are exactly how you do Auditing by List today. Any earlier data contrary to this is cancelled. Only 2 points change – we F/N everything that reads by E/S or a process to handle (L3B requires processes, not E/S to get an F/N) and we never tell the pc that it read or didn't read, thus putting his attention on the meter.

We still indicate F/Ns to the pc as a form of completion.

L1C and Method 3 are **not** used on high or very low TAs to get them down or up.

The purpose of these lists is to clean up by-passed charge.

An auditor also indicates when he has finished with the list.

An auditor should dummy drill this action both on a doll and bullbait.

The action is very successful when precisely done.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 AUGUST 1978

Remimeo

Ref: HCOB 28 Feb 71 C/S Series 24 METERING READING ITEMS
HCOB 8 Apr 78 AN F/N IS A READ
E-Meter Essentials, page 17 (ROCK SLAM)
HCOB 18 Jun 78 NED Series 4 ASSESSMENT AND HOW TO GET THE ITEM

INSTANT READS

The correct definition of **instant read** is **that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor.**

All definitions which state it is fractions of seconds after the question is asked, are cancelled.

Thus an instant read which occurs when the auditor assesses an item or calls a question is valid and would be taken up and latent reads, which occur fractions of seconds after the major thought, are ignored.

Additionally, when looking for reads while clearing commands or when the preclear is originating items, the auditor must note only those reads which occur at the exact moment the pc ends his statement of the item or command.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
4 DECEMBER 1972R
Revised 13 May 1975

Remimeo

Integrity Processing Series 1R

DEFINITIONS

INTEGRITY PROCESSING is that processing which increases a person's personal integrity and trust in himself and others by freeing him of past overts, withholds and missed withholds.

DEFINITION: **Overt** – A harmful or contra-survival act. Precisely, it is an act of commission or omission that harms the greater number of dynamics.

DEFINITION: **Withhold** – An undisclosed contra-survival act; 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 or ethical 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.

DEFINITION: **Missed Withhold** – An undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed. This is a withhold which another person nearly found out about, leaving the person with the withhold in a state of wondering whether his hidden deed is known or not.

Integrity is defined as:

1. The condition of having no part or element taken away or wanting; undivided or unbroken state; wholeness.
2. The condition of not being marred or violated; unimpaired or uncorrupted condition; soundness.
3. Soundness or moral principle; the character of uncorrupted virtue, especially in relation to truth and fair dealing; uprightness, honesty, sincerity.

This relates to **Ethics** which is defined as “the principles of right and wrong conduct and the specific moral choices to be made by the individual in his relationship with others”.

Thus we see that a person who acts against his own moral codes and the mores of the group violates his integrity and is said to be out-ethics.

Such acts are called overts. A person having committed an overt and then withholding the fact of that overt, and withholding himself from committing further overts, will individuate from the group. The group itself will then lose integrity as it becomes divided and lacks wholeness.

Integrity Processing is therefore that processing which enables a person, within the reality of his own moral codes and those of the group, to reveal his overt acts so he no longer requires to withhold and so enhances his own integrity and that of the group.

DEVELOPMENT

In the early '60s LRH developed the technology known as Sec Checking. As issued it was used for two purposes: as a general processing tool to clean up a pc's overt acts and withholds and as a security tool to detect out-ethics persons and security risks.

In 1970 this technology was refined and issued under the name of Confessionals.

In 1972 a complete update was done of basic O/W tech and the earlier procedures of Sec Checking and Confessionals. A new technology emerged – Integrity Processing.

Recently Integrity Processing has been reviewed as to its workability and most optimum usage by LRH and certain revisions have been made.

USAGE

Integrity Processing has two uses. Its basic use is as a tool for pc case gain, increase in responsibility and case progress. As such it belongs at Exp Grade II on the Grade Chart. You can't expect a pc with unhandled Drugs, who can't communicate because others don't really exist (Grade 0), and who is caved in by problems (Grade I) that he hasn't even cog-nited on, to have enough responsibility to answer up on O/Ws (Grade II). Therefore, Integ as a full RD goes at Exp Grade II. It is usually programmed to be done at or towards the end of the Grade and a full battery of Integ lists are used. It is not a mandatory Grade II Exp process, but is recommended.

The second use of Integrity Processing is as an ethics or security measure. It is used here as part of staff requirements or when a security clearance is needed. As such it has no case prerequisites and is not subject to such things as the Drug RD rule as it is not being used for pc case gain. Only one or at most two Integ lists would be used.

When used as an ethics or security measure, Integ can be done as auditing in a session (and is therefore subject to the Auditor's Code), or can be done as a straight security action, not "in session". In the case of the latter, the person must be informed that he isn't being audited. The technical procedure in either case would be the same.

It is noted that use of Integ as a non-session security measure or in the case of severe out-ethics is rare, and nothing here condones misuse or abuse of Integrity Processing as a security or ethics action. Such misuse would be itself subject to immediate and severe Ethics action as it would constitute an extreme betrayal of trust.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENCE – RELIGIOUS CONFESSION

The need for a person to be able to morally cleanse himself by confession of sins has long been recognized in religion.

The Buddhist monk 2,500 years ago was permitted to confess and seek expiation for “acts of censure”. The penalty for failure to confess was loss of the rights and privileges of a monk. This was enforcement of the natural law that he who commits actions against the codes or mores of the group separates himself from that group.

The Bible, in the Books of James and John, calls for the confession of sins.

Early Christian handling of confession was largely concerned with disciplinary aspects. The sinner had to wear sackcloth, make his bed in ashes, and fast. This went on for a time proportionate to the gravity of the offence, sometimes for years.

Certain sins were previously considered too serious for forgiveness and therefore not open to confession, but a gradual leniency developed as in the case of Calixtus, Bishop of Rome 217-222, who decided to admit adulterers to exomologesis (Greek for public confession).

In the 4th Century at Rome and Constantinople we hear of “penitentiaries” – priests appointed to act for the Bishop in hearing the confession of sins and deciding whether public discipline was necessary.

Due to some misuse of public confession, individual private confession became more prominent in the 5th Century.

In 1215 the Council of the Lateran ruled that everyone must make confession at least once a year before his parish priest.

In Confession as now administered in Christian Churches the disciplinary penance is often little more than nominal, stress being laid rather on the fullness of the confession.

Thus for at least 2,500 years confession has played an important role in religious practice.

Throughout the centuries two points of question have arisen which led to some unpopularity of confession. One was the possible misuse of information disclosed in *public* confession, hence the development of private confession before an authorized person whose code of conduct prevented misuse. The other was the infliction of disciplinary action as atonement for the sins confessed. But the latter goes beyond the realm of personal morals and ethics into justice. Confession itself, and the need for some form of confession has not been in question.

With Integrity Processing Scientology follows in the tradition of religion. This processing enables the individual to confess to overts without duress. It is done with a qualified Auditor bound by the Auditor’s Code. Disciplinary action forms no part of the processing.

The technology by which Integrity Processing is delivered is new. It is not the same as any earlier technology either in Scientology or other religion. It does however follow in the longstanding tradition of religion in providing a means for the individual to admit to and take responsibility for transgression against the mores of the group and so regain a spiritual and moral integrity.

Compiled from LRH briefings

and materials

Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234

Revised by
W/O Ron Shafran CS-4

Approved by
Commodore's Staff Aides

Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:RS:AL:MG:BL:clb.rd

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
5 DECEMBER 1972RA

Revised 13 May 1975

Remimeo

Integrity Processing Series 2RA

PROCEDURE

Integrity Processing must be done only by a well trained auditor, skilled in TRs, basic auditing and metering, who can make a prepared list read, and who has been fully checked out and drilled on these techniques.

As an auditing action it is done in model session with Rudiments in.

Every reading question of an Integrity Processing Form is F/Ned. The actual form question must be taken to F/N, not some other question.

Here is the basic procedure for Integrity Processing:

1. Set up the room, chairs, table, etc., as you would for any auditing session with all admin to hand, worksheet paper, Integ Form you will use, etc.
2. Make sure your pc's hands are not too dry or moist, the cans are the correct size and the pc knows how to hold them. Ref. False TA HCO Bs.
3. Start the session and fly a Rud if no F/N. If TA high or low do not try to fly a Rud but do a C/S Series 53RJ, assess and handle. If you are not trained in doing a C/S Series 53, end off for C/S instruction.
4. Put in any needed R-Factor on doing Integrity Processing.
5. Clear the procedure and the use of the buttons "suppress" and "false" etc. If necessary as an example run a non-significant question to demonstrate the procedure (e.g. Have you ever eaten an apple?).
6. Take up the first question and clear the words backwards, then the full command noting any read while clearing, which is valid. See BTB 2 May 72R, CLEARING COMMANDS, and HCO B 28 Feb 71, C/S Series 24, METERING READING ITEMS. Then, as needed, groove in the question further by asking for the time period the question would cover, the activities and people that would be involved, etc. This will steer the pc to the area and bring it into view.
7. With good TR 1 give the pc the first question, keeping an eye on the meter and noting any instant read. Even the smallest change of characteristic is checked in Integrity

Processing and that question taken up if it develops into an “SF”, “F”, “LF” or “LFBD”.

8. Take up each reading question getting the who, what, when and where of every overt, going earlier similar to F/N. Get specifics, not general or vague answers. If the pc gives off another's overt ask him if he ever did something like that. You want what the pc has done.
9. **Take the original reading question to F/N.** Not some other question. Always repeat the original question as part of the earlier similar command to keep the pc on that question.
10. If the question does not read and does not F/N put in Suppress on the question (and if necessary Invalidate, Abandoned, Not-Is, etc.) asking, “On the question _____ has anything been suppressed?” and noting any instant read. If Suppress (or one of the other buttons read) has read it means the read has transferred from the question to the button, so take up the question as in 8 above to F/N. If there is no read on the buttons the question should just F/N. After the question is taken to F/N there is no need to then check Suppress. Just go on to the next question.
11. If the pc gets critical realize you have missed a withhold and pull the MWH.
12. If an R/S occurs note it large and clear on the worksheets and then circle it in red after session with the statement or question on which it occurred. Note the fact on the Auditor Report Form and Program Sheet with session date and W/S page.
13. If a reading question does not go to F/N and bogs or the TA goes high, take up an L1RA (Integ Repair List), assess and handle per instructions.
14. **Examiner.** All Integrity Processing sessions must be followed immediately by a standard Pc Examination.
15. On any Bad Exam Report (non-F/N, BIs or non-optimum statement) after an Integ session, or on any pc who gets sick or upset or does not do well or has a high or low TA, give an L1RA as the next action.

The 24 Hour Red Tag Rule must be strictly enforced.

In the case of a pc requiring an L1RA the Case Supervisor would also look for evidence of questions F/Ned on something else, unflat questions, or withholds gotten off more than once.

A poor or comm lag TR 2, hidden from the view of the C/S, can also mess up a pc on Integ as it invalidates his answers and makes him feel he hasn't gotten it off. If suspected this could be checked by D of P Interview or pc to Exams: “What did the auditor do?”

16. The Integrity Form is complete when all questions on the Form have been handled as above and all reading questions taken to an F/N on that question.

SUMMARY

If this procedure is followed and the Integrity Processing done with good TRs and metering the pc will get great results and regain abilities.

Originally reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

Revised & Reissued by CS-4

Approved by
Commodore's Staff Aides
and the Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:RS:AL:MG:clb.rd

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
8 DECEMBER 1972RA

Revised 13 May 1975

Remimeo

Integrity Processing Series 3R, 4, 4R, 5RA

**INTEGRITY PROCESSING AND
O/Ws REPAIR LIST
L1RA**

(Cancels BTB 6 Dec 72R, Integrity Processing Series 3R, "Hi-Lo TA Assessment for Integrity Processing and Confessionals", and BTB 7 Dec 72, Integrity Processing Series 4, "Mid-Integrity Processing Short Assessment".)

This is the standard correction/repair list for O/W actions such as Confessionals, Integrity Processing, O/W Write-ups, O/W Meter Checks and Sec Checks.

In Integrity Processing this list is used in the event of a BER after an Integ session, if the pc gets sick or upset or falls on his head, or if an Integ session bogs.

This action is a **24 hour repair priority**.

The list is assessed Method 5 and all reading items fully handled to F/N per the instructions given.

Prefix the assessment with a time limiter (e.g. "In this session", "In that Integrity Processing", etc.).

PRECLEAR: _____ DATE: _____

AUDITOR: _____ TA: _____

0. **Was there something wrong with the meter or cans?** _____

False TA handling.

1. **Out int.** _____

Int RD Correction List or Int RD, if Went In or Go In read.

2. **List error.** _____
L4BR and handle.
3. **Were you tired or hungry?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
4. **Had you recently taken drugs_____ medicine_____ alcohol_____?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N. Note for C/S.
5. **Did you have an ARC break?** _____
ARCU, CDEINR E/S to F/N.
6. **Did you have a problem?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
7. **Has a withhold been missed?** _____
Pull it getting who nearly found out, etc. E/S to F/N.
8. **Had you told all?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N. Indicate it if so.
9. **Did you have to get the same W/Hs off more than once?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
10. **Someone demanded a W/H you didn't have?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N. Indicate it if so.
11. **Was there a false accusation?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
12. **Was anything suppressed?** _____
Clean it up E/S to F/N.
13. **Was anything invalidated?** _____
Clean it up E/S to F/N.
14. **Was anything protested?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
15. **Was there any evaluation?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
16. **Has something been misunderstood?** _____
Clean it up, clearing any mis-u words each to F/N.
17. **Was a question left unflat?** _____
Find out which one, indicate it, flatten it.

- 18. **Has an overt been protested?** _____
Get what it was and get in Protest button on it, check for E/S.
- 19. **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.
- 20. **Was there an earlier overt undisclosed?** _____
Pull it and clean it up E/S to F/N.
- 21. **Are you withholding anything?** _____
Get what it is E/S to F/N.
- 22. **Were you worried about reputation?** _____
Clean it up 2WC E/S to F/N.
- 23. **Are there opinions you don't dare say?** _____
Get what. 2WC E/S to F/N.
- 24. **Are you here for undisclosed reasons?** _____
Find out why he's here, 2WC E/S to F/N. Note for further handling.
- 25. **Were you afraid of what might happen?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
- 26. **Was there an injustice?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
- 27. **Was there a betrayal?** _____
2WC E/S to F/N.
- 28. **Had something been overrun?** _____
Get what, rehab.
- 29. **Was some action unnecessary?** _____
Find out what it is. Indicate it if so. E/S to F/N.
- 30. **Was there something else wrong?** _____
If so and it doesn't clean up on 2WC, GF M5 and handle.
- 31. **Has the upset been handled?** _____
2WC. If so indicate it to F/N.

Approved by
Commodore's Staff Aides
Board of Issues
for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:RS:clb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 JULY 1980

Remimeo

Cancels and replaces BTB 8 DEC 72RA
Same Title

CONFESSSIONAL 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 CONFESSSIONAL 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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 DECEMBER 1974

Remimeo
Sthil Students
Franchise

Cancels
HCO B 10 July 1964, Reissued 5 December 1974
as Integrity Processing Series 6R

HCO B 10 July 1964, "Overts – Order of
Effectiveness in Processing" remains
as originally issued.

Cancels BTB 9 Dec 72,
"Why Overts Work"

Integrity Processing Series 6RA

OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING

(The data in this Bulletin has been taken
from HCO B 10 July 1964. It is useful in
Integrity Processing.)

ARC BREAKS

The commonest cause of failure in running overt acts is "cleaning cleans" whether or not one is using a meter. The pc who really has more to tell doesn't ARC Break when the Auditor continues to ask for one but may snarl and eventually give it up.

On the other hand leaving an overt touched on the case and calling it clean *will* cause a *future* ARC Break with the auditor.

"Have you told all?" prevents cleaning a clean. On the unmetered pc one can see the pc brighten up. On the meter you get a nice fall if it's true that all is told.

"Have I not found out about something?" prevents leaving an overt undisclosed. On the unmetered pc the reaction is a sly flinch. On a metered pc it gives a read.

A pc's *protest* against a question will also be visible in an unmetered pc in a reeling sort of exasperation which eventually becomes a howl of pure bafflement at why the auditor won't accept the answer that that's all. On a meter protest of a question falls on being asked for: "Is this question being protested?"

There is no real excuse for ARC Breaking a pc by

1. Demanding more than is there or

2. Leaving an overt undisclosed that will later make the pc upset with the auditor.

WHY OVERTS WORK

Overts give the highest gain in raising cause level because they are the biggest reason why a person restrains himself and withholds self from action.

Man is basically good. But the reactive mind tends to force him into evil actions. These evil actions are instinctively regretted and the individual tries to refrain from doing *anything* at all. The “best” remedy, the individual thinks, is to withhold. “If I commit evil actions, then my best guarantee for not committing is to do *nothing* whatever.” Thus we have the “*lazy*”, inactive person.

Others who try to make an individual guilty for committing evil actions only increase this tendency to laziness.

Punishment is supposed to bring about inaction. And it does. In some unexpected ways.

However, there is also an inversion (a turn about) where the individual sinks *below* recognition of *any* action. The individual in such a state cannot conceive of *any* action and therefore cannot withhold action. And thus we have the criminal who can’t act really but can only re-act and is without any self direction. This is why punishment does not cure criminality but in actual fact creates it; the individual is driven below withholding or any recognition of any action. A thief’s hands stole the jewel, the thief was merely an innocent spectator to the action of his own hands. Criminals are very sick people physically.

So there is a level below withholding that an auditor should be alert to in some pcs, for these “have no withholds” and “have done nothing”. All of which, seen through *their* eyes is true. They are merely saying “I cannot restrain myself” and “I have not willed myself to do what I have done.”

The road out for such a case is the same as that for any other case. It is just longer. The processes for levels above hold also for such cases. But don’t be anxious to see a *sudden* return of responsibility, for the first owned “done” that this person *knows* he or she has done may be “ate breakfast”. Don’t disdain such answers in Level II particularly. Rather, in such people, seek such answers.

There is another type of case in all this, just one more to end the list. This is the case who never runs O/W but “seeks the explanation of what I did that made it all happen to me”.

This person easily goes into past lives for answers. Their reaction to a question about what they’ve done is to try to find out what they did that earned all those motivators. That, of course, isn’t running the process and the auditor should be alert for it and stop it when it is happening.

This type of case goes into its extreme on guilt. It dreams up overts to explain why. After most big murders the police routinely have a dozen or two people come around and confess. You see, if they had done the murder, this would explain why they feel guilty. As a ter-

ror stomach is pretty awful grim to live with, one is apt to seek any explanation for it if it will only explain it.

On such cases the same approach as given works, but one should be *very* careful not to let the pc get off overts the pc didn't commit.

Such a pc (recognizable by the ease they dive into the extreme past) when being audited off a meter gets more and more frantic and wilder and wilder in overts reported. They should get calmer under processing, of course, but the false overts make them frantic and hectic in a session. On a meter one simply checks for "Have you told me anything beyond what really has occurred?" Or "Have you told me any untruths?"

The observation and meter guides given in this section are used during a session when they apply but not systematically such as after every pc answer. These observations and meter guides are used always at the end of every session on the pcs to whom they apply.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nb.cden

[The 5 December 1974 reissue of HCO B 10 July 1964, which the above HCO B cancels, was taken verbatim from HCO B 10 July 1964.]

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
4 JANUARY 1962
Reissued 6 March 1977

Revises and Reinstates
HCO Bulletin of 4 January 1962
“Security Checking: Fundamentals”
as a BTB

Remimeo
Franchise

CONFESSONAL 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 pre-clear 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 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.

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 unnullled. 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.

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 part 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

* 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.

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 MARCH 1963

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 HUBBARD.)

Security Checking has an important part to play in modern auditing. We have the datum 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 cannot make the rapid progress which modern clearing techniques make possible. So don't underestimate 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 important 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

DEFINITIONS FPRD COURSE

LEFT-HAND BUTTON

a suppressor-type **button**. The nearly-found-out is a **left-hand button** and does not necessarily read on the meter. Suppress, careful of, nearly found out, fail to reveal. They do not cause things to read, they prevent things from reading. All the other buttons cause things to read unnecessarily. Anxious about tends to be a **left-hand button**. Protest follows on a **left-hand button** so it tends to be the point where the **left** and right side tie together. (SH Spec 229, 6301C10)

CONFUSION

1. a **confusion** can be defined as any set of factors or circumstances which do not seem to have any immediate solution. More broadly, a **confusion** in this universe is random motion. (POW, p. 21)
2. plus randomness. It means motion unexpected above the tolerance level of the person viewing it. (Abil 36)
3. a number of force vectors traveling in a number of different directions. (UPC 11)
4. a **confusion** consists of two things, time and space; change of particles in, predicted or unpredicted, and if they are unpredicted

STABLE DATUM

1. **until** one selects one **datum**, one factor, one particular in a confusion of particles, the confusion continues. The one thing selected and used becomes the **stable datum** for the remainder. (POW, p. 23)
2. any body of knowledge is built from one datum. That is its **stable datum**. Invalidate it and the entire body of knowledge falls apart. A **stable datum** does not have to be the correct one. It is simply the one that keeps things from being in a confusion and on which others are aligned. (POW, p. 24)
3. a **datum** which keeps things from being in a confusion and around which other data align. (NSOL, p. 66) See also DOCTRINE OF THE STABLE DATUM.

DOCTRINE OF THE STABLE DATUM

a confusing motion can be understood by conceiving one thing to be motionless. Until one selects one **datum**, one factor, one particular in a confusion of particles, the confusion continues. The one thing selected and used becomes the **stable datum** for the

remainder. A **stable datum** does not have to be the correct one. It is simply the one that keeps things from being in a confusion and on which others are aligned. (POW, pp. 23-24)

POSTULATE

n. 1. a self-created truth would be simply the consideration generated by self. Well, we just borrow the word which is in seldom use in the English language, we call that **postulate**. And we mean by **postulate**, self created truth. He **posts** something. He puts something up and that's what a **postulate** is. (HPC A6-4, 5608C--)

2. a postulate is, of course, that thing which is a directed desire or order, or inhibition, or enforcement, on the part of the individual in the form of an idea. (2ACC 23A, 5312CM14)

3. that self-determined thought which starts, stops or changes past, present or future efforts. (APIA, p. 33)

4. is actually a prediction. (5112CM30B)

v. 1. in Scn the word **postulate** means to cause a thinkingness or consideration. It is a specially applied word and is defined as causative thinkingness. (FOT, p. 71) **2 . t o** conclude, decide or resolve a problem or to set a pattern for the future or to nullify a pattern of the past. (HFP, p. 155)

3. to generate or "think" a concept. A **postulate** infers conditions and actions rather than just plain thinks. It has a dynamic connotation. (SH Spec 84, 6612C13)

JUSTIFICATION

explaining away the most flagrant wrongnesses. Most explanations of conduct, no matter how far fetched, seem perfectly right to the person making them since he or she is only asserting self-rightness and otherwrongness. (HCOB 22 Jul 63)

EVIL

1. that which inhibits or brings plus or minus randomness into the organism, which is contrary to the survival motives of the organism. (Scn 0-8, p. 92)

2. may be classified as those things which tend to limit the dynamic thrust of the individual, his family, his group, his race, or life in general in the dynamic drive, also limited by the observation, the observer and his ability to observe. (DTOT, pp. 20-21)

3. evil is the opposite of good, and is anything which is destructive more than it is constructive along any of the various dynamics. A thing which does more destruction than construction is evil from the viewpoint of the individual, the future, group, species, life, or MEST that it destroys. (SOS, Bk. 2, p. 34)

EVIL PURPOSE

destructive intentions. (7203C30SO) Abbr. Ev purp.

PRIOR CONFUSION

1. all sticks on the time track stick because of a **prior confusion**. The most stuck point on the track is a problem. The **confusion** occurred minutes, days, weeks before this problem. (HCOB 9 Nov 61)

2. all somatics, circuits, problems and difficulties including ARC breaks are all preceded by a **prior confusion**. Therefore it is possible to eradicate somatics by sec checking the area of **confusion** which occurred just before the pc noticed the somatic for the first time. (HCOB 2 Nov 61)

FIXED IDEA

is something accepted without personal inspection or agreement. (HCO PL 19 May 70)

SERVICE FACSIMILE,

1. these are called “**service facsimiles.**” “**Service**” because they **serve** him. “**Facsimiles**” because they are in mental image picture form. They explain his disabilities as well. The **facsimile** part is actually a self-installed disability that “explains” how he is not responsible for being able to cope. So he is not wrong for not coping. Part of the “package” is to be right by making wrong. The **service facsimile** is therefore a picture containing an explanation of self condition and also a fixed method of making others wrong. (HCOB 15 Feb 74)

2. this is actually part of a chain of incidents which the individual uses to invite sympathy or cooperation on the part of the environment. One uses engrams to handle himself and others and the environment after one has himself conceived that he has failed to handle himself, others and the general environment. (AP&A, p. 7)

3. it is simply a time when you tried to do something and were hurt or failed and got sympathy for it. Then afterwards when you were hurt or failed and wanted an explanation, you used it. And if you didn't succeed in getting sympathy for it, you used it so hard it became a psychosomatic illness. (HFP, p. 89)

4. every time you fail, you pick up this **facsimile** and become sick or sadly noble. It's your explanation to yourself and the world as to how and why you failed. It once got you sympathy. (HFP, p. 89)

5. that facsimile which the preclear uses to apologize for his failures. In other words, it is used to make others wrong and procure their cooperation in the survival of the pre-

clear. If the preclear well cannot achieve survival, he attempts an illness or disability as a survival computation. The workability and necessity of the **service facsimile** is only superficially useful. The **service facsimile** is an action method of withdrawing from a state of beingness to a state of not beingness and is intended to persuade others to coax the individual back into a state of beingness. (AP&A, p. 43)

6. that computation generated by the preclear (not the bank) to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and enhance own survival and injure that of others. (HCOB 1 Sept 63)

HIDDEN STANDARD

1. a **hidden standard** is a problem a person thinks must be resolved before auditing can be seen to have worked. It's a **standard** by which to judge Scn or auditing or the auditor. This **hidden standard** is always an old problem of long duration. It is a postulate-counter-postulate situation. The source of the counter-postulate was suppressive to the pc. (HCOB 8 Nov 65)

2. is not just a physical or mental difficulty but one by which the pc measures his case gains. A case measurement thing used secretly by the pc. (BTB 18 Sept 72) Abbr. HS.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 NOVEMBER 1970

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

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
11 DECEMBER 1972RA

Revised 13 May 1975

Remimeo

Integrity Processing Series 8RA

THE TECH AND ETHICS OF INTEGRITY PROCESSING

(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 Integrity Processing to a person without finding the earlier basic, you hang them.

If you can't chase back an Integrity Processing 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 Integrity Processing and it doesn't produce anything and the needle is clean you should indicate that the Integrity Processing 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 Commission. So you should ask yourself, “How come all these overts of omission?” There's an earlier overt of commission, 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, Integrity Processing specializes in overts and withholds. So the full panorama of Integrity Processing buttons is Ruds plus False, Suppress, Invalidate, Evaluate, Protest, Unnecessary. So if the TA goes up during Integrity Processing you should check buttons. If it doesn't handle rapidly and easily revert to the *LIRA (Integ Repair List)*.

If you can't get an F/N on Integrity Processing and have to end session you must have a line to Qual that cleans it up within 24 hours.

Every time an Integrity Processing action won't fly it has got to be a 24-hour urgent repair. The Integrity Processing Repair List consists of the ruds and buttons.

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 Integrity Processing!

If you give a person Integrity Processing 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 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 grandmother 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.

Anytime Integrity Processing is done the session reports *must* go into the pc folder otherwise the C/S can make an error in C/Sing because of the omitted data.

One does not do Integrity Processing in the middle of other auditing rundowns. The action therefore requires C/S clearance.

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 enturbation, 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't's" have a line for them to be handled on.

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 are given Integrity Processing. Such processing is however not limited to such cases.

It is extremely valuable processing to raise the cause level of staff, students and others.

Compiled from LRH briefings
and materials by
Lt. Comdr. Brian Livingston

Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:BL:mh.rdjh

[The full bulletin is contained in the BTB 30 July 70 THE TECH AND ETHICS OF CONFSSIONAL]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 JUNE 1984

Remimeo
False Purpose RD
Auditors and C/Ses
Cramming Officers
All Sec Checkers
HSSC Checksheet
False Purpose RD
Checksheet

False Purpose Rundown Series 4

CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS

(Modifies: HCOB 30 Nov 78 CONFSSIONAL PROCEDURE
Reference: HCOB 21 Jan 60 JUSTIFICATION
HCOB 7 Jul 64 JUSTIFICATIONS
HCOB 8 Jul 64 MORE JUSTIFICATIONS
TAPE 6406C09 THE CYCLE OF ACTION, ITS INTERPRETATION ON THE E-METER
TAPE 6406C16 COMMUNICATION, OVERTS AND RESPONSIBILITY)

One of the tools of the successful auditor is the technique of getting off the pc's justifications when pulling overts and withholds. When this tech has fallen out of use auditing has been less effective. Therefore in auditing the False Purpose RD it is mandatory that on each overt pulled the pc's justifications of that overt must be cleared.

Additionally, a step is added to sec checking procedure of getting the pc's justifications off on each overt that is found.

THEORY

Where the pc is justifying, he is in a non-confront of his own causation. By justifying he is lessening the severity of the overt and as long as he has an overt justified, he hasn't taken responsibility for it and it will still be charged. Thus pulling off the pc's justifications is invaluable in raising his cause and responsibility level.

PROCEDURE

Justifications are asked for after the time, place, form and event of the overt have been gotten and before asking for „who missed it“ **and E/S**.

The pc's justifications can be gotten by asking, „Have you justified that overt?“ or „Why wasn't that an overt?“, getting that answered, and asking for any more justifications until all are gotten. Quite often they will come off in a torrent, to the great relief of the pc.

Example: Auditor is running the confessional question, „Have you ever stolen an apple?“. After getting the pc to answer and give the what, when and so forth of the overt, the auditor asks:

Auditor: „Have you justified that overt?“

PC: „Yes, I decided it was OK to steal the apples because I was hungry.“

Auditor: „Thank you. How else did you justify it?“

PC: „Well, the store had so many apples in stock that I knew it wouldn't hurt them to lose a few... and after all, they've overcharged me before, so they actually sort of owed it to me, and I always shop there so they're still making plenty of money from me.“

Auditor: „OK. How else did you Justify it?“

PC: „That covers it. Boy, I really had that one loaded up with reasons for its being alright!“

Auditor: „Thanks very much. Who missed it?“

(Auditor continues on with the „missed“ step and then if no EP goes E/S on the sec check question.)

GRADE IV

This HCOB in no way changes or replaces the „Overt-Justification“ process which is run as part of Expanded Grade IV.

Ls

The L Rundowns are audited exactly per the Class X, XI and XII materials and are not added to or modified in any way by this HCOB.

This is quite a powerful bit of tech. It's application can make all the difference in cleaning up an overt.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:rw:iw

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
12 DECEMBER 1972

Reissued 10 July 1974 as BTB

Remimeo

Cancels
HCO Bulletin of 12 December 1972
Same title

Integrity Processing Series 9

RUDIMENTS

All Integrity Processing must be done in Model Session form with a rud flown at start of session if no F/N.

This is because wildly out rudiments can cause the pc to be so far out of session that the meter will not read on charged questions. This is particularly true in the presence of weak TRs.

Compiled from LRH briefings
and materials by
Lt. Comdr. Brian Livingston

Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:BL:mh.rjdh

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

Franchise

REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS
HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN

I am in a hurry to get this bulletin to you and to get it into use for all except CCH sessions.

For a long time I've been urging you to get rudiments in. For the past ten days I have been working hard to analyze and resolve why you sometimes cannot.

Just as an E-Meter can go dead for the auditor in the presence of a monstrous ARC break, I have found it can go gradually dull in the presence of out rudiments. If you fail to get one **in** then the outness of the next one reads faintly. And if your TR1 is at all poor, you'll miss the rudiment's outness and there goes your session.

To get over these difficulties, I have developed a Model Session that can be used, in the rudiments, as a series of repetitive processes.

Then, with this, I've developed Repetitive Rudiments.

The auditor at first does *not* consult the meter, but asks the rudiments question of the pc until the pc says there is no further answer. At this point the auditor says, "I will check that on the meter." And asks the question again. If it reads, the auditor uses the meter to steer the pc to the answer, and when the pc finds the answer, the auditor again lays the meter aside and asks the question of the pc as above until the pc has no answer. The auditor again says, "I will check that on the meter" and does so.

The cycle is repeated over and over until the meter is clean of any instant read (see HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962 for Instant Read).

The cycle:

1. Run the rudiment as a repetitive process until pc has no answer.
2. Consult meter for a hidden answer.
3. If meter reads use it to steer ("that" "that" each time the meter flicks) the pc to the answer.
4. Lay aside the Meter and do 1 and 2 and 3.

The process is flat when there is no instant read to the question.

One does not "bridge out" or use "two more commands". When the meter test of the question gets no instant read, the auditor says, "Do you agree that that is clean?" covertly looking at the needle as he or she says "clean". If the question really isn't clean, there will be

an instant read on “Do you agree the question is clean?” If there is such a read, do 1, 2 and 3 again.

The trick here is the definition of “In Session”. If the pc is in session the meter will read. If the pc is partially out the meter will read poorly, and the rudiment will not register and the rudiment will get missed. But with the pc in session the meter will read well for the auditor. Thus you get the pc to talk to the auditor about his own case, the definition of “in session”, before consulting the meter by using the repetitive process.

What a relief to the pc to have his rudiments in! And goodbye ARC breaks and no auditing results!

Use this system *always* on the beginning rudiments for every type of session.

Use this system on the Middle Rudiments in a havingness and sometimes on the Prepcheck type of session. But seldom on a Routine 3 (goals) type of session.

Use this system always on the End Rudiments of a havingness session. Do not use it on the End Rudiments of a Prepcheck or Routine 3 type of session unless the session has been full of screaming pc (which with this system it won't be).

- Havingness Type Session:

Repetitive Rudiments System on Beginning, Middle and End Rudiments.

- Prepcheck Type Session:

Repetitive Rudiments on Beginning and sometimes Middle Rudiments. Ask End Rudiments against meter as in step 2 and 3 of cycle (Fast Checking, see below).

- Routine 3 Type Session:

Use Repetitive Rudiments on Beginning Rudiments. Use 2 and 3 only (Fast Checking) for Middle and End Rudiments unless Session very rough.

So that's where Repetitive auditing processes wind up. Addressed to rudiments!

A tip – you can ARC break a session by overuse of Middle Rudiments on Routine 3 processes. Never use the Middle Rudiments just because the pc is talking about his or her own case. That's the definition of In Session. Use Middle Rudiments in Routine 3 when you have not had *any* meter needle response on three goals read three times (not one goal read disturbed the needle). Then get your Middle Rudiments in and cover the first consecutive nul goal above (the three that gave no response). Don't use Middle Ruds just because 3 goals went nul. Only if no reading of a goal disturbed the needle for three goals in a row. Also use Middle Ruds when the pc “can't think of any more” in listing of goals or items. Don't use every time you shift lists now. Only if the pc “can't list more”.

In Prepchecking use Middle Ruds Repetitively after 3 Zero questions have each been nul on a list of Zeros and recheck those Zeros if Middle Ruds were out. Use Middle Ruds after each What question was nulled and check the What question again and rework it if alive. Also check the Zero questions if a What went nul. If a Zero advanced to a What, both What and Zero must be checked for nullness and found nul before leaving them.

One Middle Rudiments use may suffice for both unless one was found still alive after the Middle Ruds were gotten in. Repair it and recheck if so.

FAST CHECKING

A *Fast Check* on the Rudiments consists only of steps 2 and 3 of the cycle done over and over.

Watching the meter the auditor asks the question, takes up only what reads and, careful not to Q and A, clears it. One does this as many times as is necessary to get a clean needle. But one still says, "Do you agree that that is clean?" and catches up the disagreement by getting the additional answers. When both the question and the agreement are seen to be clean, the question is left.

In using Fast Checking **never say, "that still reads."** That's a flunk. Say, "There's *another* read here."

You cannot easily handle a transistor type meter more sensitive than a Mark IV. The needle would be so rapid in its swings you would find it nearly impossible to keep it centred. Therefore a more sensitive meter was no answer. The TR 1 of many auditors lacks any great impingement. And this is remediable only when "altitude" can also be remedied. There had to be a better answer to getting out rudiments to read better on a Meter for all auditors and all pcs. Repetitive Rudiments is the best answer to this.

(Note: I am indebted to Mary Sue, when I was working on this problem, for calling my attention back to this system which I originally developed for Sec Checking and where it worked well.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 13 DECEMBER 1972R
Revised & Reissued 1 November 1974

Remimeo

Cancels
BTB of 13 December 1972
Same title

Integrity Processing Series 10R

**INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS
MUST BE F/Ned**

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

When you leave an Integrity Processing 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 an Integrity Processing 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 an Integrity Processing question unflat and go on to the next one. Or to fail to obtain an F/N on withholds in the rudiments and go on with the session.

One girl, being audited, was left unflat on a withhold 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 rumors, rapidly traced them back, got hold of the girl, sat her down and checked auditing and found the unflat withhold 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 withhold question was left unflat on you?" It was found and *handled*. 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 an Integrity Processing question is left unflat on a pc and thereafter ignored, the consequences are numerous.

THE REMEDY

The prevention of Integrity Processing being left unflat is easily accomplished:

1. Develop excellent TRs and Basic Auditing.
2. Know the E-Meter.
3. Work only with an approved E-Meter.
4. Know the various bulletins on Integrity Processing.
5. Get off your own withholds so that you won't avoid those in others.
6. Apply correct Integrity Processing procedure and handle each reading question to an honest F/N on that question.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

[Above Bulletin correspond more or less to HCOB 19 OCTOBER 1961 SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 14 DECEMBER 1972R

Revised 12 February 1973
Reissued 1 November 1974

(Only change is signature.)

Remimeo

Integrity Processing Series 11R

GENERALITIES WON'T DO

The most efficient way to upset a pc is to leave an Integrity Processing question unflat. This is remedied by taking each reading question to an F/N on the question.

The best way to “miss” an Integrity Processing question is to let the pc indulge in generalities or “I thought ...”

A withhold given as “Oh, I got mad at them lots of times,” should be pulled down to when and where and the first time “you got mad” and finally, “What did you do to them just before that?” Then earlier similar if no F/N.

The pc who withholds somebody else’s withholds and gives them as answers is a card. But he isn’t helped when the auditor lets him do it.

Situation: You ask the pc for a withhold about Joe. The pc who says, “I heard that Joe...,” should be asked right there, “What have you done to Joe? You. Just you.” And it turns out he stole Joe’s last blonde. But if the auditor had let this pc go on and on about how the pc had heard how Joe was this or that, the session would have gone on and on and the Tone Arm up and up.

We have pcs who use “withholds” to spread all manner of lies. We ask this pc, “Have you ever done anything to the Org?” The pc says, “Well, I’m withholding that I heard...,” or the pc says, “Well, I thought some bitter thoughts about the Org.” Or the pc says, “I was critical of the Org when...,” and we don’t sail in and get *what the pc did*, we can comfortably stretch a 5-minute item to a session or two.

If the pc “heard” and the pc “thought” and the pc “said” in answer to an Integrity Processing question, the pc’s reactive bank is really saying, “I’ve got a crashing big withhold and if I can keep on fooling around by giving critical thoughts, rumours, and what others did, you’ll never get it.” And if he gets away with it, the auditor has missed a withhold question.

We only want to know what the pc did, when he did it, what was the first time he did it and what he did just before that, and we’ll nail it every time.

THE IRRESPONSIBLE PC

If you want to get withholds off an “irresponsible pc” you sometimes can’t ask what the pc did or withheld and get a meter reaction.

This problem has bugged us for some time; I finally got very bright and realized that no matter whether the pc thought it was a crime or not, he or she *will* answer up on “don’t know” versions as follows:

Situation: “What have you done to your husband?” Pc’s answer, “Nothing bad.” E-Meter reaction, nul. Now we know this pc, through our noticing she is critical of her husband, has overts on him. But she can take no responsibility for her own acts.

But she *can* take responsibility for his *not knowing*. She is making certain of that.

So we ask, “What have you done that your husband doesn’t know about?”

And it takes an hour for her to spill it all, the quantity is so great. For the question releases the floodgates. The Meter bangs around.

And with these withholds off, her responsibility comes up and she *can* take responsibility on the items.

This applies to any zone or area or terminal of Integrity Processing.

Situation: We are getting a lot of “I thought”, “I heard”, “They said”, “They did” in answer to a question. We take the terminal or terminals involved and put them in this blank:

“What have you done that _____ (doesn’t) (don’t) know about?”

And we can get the major overts that lay under the blanket of “How bad everyone is but me.”

This prevents you missing an Integrity Processing question. It’s a bad crime to do so. This will shorten the labour involved in getting every question flat.

And if your pc is withholdy you can insert this “Have I missed an Integrity Processing question on you?” while doing the processing.

Always clear up what was missed.

A pc can be very upset by reason of a missed Integrity Processing question. Keep them going up, not down.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

[Above Bulletin correspond more or less to HCOB 16 NOVEMBER 1961 GENERALITIES WON'T DO]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 DECEMBER 1972R
Revised 1 November 1974

Remimeo

Integrity Processing Series 12R

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 *students*, 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.

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 toward 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.

“Have I missed a withhold on you?” can be used in Integrity Processing if the pre-clear gets upset or critical during session.

Any ARC Broken 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 Integrity Processing Specialist who 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
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

[Above Bulletin correspond more or less to HCOB 22 FEBRUARY 1962 WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 DECEMBER 1972
Reissued 7 November 1974

Remimeo

Cancels
BTB of 16 December 1972
Same title

Integrity Processing Series 13

HELP THE PC

In general, when getting rudiments in or getting off missed withholds or invalidations, help the pc by guiding his attention against the needle.

This is quite simple. The auditor asks the question, the needle instantly reacts, the pc (as he or she usually does) looks puzzled if the auditor says "It reacts." The pc thinks it over. As he or she is thinking, the auditor will see the same reaction on the needle. Softly the auditor says "That" or "There" or "What's that you're looking at?" As the pc knows what he or she is looking at at that instant, the thing can be dug up.

This is auditor co-operation, not triumph.

Most often the pc does not know what it is that reacts as only unknowns react. Therefore an auditor's "There" when the needle twitches again, before the pc has answered, coordinates with whatever the pc is looking at and thus it can be spotted and revealed by the pc. This is only done when the pc comm lags for a few seconds.

Remember, the pc is always willing to reveal. He or she doesn't know What to reveal. Therein lies the difficulty. Pcs get driven out of session when asked to reveal something yet do not know *what* to reveal.

By the auditor's saying "There" or "What's that?" quietly each time the needle reacts newly, the pc is led to discover what should be revealed.

Auditors and pcs get into a games condition in Integrity Processing and rudiments only when the auditor refuses this help to the pc.

New auditors routinely believe that in Integrity Processing the pc *knows* the answer and won't give it. This is an error. If the pc knew all the answer, it wouldn't react on the meter.

Old-timers have found out that only if they steer by repeated meter reaction, giving the pc "There" or "What's that?" *can* the pc answer up on most rudiments questions, missed withholds and so on.

But don't use steering to harass the pc, or cut his comm, or draw attention to the auditor.

This is the only use of reads other than instant reads on the E-Meter.
Help the pc. He *doesn't* know. Otherwise the needle would never react.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

[Above Bulletin is an excerpt from the HCOB 10 MAY 62, PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 DECEMBER 1972
Reissued 7 November 1974

Remimeo

Cancels
BTB of 17 December 1972
Same title

Integrity Processing Series 14

HAVINGNESS

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 havingness may be run in conjunction with Integrity Processing but may **not** be used to hide or obscure the fact of failure to F/N an Integrity Form question.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

[Above Bulletin is an excerpt from the HCOB 11 January 62, SECURITY CHECKING TWENTY-TEN THEORY]

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
6 JUNE 1968 RA
Revised 13 May 1975

Remimeo

(Cancels HCO B 6 June 68, "Sec Checking Info",
and BTB 19 Dec 72, Integrity Processing Series 16,
"Auditing Errors in Integrity Processing".)

Integrity Processing Series 16RA

INTEGRITY PROCESSING INFO

1. Use the question as a *guide* for digging, not as a rote question.
2. Follow each *non-reading* question with suppress and leave each *reading question* only when it has been taken to EP (per HCO B 13 DEC 72R, INTEGRITY PROCESSING SERIES 10R, "INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS MUST BE F/NED"). If suppression is found, start the cycle over with the question itself after suppress is clean. Realize that withholds exist, that they can be suppressed and that they can be restimulated and pulled. Once you have EP, however, don't recheck the question.
3. Suppress is always asked "repetitively" and not as a "fast check".
4. An R/S means **crimes** that **must** be pulled. A sporadic R/S can be turned on full by varying the question that produced it; the R/S will become wider and more chronic as the exact crime is approached. When the crime is found the R/S will become *very* pronounced, and then vanish. That's **crimes**, not "failed to wash the car".
5. A DR (Dirty Read) is not an R/S but can sometimes turn into an R/S by probing if a crime is present. It is noted on the worksheet as a "DR" though, never as an R/S.
6. The specific details of each misdeed must be gotten. Don't buy generalized overts, motivators and justifications.
7. You still use a comm cycle. Avoid heavy accusation.
8. ARC Breaks must be clean – you can't audit over an ARC Break.
9. Check for missed withholds every few questions.
10. Clean up the Integrity Processing Form at the end with such questions as "Half truth" and "Have you gotten away with anything?" etc.
11. Follow questions with "Have you told me more than was there?" on a pc who tends to dub in overts or motivators.
12. Limit the pc to this life if he takes up running track in an effort to avoid this life of-fenses.

13. Clean up any DN as soon as it appears by checking for a missed withhold or getting all? of the one you're on.
14. Watch the pc's indicators, e.g. for signs of missed withholds.
15. Keep track of the TA position during Integrity Processing. If a question sends the TA higher and if it then remains higher, something was missed on that question.
16. Pursue each chain to basic.
17. Pat "No's" can be handled by asking for overwhelmingly large overts, e.g. "Have you robbed any banks?" (Murder technique) or by reverse questions such as "Tell me about when you have *not* stolen something."
18. A question that reads sporadically isn't quite the right one and needs to be varied.
19. Keep aware of the needle – especially when a question is first called. Also, questions sometimes will show a need to be compartmented, e.g. "*Have you ever stolen (read) anything?*" Here the read on "stolen" should be pursued. A pc with a known withhold can have a prior read and not an instant one – this is something to watch for.
20. Keep your TR 1 in. Otherwise questions will not read due to lack of Auditor impingement.
21. Keep your TR 2 in. Otherwise the pc will feel his answer has not been accepted and it can put a pc on a withhold of nothing.
22. Help the pc give a withhold he's having trouble presenting. One way is by having him tell you what subject it's about or "part of it", another is by use of the overwhelmingly large overt approach: "Well, did you murder someone?"
23. Cut any natter line, pin down the critical thoughts and motivators and get the prior *overt*. The person getting Integrity Processing must not be allowed to sit and natter about a person or an Org, etc.
24. A person who has a valid EP on an Integrity Processing *Form* has the whole form ended off. It's the subject of the Integrity List which EPs, not just one question.
25. Beware of a "false read", which is thinking something read which didn't. Protest can then give you a read. Clean up questions with "Protest", "Suppress", "Inval" buttons where the pc says there's nothing there. Then if it *still* reads on check, there *is* something there. False reads (saying something read which really didn't) can wreck a case. Can also check for demanding a withhold he doesn't have.
26. Make sure you get the question answered – question: "Did you steal the tools from the tool shed?" is not answered by "I have a thing about keys."

Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234

Revised by

W/O Ron Shafran
CS-4

Approved by
Commodore's Staff Aides

Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:RS:MH:AL:nt.rd

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
23 DECEMBER 1972R
Revised 13 May 1975

Remimeo

(Cancels BTB 23 Dec 72, same title,
Integrity Processing Series 20, and
BTB 20 Dec 72, Integrity Processing Series 17,
“Sequence and Use of Integrity Processing Forms”.)

Integrity Processing Series 17R

C/Sing INTEGRITY PROCESSING

Integrity Processing *as auditing is C/Sed.*

The C/S ensures Integrity Processing is not entered into a pc pgm in the middle of another rundown or auditing action. When required it may be entered into a pgm at a suitable rest point but any current process or rundown in progress on the pc would be completed first. The C/S should not use this to unduly delay Integrity Processing when required, as a person withholding overts will not make gains until those overts have been pulled.

The Auditor must be qualified as a Hubbard Integrity Processing Specialist. This is a new tech. Its practitioners must be specialist trained.

Standard C/Sing rules apply. In addition the C/S looks for the following key points.

1. Any non-sequitur F/N on some other subject. Ensures that each question is F/Ned on the subject being asked about. This is the primary thing the C/S inspects.
2. Check that each reading question was taken to an F/N.
3. Check that any R/Ses were recorded clearly and noted at the front of pc folder for future use.
4. Ensure that an Integrity Processing Repair List (L1RA) is used if session ends with no F/N or pc at all upset or gets sick shortly after Integrity Processing. Examiner 24 Hour Rule must be rigorously applied.

No. 1 above is of prime importance. Don't permit Auditors to go into some unusual solution such as checking the question after it has been taken to F/N. That could wreck a case. The Auditor simply audits, keeps the pc on the right chain going earlier as necessary to an F/N. It is the C/S who checks to see that it was in fact the question being asked that F/Ned. This is done by checking for any non-sequitur answers that F/Ned on some other subject.

If a person falls on his head after an Integrity Processing session an L1RA is given. However an FES to find missing questions that F/Ned on something else is done.

The whole essence of this is contained in F/Ning every item; getting question asked to F/N, not some other; Integrity Processing Repair List L1RA; fines for missing withholds; and

Expanded Dianetics for R/Sers (revealing and recording R/Ses and R/Sing statements for later use in Exp Dianetics). This is what has made this a major new tech that gives fabulous case gains too.

It is the duty of the C/S to ensure the tech is known and correctly applied.

Compiled from LRH briefings and
materials by
Lt. Comdr. Brian Livingston

Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234

Revised by
W/O Ron Shafran, CS-4

Approved by
Commodore's Staff Aides

Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:RS:AL:MG:BL:clb.rd

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
21 DECEMBER 1972
Reissued 1 July 1974 as BTB

Remimeo

Cancels
HCO Bulletin of 21 December 1972
Same title

Integrity Processing Series 18

FORMULATING INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS

Withholds add up to overts, secrecies, individuation; they add up to games conditions and a lot more things than just O/W.

Although we call them withholds we're really asking a person to straighten out his interpersonal relationships with other terminals and groups.

Our normal Integrity Processing is addressed to the individual versus the society or his family or group because it's what people would consider reprehensible that makes a withhold. That is the basic center line of Integrity Processing, transgressions against the mores of the group.

You can have a special mores between the individual and different groups, between the son and the mother, between the husband and the wife, between the staff member and the organization, or between the Auditor and the Preclear (to which the Auditor Integrity Processing Form is directed).

It's a moral code that you are processing one way or the other. You're straightening out somebody on the "now I'm supposed to's" against which they have transgressed. And having so transgressed they now are individuated. If their individuation is too obsessive they snap in and become the terminal and can assume the characteristics of that person.

In dealing with this you go straight to the person's handling of masses and changes of spaces or into his most confused motional areas (not e-motional).

A person has been a recluse and stayed inside a house ever since he was 20. You don't start running houses in his Integrity Processing. You find what area he was in before he was 20. Staying in the house is a solution to something. We find an area of considerable activity that lies prior to the difficulty and then run Integrity Processing on that area.

We find there was one boarding school he absolutely detests. That's what we handle. Every question would have to do with that boarding school. There are students and boys and instructors and coaches and headmasters and buildings and athletic equipment, etc. Write them all down (you don't ask the Pc) then work out all the types of crimes he might have been able to commit against those items. In this way you compile a whole Integrity Processing Form to suit the situation.

Most often one takes the most appropriate issued form and simply adds a few questions to cover the special situation. You can always add some questions but don't omit any. When you want to handle a specific area or activity it can be more satisfactory to compile a special form covering all the things you think of that he could have done in that area that he is never going to tell anybody.

This is particularly so when the area has its own special tight mores he has cut up against and so has individuated himself from that area, cannot as-is any part of the track and of course gets trapped in that particular zone and activity.

Forget is a version of Not Know. So any sensory perceptic shut-off is an effort not to know and you have a target.

So you can do little special Integrity Processing Forms to go along with a special zone of activity and eventually you'll get a "What do you know!" There is no use telling him what he has been doing wrong. He is too in the thing to see it. You can see it because you're outside it.

You just put "Have you ever done anything to _____?" to a whole list and you've got a formulized method of getting together an Integrity Processing Form.

A cognition is totally dependent upon a freedom to know. Overts and withholds are dedicated to Not Knowingness. It takes the guidance of the Integrity Processing Form list of questions to handle this.

The formula then is to just make a list of all the items you can think of that have anything to do with the target and write up a list of possible overts against them or questions that call for overts. Has he done anything to _____? Has he interfered with anything about _____? etc. Don't include questions that call for motivators or justifications.

The first rule is – any area or zone of life with which a person is having difficulty in life, or has had difficulty, is a fruitful area for Integrity Processing. You'll find out every time he's got withholds in that zone or area.

The second rule is to break the problem down to its most fundamental expression. Then write down those nouns associated with it and those basic doingnesses associated with this fundamental expression. Then just phrase up your processing questions on the basis of "Have you ever _____?" and any other verb you want to put in. "Have you ever done _____?" "..... prevented _____?" etc. You don't have to get too fancy as the needle will fall when you get close to it.

That area where an individual is having difficulty he is stupid. Stupidity is Not Knowingness. Not Knowingness occurs through overts. But the overt has to be hidden so it must be an overt which is withheld. These withholds then add up to stupidity, so of course he has trouble. There isn't anything complicated about it at all.

Compiled from LRH briefings
and materials by
Lt. Comdr. Brian Livingston

Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:BL:mh.rd

[This BTB is in similar form released as HCOB 1 Mar 77 III Formulating Confessional Questions]

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
22 DECEMBER 1972R
Revised 13 May 1975

Remimeo
C/S
Staff C/S

Integrity Processing Series 19R

**ORDERING PERSONNEL TO
INTEGRITY PROCESSING**

Integrity Processing may be required on any Academy student, org staff member, or HGC pc where lack of progress, effectiveness or case gain is evident due to overts or withholds from the organization, or where there is a possibility of a threat to a Scientology Organization.

HCO or Executives may request such processing of their staff members. Neither Tech nor Qual are bound by such requests as an FES could reveal that the trouble stems from “out lists” or other matters needing correction. They should however take cognizance of such requests and do all possible to get the person handled and the Integrity Processing delivered with minimum delay when warranted.

Integrity Processing is not punishment in any way. It is auditing, must be C/Sed, must be *delivered* by a qualified Hubbard Integrity Processing Specialist and will help the person by giving fabulous case gains when done correctly.

Compiled from LRH
briefings and materials

Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234

Revised by
W/O Ron Shafran, CS-4

Approved by
Commodore's Staff Aides

Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:RS:AL:MG:BL:clb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 AUGUST 1968

BPI
Auditor

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.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:js.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 JUNE 1984

BPI
Remimeo
Auditors
C/Ses

False Purpose Rundown Series 1

FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN

Refs:

BOOK: ADVANCED PROCEDURE & AXIOMS, CHAPTER "POSTULATES"
BOOK: SCIENTOLOGY 0-8: THE BOOK OF BASICS, CHAPTER "CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS"
HCOB 27 MAR. 84 C/S SERIES 119 STALLED DIANETIC CLEAR: SOLVED
HCOB 30 JULY 80 THE NATURE OF A BEING

That beings are basically good and are seeking to survive are two fundamental facts of life.

A being's basic goodness can be made brightly evident or be heavily obscured, the quality of his life and survival potential can be enhanced or reduced, all through a factor fundamental to the thetan himself: **Purposes**.

Where a being has accumulated non-survival purposes and intentions, he will be found to be having, doing and being far below his potential. Having committed overt acts (prompted by false, non-survival intentions and purposes) he then restrains himself from action. Achievement, stability, certainty, respect for self, and even the thetan's innate power can seem to deteriorate or disappear altogether.

And it can be found that many of these contra-survival purposes have been fettering the being for a **very** long time.

Recent upper level research breakthroughs have led to the development of a new rundown designed to slash straight through to the root of such false purposes and unwanted intentions and **blow** them.

The name of this new rundown is the **False Purpose Rundown**.

RESEARCH

The tech research done was quite extensive and involves several major discoveries. But I'll let you in on one thing: There were a group of beings (translates to „psychs“ and „priests“ – same crew, really) who existed way, way back on the track.

It was the aim of these psychs back on the whole track to very carefully push in people's anchor points to prevent them from *reaching*. The psychs were, themselves, a bunch of

terrified cowards, and the *prevention of reaching* was one facet of their operation. Handling overts, withholds and non-survival purposes with the False Purpose Rundown has proven highly effective in undoing the effects of the „work“ of psychs on the whole track, and *restoring* the thetan's *willingness and ability to reach*.

DELIVERY

The False Purpose Rundown may only be delivered by an auditor who has completed the **Hubbard False Purpose Rundown Auditor** (HFPRDA) course, where one studies the materials of the new tech breakthroughs and masters the laser-precise techniques of False Purpose Rundown auditing. The rundown may only be C/Sed by a New Class VI C/S (or above) who also has been thoroughly trained in the tech of the False Purpose Rundown as both an auditor **and** a Case Supervisor.

The auditing is very fast and very direct.

And – hold your hat – though it is the result of research into the far reaches of the OT band, it can be delivered to persons who have just begun on their way up the Bridge! Case prerequisites for the rundown are determined by the Case Supervisor, based on the pc's drug history and personality test results. Some pcs will need no prior case actions at all. (REF. HCOB 12 NOV 81RB, GRADE CHART STREAMLINED FOR LOWER GRADES)

RESULTS

Pcs and PreOTs report – and folder studies confirm – a very high rate of case gain per hour of auditing on this rundown, with unwanted fixed conditions and considerations dropping away left and right.

Barriers to enjoyment of life and attainment of goals that before seemed solid and formidable can be whisked away like a puff of smoke before a fresh gust of wind. What would be left if such barriers were gone? Certainty of self and one's basic purposes and intentions – and a revitalized reach, drive and confidence in one's ability to achieve them, free from self-restraint.

And that, my friend, *is worth reaching*.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:rw:iw

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 JUNE 1984R
Issue IV

Revised 12 January 1990

(Also Issued as an HCO PL, HCO same date and title.)

Remimeo
Auditors
C/Ses
MAAs/Ethics Officers
Cramming Officers
HSSC Checksheet
False Purpose RD
Auditors and C/Ses

False Purpose Rundown Series 2R

**THE “LOST TECH” OF HANDLING
OVERTS AND EVIL PURPOSES**

Refs:

HCO PL 7 Feb. 65	KSW Series 1	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING
HCO PL 17 June 70RB I	KSW Series 5R	TECHNICAL DEGRADES
Rev. 25.10.83		
HCOB 28 Feb. 84	C/S Series 118	PRETENDED PTS
HCOB 13 Oct. 82	C/S Series 116	ETHICS AND THE C/S
HCOB 9 Feb. 79R	KSW Series 23R	HOW TO DEFEAT VERBAL TECH CHECKLIST
Rev. 23.8.84		
HCOB 15 Feb. 79	KSW Series 24	VERBAL TECH: PENALTIES
HCO PL 17 Jan. 79A		NEW TYPE OF CRIME

In a recent review of several cases, I’ve unearthed some vital tech in the fields of pulling overts and handling evil purposes that had been “lost” (buried) by certain SPs who’ve long since departed. This tech has now been put fully back into use and – with the addition of totally new breakthroughs on the handling of evil purposes – is more powerful than ever.

HISTORY

In early days I developed Security Checking to a high skill, whereby the meter was used to get the exact time, place, form and event nailed down on every overt.

In later years, in rundowns such as Expanded Dianetics, Sec Checking was covertly knocked out of use through verbal tech. This got to the point where some cases, not having been unburdened of later overts and withholds with Sec Checking, were sent off down the track in search of early overts and evil purposes well beyond the confront and reality of the

precise. Attempts were sometimes made to use high-powered L&N questions on such pcs to locate evil purposes and intentions to run. Burdened with unpulled overts, the pcs had a hard time answering such questions.

A few unscrupulous persons who themselves were strenuously avoiding being sec checked put this "tech" out in issues. It of course threw a wrench into the works and was one of the main tricks they pulled in an effort to undermine the workability of Expanded Dianetics. Sec Checking tech was, some years later, put back into use with a vengeance and many pcs got excellent gains from it. But not all of the tech was restored: The tech of handling evil purposes had been omitted!

What happened was that a "pendulum swing" effect had occurred. At one extreme, only straight pulling of overts and withholds close to present time was stressed. And at the other extreme, scant attention was paid to skilled sec checking of the pc's current or recent withholds and, instead, auditors were guiding pcs in a search for whole track incidents and evil purposes exclusively.

SUCCESS

The fact is that any auditing aimed at handling the basic factors that can stall a case cannot succeed up to its full potential unless it includes **both**:

- A. Thorough, vigorous pulling of the pc's overts, and**
- B. Tracing the overt back to E/S overts on that chain and back to the underlying evil purpose and carrying it through to a full blow.**

I have since restored the tech of Sec Checking to full use and it is working very well in the hands of skilled auditors.

But now we have the brand-new, startlingly direct and powerful tech of the False Purpose Rundown! Based on discoveries made in upper level research this new rundown has produced spectacular results, including the undoing of psychs' suppressive actions of long, long ago. But for an auditor to be able to use this new tech he must first be a skilled Sec Checker.

This does not mean that the technology of Sec Checking cannot be used, nor is this HCOB intended to prevent people from being sec checked as part of HCO investigatory or justice actions. Sec Checking is a vital tool in its own right.

ETHICS

If in the future any person is found to be omitting or refusing to deliver the False Purpose RD or related RDs when needed, or doing something else and calling it "False Purpose RD," he may be called before a Committee of Evidence on a charge of:

Attempting to undermine or advising or encouraging or condoning the abandonment or reduction of use of the full technology of locating and handling overts, evil purposes, destructive intentions and nonsurvival considerations.

This offense is classified as a high crime, and if proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt by a Committee of Evidence, the offender may be declared suppressive and expelled from the Church.

SUMMARY

In this technology lies the key to sanity, certainty, reach and ability. Only the truly suppressive would wish to see it neglected or abandoned.

With this tech in your good hands and well applied, their wish will fade away as they do.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

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

Franchise

THE PRIOR CONFUSION

A recent discovery I have made may well do away with the need to directly run problems, particularly on people who find them hard to confront.

The mechanism is this:

All problems are preceded by a Prior Confusion.

The handling consists of locating the problem, then locating the Prior Confusion and then Sec Checking that Prior Confusion.

The preclear tends to edge forward in time to the problem continuously and to 'bounce' out of the Prior Confusion once located. The remedy is to locate the O/Ws in the Prior Confusion and keep the preclear out of the moment of the Problem.

All somatics, circuits, problems and difficulties including ARC breaks are all preceded by a Prior Confusion. Therefore it is possible (but not always feasible at the moment) to eradicate somatics by Sec Checking the Area of Confusion which occurred just before the pc noticed the somatic for the first time.

This is part of a Class II Auditor's skills.

A problem could be regarded as a mechanism by which to locate hidden Areas of Confusion in a pc's life.

All Hidden Standards are the result of a Prior Confusion.

The mechanism is extremely valuable. All rudiments could be run by finding the rudiment out, getting the difficulty expressed, locating the Prior Confusion and then finding the pc's O/Ws in that Area of Confusion.

A Problems Intensive based on this mechanism is under design and I will release it for Class II use when I am satisfied the form is complete.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:vbn.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 30 JULY 1962

Franchise

A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE

Here is the pattern for a new Problems Intensive that can be given by HGC or field auditors and which will get them marvellous results on new or old pcs.

This arrangement makes prepchecking come into its own, for if it is well done then the pc is fairly well set up for having his goal found.

This intensive is amazingly easy to run providing that the auditor does it pretty well muzzled and does not violate repetitive prepchecking drill. Of course if the auditor's meter reading is not perfect and if the auditor is not cognizant of recent HCO Bulletins on the meter and if the auditor misses as many as two reads in a session, this whole result can wind up in a fiasco. If the pc doesn't feel better on this one then the auditor just didn't read the meter or miserably flubbed current drill. Of these two the D of P had better suspect the meter readings if anything goes wrong.

The first thing to do is complete the old case assessment form. We do this in Model Session and check after each small section of it as to whether we've missed a withhold on the pc.

We then assess the self-determined change list (and don't goof and put other determined changes on the pc's change list, or we'll be assessing engrams).

We find the most important, most reacting change in the pc's life by the largest read. This can also be done by elimination.

We then locate the prior confusion to that change. In no case will it be earlier than two weeks from the incident. These confusions, so often missed by the auditor, take place from two weeks to five minutes before the actual decision to change.

Having located the time of the prior confusion, but not done anything else about it, no lists of names or anything like that, we then go one month earlier in date.

This gives us an exact date for our questions. Let us say the self-determined change was June 1, 1955. The prior confusion was May 20, 1955, and the arbitrary month earlier was April 20, 1955. We get the pc to spot this arbitrary date more or less to his own satisfaction.

We now form a question as follows: "Since (date) is there anything you have.....?"

The endings are in this order: Suppressed, Suggested, Been careful of, Invalidated and Failed to reveal.

The question with one end is completely cleaned by Repetitive Prepchecking. One asks it off the meter until the pc says there is no more. Then one checks it on the meter and steers the pc with any read, and then continues the question off the meter, etc, etc.

In turn we clean each one of the buttons above. This will take many hours in most cases. It is vital not to clean anything that's clean or to miss cleaning a read that reacts. In other words, do a clean meter job of it all the way at sensitivity 16.

When we have in turn cleaned each of the buttons above, we do a new assessment of the change list and get us a new time just as before and handle that just as before.

When the second area is clean we assess for a third.

Frequently, particularly if the needle gets dirty, we ask for missed withholds. Indeed one can use all the Middle Rudiments at least once each session.

With expert needle reading that intensive will give the pc more gain per hour of auditing than anything else short of Routine 3GA.

I wish you lots of success with it. Remember, the more variables you introduce into such a system the less confidence the pc will have in you.

Good hunting.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 NOVEMBER 1961

Franchise

**THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE
USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION**

All sticks on the time track stick because of a Prior Confusion.

The most stuck point on the track is a Problem.

A Problem is caused by a balanced postulate-counter-postulate. Neither postulate has dominance. The problem, therefore, hangs in time and floats in time. Force vs force, endeavour vs endeavour, all these are the anatomy of a problem.

One cannot have a problem without overts and withholds against the people involved in it, for one cannot be so individuated as to not influence others unless one has O/Ws on those others.

All somatics, aberrations, circuits and problems are postulate-counter-postulate situations.

All these items occur only where one has O/Ws on others.

By finding and Sec Checking the Area of Prior Confusion to any problem, somatic, circuit or hidden standard, one can alleviate or blow that problem or condition.

THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

To give a Problems Intensive, the auditor first fills in the Preclear Assessment Form on the pc.

1. Complete Change List

The auditor then asks the pc for all the *self-determined* changes the pc has made this life. These are written with date first, followed by two or three descriptive words. This list is a long column on the page, or two columns on the page.

It is important that no other-determined changes in his or her life are recorded as these are occurrences and assess because of engram content as in operations.

The pc must have made up his or her mind to change, to move, to diet, to seek adventure, to take up Thackeray, to go to Church, etc, etc.

When the E-Meter no longer reacts to the question “Was there another time you decided to change your life?”, when no needle action remains, consider list complete.

2. Assess Change List

Now Assess this list. It can be assessed by biggest needle reaction or, better, by elimination.

One change will react consistently. If none remain, find out about any more changes.

You will wind up with a charged, self-determined change.

Write it down.

3. Obtain Problem

Ask the pc for the problem that preceded this change.

If you have the right change, the Problem will *leap* into view. If you have the wrong change, the pc will appear to be in present time trying to figure out what problem there *might have been*.

This last indicates he is not stuck in the problem, therefore it isn't it. If pc obviously can't find any problem in the area, even when coaxed, do a better assessment.

When you have the problem, write it down.

4. Date the Problem

By using any dating system on the E-Meter, find the date *in this lifetime* when this problem arose. This gets the pc into a time perspective with regard to the problem.

If the pc insists on going back track, play along with it. Do following steps anyway on back track. But do not encourage it. A Problems Intensive concerns this lifetime.

5. Find Prior Confusion

Discuss the problem with the pc. Find out what people or type of person it concerns.

Locate on the Meter the Confusion which occurred minutes, days, weeks before this problem.

Find out the names of the people concerned in this confusion.

Write down these names.

Now ask searchingly with Meter for any missing persons.

When satisfied you have the persons (and sometimes things) involved, end your list.

NOTE: At this point one could assess the list for the most heavily charged person but the step is not vital nor, in the light of terminal phenomena, since only a goals terminal can be safely run, is this really safe.

6. Compose Sec Check

Composing a generalized Sec Check based on the type of confusion, and using the date of the confusion in every question, make ready to Sec Check the Area.

7. Sec Check Confused Area

Get off all the pc's overts and withholds in the Area of Confusion.

8. Test for Problem

Test on E-Meter for the Problem found above. If it is still reacting on Meter, Sec Check further. Do this until problem seems quietened down.

9. Assess for New Change

Return to Change List and any new self-determined changes pc now recalls.

Assess List.

Continue on with steps as above.

A Problems Intensive can key out present time problems of long duration, chronic somatics, circuits and hidden standards.

It is one of the skills of a Class II Auditor.

Excellent graph changes have been obtained by giving a Problems Intensive.

L RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 JUNE 1984

Remimeo
False Purpose RD
Auditors and C/Ses
Cramming Officers

False Purpose Rundown Series 3

**THE PRIOR CONFUSION:
NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH**

REFS:	
HCOB 2 NOV 61	THE PRIOR CONFUSION
HCOB 9 NOV 61	THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION
HCOB 5 APR 71RA	TRIPLE RERUNS
HCOB 26 JUN 78RA II	NED SERIES 6RA ROUTINE 3RA ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS (Section on NARRATIVE R3RA)
HCOB 13 SEP 78	R3RA ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS AND NARRATIVE R3RA AN ADDITIONAL DIFFERENCE
HCOB 28 MAY 69	HOW NOT TO ERASE
HCOB 6 OCT 61	TRAINING OF STAFF AUDITORS
HCOB 30 JUL 62	A SMOOTH HGC 25-HOUR INTENSIVE
TAPE: 6110C03	"THE PRIOR CONFUSION"

The highly effective tech of handling problems on a pc by finding the prior confusion to the problem and pulling O/Ws in that area has been in use since its discovery in the early 60s.

The theory of this is that any fixed idea or condition is the result of a postulate made by the thetan. Just prior to that postulate there was a confusion – an unconfontable disturbance. The postulate is a stable datum, adopted in an attempt to solve that confusion. By getting off the pc's O/Ws in the area of the confusion, one can key out the postulate and fixed condition.

BREAKTHROUGH

I have just made a breakthrough of magnitude on the subject of the prior confusion while engaged in whole track research. This tech has a broader application than was originally envisioned.

What has actually been spotted here is that the psychs on the whole track created a confusion originally and used the overwhelm of that as the knockout for the implant. They didn't, at that stage of the track, have any other tools to knock beings out. So the mechanism of prior confusion is very early and very dominant.

This breakthrough on the prior confusion comes from spotting the first moment of the confusion.

This does not mean that a pc, in running back an evil purpose, is necessarily going to contact an incident containing a psychiatrist. But you as the auditor should know that that is what this tech discovery is based upon.

HANDLING EVIL PURPOSES

This has immediate application in auditing addressed to the locating and handling of a pc's accumulated evil purposes and nonsurvival considerations.

Once such a purpose or consideration is found, one locates the confusion which occurred just before it. If there is no blow of the purpose or no visible reaction, then one gets an earlier time for the same evil purpose and an earlier confusion to that. **When one finds the first moment of the first confusion which led to that evil purpose, one can blow the whole thing.**

Once the **First Moment** of that first confusion on that chain is found, you will normally get a blowdown of the tone arm, a cognition, VVGIs in the pc and a persistent F/N, if not a floating TA.

Getting the first moment of the confusion is crucial. This follows the fundamental auditing principle of the "earlier beginning," as described in the basic books and in New Era Dianetics tech. By locating the earliest moment when the pc had an awareness of the confusion, it can be blown.

SOURCE

The false purpose or evil intention may have been generated by the person himself or directly implanted by another. This new application of prior confusion tech as given in the False Purpose Rundown has been shown to be highly effective regardless of the source of the purpose or intention.

ERRORS

On the False Purpose RD if one gets the prior confusion but the evil purpose doesn't spectacularly blow, it could be due to a number of reasons. But it is primarily one of these two things:

1. The auditor failed to get the **earlier time the pc had that same purpose** and then get the prior confusion beneath it; or
2. The auditor did get the basic prior confusion on that evil purpose, but failed to get the **first moment of that confusion.**

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 JUNE 1984

Remimeo
False Purpose RD
Auditors and C/Ses
Cramming Officers
All Sec Checkers
HSSC Checksheet
False Purpose RD
Checksheet

False Purpose Rundown Series 4

CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS

(Modifies: HCOB 30 Nov 78 CONFSSIONAL PROCEDURE
Reference: HCOB 21 Jan 60 JUSTIFICATION
HCOB 7 Jul 64 JUSTIFICATIONS
HCOB 8 Jul 64 MORE JUSTIFICATIONS
TAPE 6406C09 THE CYCLE OF ACTION, ITS INTERPRETATION ON THE E-METER
TAPE 6406C16 COMMUNICATION, OVERTS AND RESPONSIBILITY)

One of the tools of the successful auditor is the technique of getting off the pc's justifications when pulling overts and withholds. When this tech has fallen out of use auditing has been less effective. Therefore in auditing the False Purpose RD it is mandatory that on each overt pulled the pc's justifications of that overt must be cleared.

Additionally, a step is added to sec checking procedure of getting the pc's justifications off on each overt that is found.

THEORY

Where the pc is justifying, he is in a non-confront of his own causation. By justifying he is lessening the severity of the overt and as long as he has an overt justified, he hasn't taken responsibility for it and it will still be charged. Thus pulling off the pc's justifications is invaluable in raising his cause and responsibility level.

PROCEDURE

Justifications are asked for after the time, place, form and event of the overt have been gotten and before asking for „who missed it“ **and E/S**.

The pc's justifications can be gotten by asking, „Have you justified that overt?“ or „Why wasn't that an overt?“, getting that answered, and asking for any more justifications until all are gotten. Quite often they will come off in a torrent, to the great relief of the pc.

Example: Auditor is running the confessional question, „Have you ever stolen an apple?“. After getting the pc to answer and give the what, when and so forth of the overt, the auditor asks:

Auditor: „Have you justified that overt?“

PC: „Yes, I decided it was OK to steal the apples because I was hungry.“

Auditor: „Thank you. How else did you justify it?“

PC: „Well, the store had so many apples in stock that I knew it wouldn't hurt them to lose a few... and after all, they've overcharged me before, so they actually sort of owed it to me, and I always shop there so they're still making plenty of money from me.“

Auditor: „OK. How else did you Justify it?“

PC: „That covers it. Boy, I really had that one loaded up with reasons for its being alright!“

Auditor: „Thanks very much. Who missed it?“

(Auditor continues on with the „missed“ step and then if no EP goes E/S on the sec check question.)

GRADE IV

This HCOB in no way changes or replaces the „Overt-Justification“ process which is run as part of Expanded Grade IV.

Ls

The L Rundowns are audited exactly per the Class X, XI and XII materials and are not added to or modified in any way by this HCOB.

This is quite a powerful bit of tech. It's application can make all the difference in cleaning up an overt.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:rw:iw

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCOB BULLETIN OF 9 JUNE 1984RA
Revised 22 March 1996

Remimeo
False Purpose RD Auditors
False Purpose RD C/Ses
Cramming Officers

(Revised to handle compilation errors which gave an incorrect sequence of taking up volunteered evil purposes before pulling the pc's overts, and did not clearly state the EP of an FPRD chain. With this revision the procedure exactly follows LRH tech data and handles the possibility of auditors missing withholds. Revisions in Arial.)

False Purpose Rundown Series 5RA

AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN

References:

LRH TECHNICAL TRAINING FILM TR-14,	CONFESSIONAL TRS
HCOB 30 NOV 78R REV. 10.11.87	CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE
HCOB 5 JUN 84R FPRD SERIES 1R	THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN
REV. 11.01.90	
BOOK: ADVANCED PROCEDURE AND AXIOMS, CHAPTER „POSTULATES“	
HCOB 28. NOV 70 C/S SERIES 22	PSYCHOSIS
HCOB 09. MAY 77 II ExDN SERIES 24	PSYCHOSIS, MORE ABOUT
HCOB 28 FEB 84 C/S SERIES 118	PRETENDED PTS
HCOB 27. MAR 84 C/S SERIES 119	STALLED DIANETICS CLEAR: SOLVED
HCOB 07. JUN 84 FPRD SERIES 3	THE PRIOR CONFUSION: NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH
HCOB 08. JUN 84 FPRD SERIES 4	CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS
HCOB 06. NOV 64	STYLES OF AUDITING (LEVEL II - GUIDING STYLE)
HCOB 21. MAR 74	END PHENOMENA
HCOB 01. MAR 77 II	CONFESSIONAL FORMS

The False Purpose Rundown is a brand-new development in the handling of overts, withholds, evil purposes and destructive intentions. Using this new technique they are traced straight down to their origins and **blown**.

EVIL PURPOSES

An evil purpose is a destructive purpose, intention or postulate.

I discovered in 1970 that evil purposes are the basis of insanity. A person who continuously commits harmful acts has evil purposes. He is prompted by these purposes to commit overts. (Such a person often tries to keep these overts carefully hidden while continuing to commit them.)

This does *not* mean that every pc who gives off an evil purpose is a raving psychotic or a John Dillinger or is bent only on destruction. It does *not* mean that any pc who discovers he has been dramatizing a destructive intention is an SP. What it does mean is that this is an area that will cause (or, more likely, has already caused) a great deal of difficulty or conflict not only for the pc himself but for those around him.

POSTULATES

Evil purposes are, in effect, postulates.

Research on purposes and postulates and their role in the general aberration of a case goes back as early as 1950, and a lot of material exists on this in HCOBs and in basic Dianetics and Scientology books.

In dealing with this subject we are, in reality, dealing with a whole spectrum of what are actually postulates: considerations, intentions, purposes, service facsimiles and computations. These are all postulates.

Such false purposes, false considerations, quasi-evil purposes and the like can sit squarely in the road of attempts to hat or train or get case gain on a person.

NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH

Underlying an overt chain you will very often find an evil purpose or destructive intention. In other words, when you start tracking down O/Ws with E/Ses keeping on a certain type of O/W, you will very likely run into an evil purpose on a case. The underlying evil purpose prompts the person to commit and continue committing harmful acts.

The breakthrough that I have made on this line is in the application of prior confusion tech to the handling of overts and evil purposes. Just as an evil purpose can be found at the bottom of a chain of overts, so can a confusion be found just prior to an evil purpose.

Once the first underlying prior confusion on that chain is located, it is only necessary to have the pc spot the **first moment** of it to cause it to blow.

END PHENOMENA

On the False Purpose Rundown, the auditor's aim is to pull an overt down its E/S chain, then get the underlying evil purpose, and run the purpose back to the prior confusion and earlier times he had that same purpose, getting the prior confusion each time, until the evil purpose blows.

The end phenomena the auditor is going for is finding and blowing the underlying evil purpose, accompanied by an F/N, cognition and VGIs.

Often the pc has a spectacular release on locating and blowing the evil purpose, and sometimes he has such a big win that there is a persistent F/N. but the EP is as above: F/N, cognition, VGIs and evil purpose blown.

AUDITOR REQUIREMENTS

A False Purpose RD auditor must be a graduate of the new HUBBARD FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN AUDITOR course and provenly competent in handling the high-precision tech of the rundown. A prerequisite to this course is the HUBBARD SENIOR SECURITY CHECKER COURSE, where one becomes a highly skilled sec checker. *No one* who has not successfully completed these two courses may audit the False Purpose Rundown.

INDOCTRINATING OF PC

Before starting False Purpose Rundown auditing on a pc, the auditor must first indoctrinate him on it. This is done as follows. Use the Scientology Tech Dictionary in addition to a good English dictionary in clearing words.

1. Clear the words: overt act, overt, withhold, missed withhold, motivator, overt of omission, overt of commission, justification.
2. Clear the basic Confessional procedure of pulling an overt or withhold.
3. Clear why justifications are gotten off as part of pulling an overt, using HCOB 8 JUNE 84, FPRD Series 4, CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS.
4. Clear the words: purpose, intention, impulse, motive, goal, consideration, evil, bad, harmful, destructive, nonsurvival.
5. Clear „evil purpose” in the Tech Dictionary and get the person to give examples using fruit words (e.g. „to smash an apple”). Ensure that he understands the difference between an evil purpose or intention and a good purpose or intention, and that we do not want to run out good intentions.
6. Clear any previous uncleared words on the alphabetical word list for the False Purpose Rundown Correction List.
7. Have the person read HCOB 5 JUNE 84R, FPRD SERIES 1R, FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN, through the section „Research”.
8. Have the person read HCOB 9 JUNE 84RA, FPRD SERIES 5RA, AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN, through the section „NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH”.
9. Have the person read HCOB 7 JUNE 84, FPRD SERIES 3, THE PRIOR CONFUSION: NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH.
10. Clear the steps of False Purpose Rundown auditing procedure on the pc. Have the pc study the diagram of an FPRD chain that is attached to this HCOB.
11. Run through a nonsignificant question to demonstrate the procedure (e.g. „Have you ever smashed an apple?”).
12. Clear the words „computation” and „service facsimile”, as service facs can come up during FPRD auditing. Also clear HCOB 5 SEP 78, ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE, and the service fac brackets.

AUDITING PROCEDURE

STEP A: Auditor clears and asks the question from the False Purpose RD form.

Example: „Do you have an overt on cats?“

On each reading sec check question get the question answered fully and the overt pulled with time, place, form and event and pull any justifications of the overt as part of this. This is done with full sec checking tech).

Take the overt question E/S to F/N, per Confessional procedure.

Note: It is very important in running down these overt chains that the auditor keeps the pc **on** the same chain. Should the pc offer up some other overt or even an evil purpose disrelated to the chain being run, it is just noted in the worksheet for later reference. It would be an auditor error of magnitude to Q&A with such an origination and pursue it in the middle of handling the overt chain that was started with. (REF: HCOB 21 MAR 62, PREPCHECKING DATA, WHEN TO DO A WHAT)

Additional Note: In running an overt E/S, the pc may volunteer an evil purpose that he feels underlies the overt chain. If this occurs, i.e. the pc originates an evil purpose, the auditor should acknowledge the pc and note the item on the worksheet, along with any meter read that occurred. The auditor is to then continue pulling the overt chain, with full use of Sec Checking tech, earlier-similar to F/N.

STEP B: After running the overt E/S to F/N, the auditor asks:

„Was there some evil purpose or destructive intention that prompted you to commit that overt?“

and, if this reads, he pulls the evil purpose or destructive intention. The auditor is expected to put in „Suppress“, „Invalidate“ and other left-hand buttons if this question is not reading.

(If this question [„Was there an evil purpose...“] still does not read despite being thoroughly worked over with buttons, this puts one back at Step A. The original question one started with [e.g., „Do you have an overt on cats?“] is re-checked as per standard confessional procedure. Once that original question F/Ns on being checked, carry on with the next question listed on the False Purpose RD form.)

The purpose or intention should read when the pc gives it. *If there is no read when it is given and the pc is satisfied the wording is correct, the auditor puts in buttons on the item.*

In the event that the pc earlier volunteered the evil purpose that prompted the overt on that chain, and it read (or now reads), the auditor would not now ask this question („Was there some evil purpose...“) but would take the item previously given and run it with Steps C1, C2 and so on.

STEP C: Get the prior confusion which occurred just before that evil purpose. Then ask for and find the first moment of that prior confusion which led to that evil purpose.

This is done as follows:

- C1: The auditor asks:
„**Was there a confusion that occurred just before you had the purpose** _____
(the wording of the evil purpose given by the pc)?”
(Example: „Was there a confusion that occurred just before you had the purpose
‘to kill cats’?”)
and, by using the meter, the auditor finds this confusion.
- C2: The auditor then asks:
„**When was the first moment of that confusion?**“
and gets the pc to find this.
- STEP D: Ask the pc:
„**Was there an earlier time you had the purpose** _____ (the wording of the
evil purpose given by the pc)?”
(Example: „Was there an earlier time you had the purpose ‘to kill cats’?”)
and find this earlier time the pc had that purpose.
What is being looked for is **not** an earlier similar purpose, but an earlier time the
pc had **that same exact purpose**.
- STEP E: Find the **confusion prior to that time** as per steps C1 and C2 above, and proceed
to Step D.
- STEP F: The auditor continues going earlier as per steps D and E, until the pc has found
the first moment of the first confusion which led to **that** evil purpose. At that point
the evil purpose should blow, accompanied by F/N, cognition and VGIs.
- STEP G: If all steps A through F have been done yet there is still no EP, assess and handle
a False Purpose RD Correction List.
Once that question from the FPRD form has been taken to EP, the auditor re-
checks it and, if reading, repeats Steps A to G on it. Once that questions F/Ns on
checking, the next question on the form is taken up and handled with Steps A to
G.

FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN FORMS

The False Purpose Rundown procedure utilizes a form that consists of a series of Sec Check questions related to a specific subject or area. There are different False Purpose RD forms which the C/S may include in the pc’s program. Whatever form is used, the auditor does the whole form on the pc. Every question is cleared and checked on the meter as per basic sec checking tech.

Some of the questions on the form ask for overts (e.g., „Have you ever stolen materials from a school?”) and other questions ask directly for evil purposes and destructive intentions (e.g. „Have you had an evil purpose towards a school teacher?”).

On questions which ask for an overt, one pulls the overt fully and then takes the question E/S to F/N. Then the evil purpose is asked for (Step B).

On questions which ask directly for an evil purpose or destructive intention, the auditor must first get the question answered, pulling what the evil purpose is, and then pull the pc's overts of dramatizing that purpose. This is done regardless of what the evil purpose is. He may not have carried out that purpose fully, but he did something to dramatize it or committed some overt that is directly associated with that purpose. The auditor finds and pulls the overt, and gets any E/S overt by asking, „Is there an earlier time you (type of overt just pulled)?” (or a similarly worded question that keeps the pc on that chain). He pulls the overt chain E/S to F/N. Then the evil purpose is handled as per Step C.

For example, on the question „Have you had an evil purpose towards a school teacher?” the auditor pulls the reading evil purpose „to hit the teacher”. Having done that, the auditor must then pull the overts committed in dramatizing the purpose „to hit the teacher”. The auditor would first check to see if the pc did hit a teacher. In this example, the pc did not hit a teacher, but he did dramatize that purpose by slashing the tires of a teacher's car. That overt is pulled and taken E/S overt per Step A. Then the auditor runs the evil purpose „to hit the teacher” with Steps C1, C2 and so on.

The whole aim in doing this rundown is to locate overts and evil purposes on the case and fully blow them. These two types of sec check questions give two different approaches to getting off a person's overts, withholds and underlying evil intentions.

STYLE OF AUDITING

The style of auditing used on the False Purpose RD is Level II, Guiding Style. The auditor must be well drilled in this style of auditing to be successful with the rundown.

GOOD INTENTIONS

Only evil or destructive intentions are picked up and handled in this auditing. **Do not** run good intentions.

PAST TRACK

Do not limit the pc to this lifetime when going E/S on overts or when asking for an earlier time he had that evil purpose. *Almost all evil purposes are whole track.*

However, the FPRD auditor must be alert to any attempt by a pc to dive to a whole track overt when a question is asked, in an effort to avoid giving off a this-lifetime overt. One handles this as per standard Sec Checking tech as given in HCOB 30 Nov 78R CONFES-SIONAL PROCEDURE.

LISTING

By following the False Purpose RD procedure exactly, the auditor should be able to easily find and pull the pc's evil purposes. The pc is not asked listing questions, nor is L&N any part of the procedure. But it is possible that a pc *could* start listing and the auditor must be able to recognize and handle such a situation per standard listing tech.

The auditor would handle an out list per HCOB 11 APR 77, LIST ERRORS, CORRECTION OF, and HCOB 17 MAR 74, TWC, USING WRONG QUESTIONS.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON SERVICE FACS

Upon reviewing the session worksheets the C/S may find that a service fac was found and F/Ned, but not fully blown. In such an instance the C/S can order the service fac run in the R3SC brackets in a later session, to fully blow it. It is the auditors responsibility to ensure the item reads, if it isn't reading, it is not run.

However, *if one is doing a False Purpose RD Correction List* and in doing so locates a reading service fac, *the auditor should run it out with R3SC in that session.*

REPAIR

During a chain if the auditor hits an impasse, it is expected that he would apply the appropriate sec checking tools right then and there to handle: Murder routine, checking for a missed withhold, use of buttons, etc.

If there is some bog that the auditor is unable to rapidly handle using the routine sec check debug tools, a False Purpose Rundown Correction List should be assessed and handled.

SUMMARY

The importance of using this tech of purposes and considerations is immeasurable.


It can make the difference between complete failure and successful hatting; between a hell-bound existence and a pleasurable productive life.

This tech is for use. Use it well.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Compilation assisted by LRH
Technical Research and Compila-
tion

LRH:RTRC:amg



HCOB 9.6.84R
Rev. 3.5.85
Attachment #1

PC'S ATTENTION,
DIRECTED BY
THE AUDITOR

PRESENT
TIME

sgsdfg

afasdfasdfasdfasdf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JUNE 1984

Limited Distribution:
False Purpose RD
Auditors and C/Ses
Cramming Officers

False Purpose Rundown Series 6

FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN COMMANDS

The following are the commands of False Purpose Rundown procedure. The full data on each of these commands and its application is contained in HCOB 9 June 84, FPRD Series 5, AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN.

- STEP A: Clear, check for read and ask the question from the False Purpose RD form being used. If it reads, get the question answered fully and the overt pulled with full time, place, form and event, also pulling the pc's justifications. This is done with full Sec Checking tech. Take this E/S as a chain of overts, down to the basic overt on the chain.
- STEP B: If no spectacular release or persistent F/N, find the underlying evil purpose, using the question:
- “Was there some evil purpose or destructive intention that prompted you to commit that overt?”**
- STEP C: If there's no great relief and persistent F/N from the pc spotting the evil purpose, find the confusion before it, and get the pc to spot the first moment of that prior confusion:
- C1: **“Was there a confusion that occurred just before you had the purpose (the wording of the evil purpose the pc gave)?”**
- C2: **“When was the first moment of that confusion?”**
- STEP D: If still no EP, get the earlier time he had that same exact purpose: **“Was there an earlier time you had the purpose?”**
- STEP E: If no EP, find the confusion prior to that time as per Steps C1 and C2 above, then proceed to Step D.
- STEP F.: Continue with Steps D and E as needed to get the first moment of the first confusion which led to that evil purpose.

STEP G: A False Purpose Rundown Correction List should be assessed if full EP is not reached by this point.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JUNE 1984

Remimeo
FPRD Auditors
FPRD C/Ses
Cramming Officers

False Purpose Rundown Series 7

C/Sing THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN

Refs:

HCOB 5 June 84 R	FPRD Series 1R	FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN
Rev. 11.1.90		
HCOB 9 June 84 R	FPRD Series 5R	AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN
Rev. 3.5.85		
HCOB 12 June 84	FPRD Series 8	FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN AUDITOR ERRORS
HCOB 16 June 70	C/S Series 6 KSW Series 20	WHAT THE C/S IS DOING
HCOB 1 Mar 77 II		CONFESSIONAL FORMS
HCOB 13 Oct 82	C/S Series 116	ETHICS AND THE C/S
HCOB 28 Feb.84	C/S Series 118	PRETENDED PTS
HCOB 27 Mar.84	C/S Series 119	STALLED DIANETIC CLEAR: SOLVED
HCOB 21 Mar. 74		END PHENOMENA

This rundown is a very powerful C/S tool for case advancement. Utilizing technical breakthroughs made in whole track research, it is unique in its direct approach to the handling of evil purposes and destructive intentions. It is actually a brand-new look at the subject: Guiding the pc down to basic on overt chains with thorough Sec Checking of each overt itself, then carrying through with special steps designed to blow the factors that originally prompted the overt.

C/S REQUIREMENTS

In order to C/S the False Purpose Rundown one must have successfully completed the Hubbard False Purpose Rundown Auditor Course and internship and must have graduated the Hubbard False Purpose RD C/S Course.

WHO CAN RECEIVE THE RUNDOWN

Case prerequisites for the rundown are Purification Rundown and Objectives. The only exception would be a pc who is in Case Category 4 per HCOB 12 Nov. 81RD, GRADE

CHART STREAMLINED FOR LOWER GRADES: OCA all in the upper half of graph, no heavy drug history. Such a pc could be put straight onto the rundown provided he had been fully educated as a pc with a Scientology C/S-1. But the False Purpose RD is not an introductory-type action and would not ordinarily be programed on a “raw meat” case.

It would also be a mistake to program someone for the False Purpose RD whose track was heavily blocked off with drugs, as the pc needs to be able to go E/S. If the C/S has such a case on his hands, despite the person having completed a standard Purif and battery of Objectives, then a Drug RD must be done.

The False Purpose Rundown is primarily used to unstick a stalled case and get it moving up the Grade Chart again. It is not a grade or level in itself.

Where a Dianetic Clear or any pre-OT has stalled in his progress up the Bridge, the False Purpose Rundown can give him a tremendous boost in blasting through the barriers he is faced with and make it possible for him to make it on up the line to full OT.

As an example, a pc receiving HRD auditing might plow into an inability to free up on something, and not come around with handlings specific to the HRD. If through folder study and assessment of prepared lists the C/S discovers that the primary factor holding the pc back lies in the area of evil purposes in conflict with one or more of the precepts of The Way to Happiness, such a pc would need to be shifted over to the False Purpose RD – and completed on a specific False Purpose RD form – and then returned to the HRD and the HRD carried through to completion.

Another example would be a pc receiving PTS handling. Should it become evident that the pc is actually a pretended PTS (per HCOB 28 Feb. 84, C/S Series 118, PRETENDED PTS) he can be smoothly moved over onto the False Purpose RD.

The False Purpose RD is not a panacea to be used in place of other standard case debug and repair tools such as drug handlings or the Expanded GF 40. It is used when the C/S has determined that what is stalling a case is evil purposes. It is programed so as to locate and handle the evil purposes and false purposes and nonsurvival considerations, after which the pc is returned to and moved on up the Grade Chart. Some repair lists, such as the GF 40X, contain questions which can detect evil purposes on a case. Such questions reading would alert the C/S to the need to ensure that the False Purpose RD was included in the pc’s future programing.

PROGRAMING

Though the False Purpose Rundown reaches more deeply into the heart of a pc’s case than Sec Checking, and incorporates brand-new tech discoveries from whole track research, its C/Sing and programing follow the same basic C/Sing and programing rules applicable to Sec Checking.

One could for example have a case that is in the middle of a grade or level, not in any sort of ethics trouble, and running fine in session, who simply originates to a Reg that he would like to receive the False Purpose RD. The Reg and C/S would handle this as they

would any pc request for a particular rundown, as per HCOB 12 Nov. 81RD, GRADE CHART STREAMLINED FOR LOWER GRADES, section "PROGRAMING." The C/S would not interrupt the grade the pc was in the middle of and interject the False Purpose RD.

On the other hand, one could have a pc who is very evidently in need of this RD right now – not later.

In all such cases the C/S follows HCOB 28 SEPT. 82, C/S SERIES 115, MIXING RUNDOWNS AND REPAIRS, and HCOB 13 OCT. 82, C/S SERIES 116, ETHICS AND THE C/S, which give the rules.

SETUPS

Before a pc is begun on the False Purpose Rundown he must be properly set up, with an F/N and VGIs.

CLEARING WORDS

The preclear must have a full understanding of the words and commands of the False Purpose Rundown. The pc has to have a very clear understanding of what is an overt, a withhold, an evil purpose, a confusion and so on.

BEGINNING THE RUNDOWN

A pc or pre-OT beginning the rundown is first put onto the False Purpose Rundown Basic Form (HCOB 14 June 84, False Purpose Rundown Series 10-A).

Other forms may be used in addition to the basic form. For example, a pc might be a field auditor in for some case cleanup and tech update; he could be programed for the False Purpose Rundown using an "auditor form." If additional forms are used, the questions are handled per the A-G steps of the False Purpose Rundown procedure. In any case, questions are not deleted from the form.

Any form may have questions added to it by the C/S that pertain to the individual person's background and occupation(s) and current scene (Ref: HCOB 1 Mar. 77 II, CONFESSIOAL FORMS).

ETHICS

The False Purpose RD does not take the place of standard ethics. If a person is currently involved in an out-ethics situation and is thereby harming the org or those around him in some fashion, or has gross downtrending statistics as a group member, that person should be hauled into Ethics and sorted out. Such handling might even include a rapid HCO Sec Check as a means of getting to the root of some PT situation, so that ethics can be gotten in.

Example (correct): A sum of money has been reported missing from the Treasury cash box. At the same time, staff member Pete begins insisting he must leave staff for one “reason” or another. Well, here is an obvious candidate for some pointed investigatory questioning by a skilled Sec Checker. The C/S in this case needs to get a certain set of Sec Check questions answered, fast. In this illustration it would be incorrect to embark on the False Purpose RD, as the auditor would be bound by the HCOBs to take the first question all the way through the rundown steps to persistent F/N, end session, start another session later and take up question number two, and so on. It is simply a matter for a straight HCO Confessional, get the questions answered and the overts pulled, each to F/N, and that’s it.

The False Purpose Rundown is a **Tech** handling. Handling tech before ethics is incorrect sequence.

Once the person has been interviewed or sec checked by an MAA, (or been before a court or committee) and physical universe handlings for any PT out-ethics have been done, or are at least in progress with the person’s ethics going in, the False Purpose RD can be used as a tool to assist him to handle the situation terminatedly. As long as ethics has gone in on the person, one can safely start him on the False Purpose RD.

Example (incorrect): Course Supervisor Elliot is found to be crashing the Academy stats, giving out verbal tech and caving in students with invalidation. Exec asks the C/S to “please get Elliot audited on the False Purpose RD right away as we must handle his destructiveness.” The C/S goes along with this. Elliot isn’t comm-eved or put through lower ethics conditions or otherwise given any ethics handling. He gets several sessions but doesn’t make any real case change. The Academy empties out. Reason: They are trying to get tech in when he is still in the ethics band. The handling is not “double the number of sessions per day he’s getting.” That would be out-sequence.

Example (correct): Betsy damaged org property and falsified an FSM commission. Turns herself in to the Ethics Officer who has her write up her O/Ws and do ethics condition formulas starting at Confusion. She works up through the conditions to Liability and writes up overts and confronts the fact that she has been out-ethics. She is, at this point, started on the False Purpose RD. Between sessions she carries on with the rest of the condition formulas, amends work, studying an ethics course, etc. The rundown is very successful. And it was successful because the sequence applied was ethics and then tech.

EP OF A SINGLE FALSE PURPOSE RD FORM

The False Purpose Rundown, similar to Sec Checking, is an unlimited process (Ref: HCOB 2 Nov. 68R, CASE SUPERVISOR CLASS VIII, THE BASIC PROCESSES). In other words, a person could receive False Purpose RD auditing any number of times, with an EP achieved for each False Purpose RD form done.

Example: Pc has had some auditing, some grades, then is inactive for a while (“falls off the Bridge”). He is involved in out-ethics, etc. He is recovered, and given False Purpose Rundown Series 10-A, the Basic Form. On completion of his auditing on this form he is doing

extremely well and is ready to continue up the Bridge. He is sent to attest to completion of "False Purpose RD Basic Form."

Example: A pc is having trouble with her marriage. She is audited on the False Purpose RD Basic Form, attests to it, and is then run on a False Purpose RD 2D Form. On completion of the 2D Form she is doing very well and her 2D situation is fully and happily resolved. She is sent to attest to completion of "False Purpose RD, Second Dynamic Form."

When the person being audited on the False Purpose Rundown has been successfully completed on the last question of a particular form, the following indicators should be present:

1. The tone arm action has flattened off.
2. A marked shift of viewpoint accompanied by a cognition about the subject that was being sec checked, such as now being free from having to restrain oneself from committing harmful acts, etc. This would be a very big, embractive cognition, or number of them.

With these phenomena present, the pc may be sent to declare completion of that form. If they are not present, have the auditor assess a False Purpose Rundown Correction List and handle it M3 to an F/Ning list. If the EP as above is still not present, the case needs to be FE-Sed and, taking care to use the data obtained from the correction list assessment, programed for any needed repair and then to complete that False Purpose Rundown form.

EP OF PROGRAM

Completing a whole program is a different matter than completing one form.

A stalled Dianetic Clear might, for example, have a case program that consists of several False Purpose Rundown forms (each carried to EP), followed by False Data Stripping and then Method One Word Clearing.

The overall program would be ended, and the pc sent to declare to the program, when the end phenomena of that program had been attained. This would mean achieving the end product that program was intended to achieve, as per the C/S Series HCOBs, and would include a marked rise in the person's OCA from the range it was in before the program was begun.

AUDITOR HANDLING

The C/S must ensure that his False Purpose Rundown auditors are well trained and interned to begin with and effectively crammed on any goofs of the procedure.

A point which must be particularly watched for is the auditor's handling of F/Ns that occur before the full EP of a chain is reached. Some auditors, accustomed to ending off an

action at the first F/N, cog, VGIs will tend to end off at an F/N rather than carrying through to the full EP (persistent F/N, cog, VVGIs, evil purpose blown).

SUMMARY

With this new rundown and its direct address to factors that underlie nonsurvival conduct, the C/S is equipped to dramatically boost a pc or pre-OT on his way up the Bridge to full restoration of his power as a being.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JUNE 1984

Limited Distribution:
Remimeo
FPRD
Auditors and C/Ses
Cramming Officers

False Purpose Rundown Series 8

FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN AUDITOR ERRORS

Refs:

HCOB 9 Jun 84 FPRD Series 5 AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN
HCOB 11 Jun 84 FPRD Series 7 C/Sing THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN
HCOB 8 Jun 84 FPRD Series 4 CLEARING JUSTIFICATIONS
HCOB 7 Jun 84 FPRD Series 3 THE PRIOR CONFUSION: NEW TECH BREAKTHROUGH
HCOB 30 Nov 78 CONFSSIONAL PROCEDURE
HCOB 13 Oct 82 C/S Series 116 ETHICS AND THE C/S

The following are common errors that were made by some of the first auditors learning to audit the False Purpose Rundown. These errors can lessen or nullify results on the rundown and must be watched for closely by the C/S and thoroughly handled if they occur – by both cramming the erring auditor and repairing the pc:

1. **Failing to vigorously pull the overts gotten while following down the overt chain.** Effective, no-Q&A overt pulling which nails down the overt in its entirety is a must. Patty-cake, sweaty-palmed auditors who did not master the tech of Sec Checking will not succeed with the False Purpose Rundown.
2. **Not taking the overt chain earlier-similar to earlier overts.** Quite often the E/S O/W chain will go backtrack. The evil purpose will be found to be underneath the earliest overt on that chain. This error often shows up in the auditor attempting to get off an evil purpose after having pulled only a light PT overt.
3. **Failure to direct proper ethics handling when needed.** Ethics must be in before tech will go in. Some persons will need ethics handlings before the False Purpose RD will even begin to bite at all. Trying to “handle” someone’s PT out-ethics situation with False Purpose RD auditing alone will result in loses.
4. **Attempting to “do the False Purpose RD” over the top of pc natter or out-of-sessionness or other symptoms of missed withholds.** This of course comes under the heading of “auditing a pc over out ruds.”

5. **Quickying.** Example: Auditor calling a persistent F/N when there obviously is no persistent F/N present. Example: Auditor saying something was an EP which wasn't.
6. **Failing to pull off the pc's justifications for each overt as the chain is followed down.** Includes asking for justifications just once (brush off), when the pc may need to be asked the question several times before all the justifications are gotten.
7. **Not getting all of the overt first before asking for the pc's justifications of that overt.**
8. **Q&A off the O/W chain, onto some other O/W chain or onto something else.**
9. **Basic overt pulling errors such as missing reads, not raising the sensitivity on questions, Q&A, not varying the question or pulling strings when needed, etc.**
10. **Not using "left-hand buttons" (e.g., "suppress" and "invalidate") when a False Purpose RD Form question doesn't read, or when the Step B question of the False Purpose RD procedure does not read.**
11. **Failure to recognize when basic on the overt chain has been reached and the chain flattened.**
12. **Overrunning a session or chain by trying to carry on past a spectacular release or persistent F/N.**
13. **Auditor not knowing what an evil purpose or destructive intention is and taking up good intentions, random statements, computations, etc., as "evil purposes."** Includes failing to clear these terms thoroughly with the pc before beginning him on the rundown.
14. **Not taking the evil purpose earlier** (to the earlier time the pc had that same evil purpose), when needed as per Step D of False Purpose RD procedure.
15. **Commands not fully cleared, and/or pc not grooved in to the procedure so that he understands what is to be done and what is expected of him.**
16. **Picking up and attempting to run random evil purposes that the pc originates while being run down a specific chain.**
17. **Turning Step B of the False Purpose RD procedure (pulling the evil purpose) into an L&N action.**
18. **Not using the False Purpose Rundown Correction List when needed on a case.**

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

FLATTENING A PROCESS

A lecture given on 19 March 1964

How are you today? Good! Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience: 19th of March.

19 March. 19 March, 14.

All right with you if I begin this lecture now? [laughter]

What would you like to know about today? Anything you want to know? [laughter]

Well, in view of the fact that you have no preference, I'll talk to you about auditing. And this is some of the basic know-hows of auditing.

Somewhere along the line, many an auditor lays aside some of his basic information on the subject of auditing. He hides it under his E-Meter, or something of the sort, and starts doing something silly and then wonders all of a sudden why he's having trouble. And it's very interesting how silly some of these things can be.

Now, there *was* a subject called "flattening a process." Now, this has been mostly forgotten. It's even part of the Auditor's Code, but it gets forgotten. It gets forgotten.

And what you need to know about this – what you need to know about this is that there are two aspects to ending a process. There are two aspects to this thing, and they are both concerned with, *What are you doing with the process?* That's the main question. What are you doing with the process?

Well, what you are doing with it tells you how to end it and how you can end it. And these two things are: you're trying to fix up the pc so he can be audited – that's number one; and number two, you are trying to audit the pc. And they give you two different endings.

Now, you can see at once that number one is basically concerned with rudiments.

"You got a present time problem?"

"Well, yeah. I have a present time problem. So on, so on and so on."

"All right. Very good. All right."

"And I – yeah, I did. I had an awful problem and so forth. And, well, I guess it was mostly my fault." Cognition, see? Serves as a cognition.

"All right. You have a present time problem?" No, you don't get any read on the meter, you don't have anything, and that's the end of that process. What was the process? Well,

the process was just doing enough to cure the elsewhere-ness of the pc. Trying to get him into the room.

Now, if you don't know that there are two different directions in processing, then you will seldom have a pc in front of you to be audited. And you will never finish a cycle of action.

Let me show you what happens to a cycle of action. You start in a Prepcheck on "gooper feathers," you see? You start in this Prepcheck on "gooper feathers" – that's the fuzz from peaches. [laughter] And you start this thing and you got it going in the session on the twelfth; and you got it going and you got one or two buttons in.

And the pc comes into the next session with a big present time problem about Los Angeles or something. So now you run a process about the present time problem in Los Angeles, and you get a couple of buttons in on that.

But he comes to the session the next time, you see, with an even worse problem, you see, about Seattle. So you audit the problem about Seattle, so forth. Well, that's just because you as an auditor wouldn't know the purpose of your tools.

You got a little hatful of tools that takes out of the road what is getting in your road in trying to complete a cycle of action on your pc. You have no business whatsoever – present time problem, storm, rain, night, income tax, any other catastrophe, see? – you have no business whatsoever permitting any present time catastrophe to get in the road of your auditing.

Well, you've been presented with a little kit and it says on it, "How to get the pc going in a session." And included in that is keying out, knocking out, destimulating, getting rid of the things which have him so distracted that you can't go on. Now, if you never use that kit, you will do nothing but Q-and-A, you will do nothing but leave unflat cycles of action.

Do you see what happens? You get something started in session A, and the pc comes into session B and he's got a present time problem about something or other, and he's just had a big cognition, what's really wrong with his lumbosis is something or other – so you audit this!

No! No, no, no, please! Please, please, please! What in essence have you done? You have mistaken your tools. Made a complete *bust* as far as what you're supposed to be doing is concerned.

You got this big set of tools over here, you understand? And they got hydraulic high-pressure drills and dump trucks, and all that sort of thing. That's all sitting over here, you see? And you got this little bunch of shiny instruments of some kind or other over here, and they're just supposed to get something out of the road fast, see?

And the pc comes in, "Oh, I had this big cognition about once upon a time in Los Angeles. *Wohwohwog!*" You're halfway through this Prepcheck on gooper feathers, you see? So look! Look! Look how idiotic it is! You reach for these dump trucks and hydraulic drills over here to handle this problem about Los Angeles!

Oh man, you know, just sad! It's sad. All you need is this little whisk broom. See? You're supposed to take this problem and this cognition and you're just supposed to take this

little whisk broom – the little kit over, that comes in on top, about half the size of the tool box on the hydraulic drill, see? You're supposed to take this little kit, and you take out the little brush out of it, and you go *fzt, ztt, fzt*. That's the end of that process, see? And you put that back in again and you say, "All right now. On the subject of gooper feathers – on gooper feathers, in this lifetime, has anything been..." And we're away. You understand?

So, it's just basically making a mistake in the purpose of the tools. And therefore, this leads an auditor into this kind of nonsense: Well, he's always had trouble – he's always had trouble with his back. So for some reason or other, we're doing a Prepcheck on his back. I don't say this is a good process or a bad process, you see, but we're doing a Prepcheck on his back. And we're going to end this after five minutes on a cognition? Hey! What's this? Now, *that* is, we have shoved the hydraulic drills and the dump trucks over here. And we've picked up this little tiny kit, and we've got this thing that's bothered him all of his whole lifetime, and we've taken this little brush out of the kit and we've gone "flick, flick," and nothing happens, see? So we kind of brushed the brush off, see? And we take this other little thing and brush at it and nothing happens. And we say, "Well, auditing doesn't work."

You're using the wrong pickaxe. You see what I mean? Naw. This is a... Really, you have to audit a thing proportionately to the amount of trouble it has given the pc.

So there are two ways to end a process, and they all depend on what you're trying to do. So we're processing this guy on gooper feathers. Big Prepcheck in progress. It's all compounded with all kinds of oddities, ramifications and cognitions, and it's going on and on and on and on and on. Well now, that is done only with one blunt instrument called a tone arm. And that tells you when it is flat. And you, frankly, have to unflatten the whole subject before you flatten it. He's got it beautifully suppressed. That's tone arm flattening. And today you only flatten with the tone arm while using dump trucks, hydraulic drills, and so forth.

You're handling the big case. You're handling the big stuff of the case. And you handle that by tone arm. And that is how you end the process, and that is the only way you end the process. And that is auditing, with an exclamation point! That's main-session auditing. All done with the TA.

Rudiment-type auditing is simply there to have an undistracted, comfortable pc who is happy about sitting in the chair and getting the main performance on. And that's rudiment-type processing. And what I've seen of your auditor's reports, what I've heard of your auditor's reports, in recent times... I may be very unjustly cruel. Maybe I am being cynical and sardonic, professorially "sneeresque," but the truth of the matter is, I think you are using rudiment approach to main-session processing. I think you've gotten it mixed up to the point where you take the main-session process, the big Prepcheck on, and you're ending it as though it were a rudiment process, as though you were merely trying to get the pc to sit still so he could be audited. How much auditing do you think you're really going to accomplish? You're not going to accomplish very much, because you're using the wrong ending.

So, you take this big thing over here: You're going to get rid of this bad back, you see? And "On a back, has anything been suppressed?" See?

"No, I don't think so," pc says.

I would sit there with my eyes rather wide open, as an auditor. "Does your back bother you or doesn't it?"

"Well, yes, it bothers me."

"Don't you think someplace in your lifetime, somewhere or another in your lifetime, in some place or another, there's a po... for instance, you ever have any accidents with it when you were a kid? Something like that? You ever have anything going on?" (You know, a restimulation.)

The guy gives it away, "I guess I have! Must have, because I have a bad back now."

"All right, now you let me repeat this question: On a bad back, or on a back – now, listen to me carefully now. Lis-lis-listen to this auditing question. Listen now: On a back, has anything been *suppressed*? Suppressed? You got that now? Got the question? All right, now go ahead and answer that question. Got it now?"

Huh, we're away for the long haul, man. Now, this is the reverse. That's the main session. That's the big show way of getting this thing on the line, see? That's the way of getting it all squared!

Now, get this approach. Just get this other brush-off approach: "Well, you say your back's been troubling you. All right. Is that a present time problem?"

"Yes, it is. *Y – heh!* Come to think about it, it is!"

"Well, good. You've had a cognition. That's the end of the session." [laughter]

Do I make my pernt? You got to get in there and sweat!

You know, you can take one of these old – you're going to see a lot of Auditing by Lists. This is moving up. The first Auditing by Lists we saw was O/W and so forth, but there are many types of lists that can be designed. And I've got this right on the assembly line for HGCs: Auditing by List. It's *Auditing* by List, not ARC break assessments by list. But you could use an ARC break assessment sheet to audit by list, you see? But you do it differently. It's handled like old R2H was. Take each point that you get a read on up with the pc, see?

So you take this old O/W, this list of overts, you know? The old Johannesburg – the Joburg See Check list.

Well, do you know that by very carefully modulating your voice and making no impingement on the pc – being very careful not to make any impingement on the pc; covering the questions in a sort of a throwaway tone of voice, you see? – "You ever stolen anything? Ah, I guess not. No. Well that's fine. That's flat. Nothing to that. All right. Did you ever work under an assumed name? Of course you wouldn't; I know that, and so on. I sort of got that. Well, that's flat."

"It's all flat. It's all flat. It's all flat. Oh, this fellow's passed his Prepcheck!"

I've seen Herbie here almost just growing *sparks* out of his head on the subject of checking out somebody who has been sec checked on that old Joburg list, you see? *Keow!*

As an auditor you should be able to make an impingement. So the Instructor checking the thing out, with that altitude, fixes the person who is being checked out for a clean sheet, you see, with a gimlet eye and says, "Have you ever worked under an assumed name?" Pow! The meter blows up, see?

The poor student says, "Why didn't that happen to me?" See?

You know, "That's a flunk! flunk! flunk! Your checksheet is not complete! You've got to do this whole case over again." You know?

"What's happened to me?" You know? "How come? How come?"

Well, he didn't bother to restimulate anything to pick up, that was how come!

Well, now, in main-session auditing, that which fits between the start of the body of the session and the end of the body of the session, that sort of stuff is laid in with a club! *You purposely restimulate what you're trying to pick up!* You don't want this to end in a hurry, you want this auditing to go on for a while.

Now, this auditing that occurs *outside* of the body of the session, you know, in the rudiments: that is just "Well, you don't have a present time problem, do you? Good. Ah, thank you!" See, that's the approach you use, then you restimulate nothing.

"Well, you look pretty good! How are you doing? Oh, you're doing all right. All right. Is it okay with you if we start the body of the session?"

I know you don't have that in your Model Session right now, but I'm putting it down here as emphasis, and maybe it ought to be put into Model Session to show you where the "club" fits! But first, before that starts, you see, that's just "Well. All right. Well, your tone arm is nice and loose here. Tone arm seems to be low, rather. And your needle's nice and loose and everything seems to be okay. Nothing worrying you, is it? All right, all right. Good. Good. Good. I'm glad of that. Yeah. All right. Oh, you say you do have a present time problem? What was it about?" [laughter] "Oh, yeah? Yeah? All right. Yeah? All right. All right. Good. Good. All right. Well, how's the present time problem now? That didn't read! All right.

"Now – now, is it all right with you if I – we get to work here on this subject of gooper feathers that we were prepchecking, now? You had any thoughts about this since the last time I audited you there, you know? You gone over this in your mind? Any improvement at all on the subject of anything? So forth? Oh, you have, huh?"

(Restimulation, see? Getting his mind, getting his main concentration.)

"Oh, you have, huh? Oh, is that so! Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. Tell me you used to... telling me you used to have nightmares about this. Did you have a nightmare about it or anything like that last night? Oh, yeah? Yeah? Is that so?"

"Well, let's see. We'd gotten along here pretty well down on the subject – we've gotten onto 'suggested' here pretty well. And I think your last answer to this had something to do with what – what was your last answer to that?"

"Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Well, that was on this subject. Yeah! All right. Well, here's the next question on that. Here's the next question on that: On gooper feathers, has anything been suggested? You got that question? All right. Good. Now, on gooper feathers, has anything *been suggested?*"

All right. And here we go, watching that tone arm. It's just sitting there taking down the tone arm reads and keeping the pc going. And the pc finally said, "Well, that isn't any more. There – it just – that – there isn't any more. I haven't got any more answers to that. I'm protesting the question."

"All right. Is this question being protested? I'm sorry, there's no read there.

"Now what – what else might we have run into on this? You might run into something else there that you haven't told me or something like that? Did I miss an answer or something of this sort? Oh, I did miss a 'suggest' answer? Oh, all right. Well, good. Thank you. I'm glad we got that cleared up. And here's your next question: On gooper feathers, has anything been suggested?"

Get the idea? You're just keeping it in there, man! Keeping that in the groove. Keeping that grinding on and on and on, see? Tone arm action. When do you leave it? Needle isn't flashing around anymore and the tone arm isn't blowing down on this particular subject – well, let's unload!

Tone arms have tendencies to go very, very quiet. I give you something like a twenty-minute test. That's a little bit cruel on the pc sometime. An auditor can tell when a tone arm is flat: It isn't moving. Also, when you tend to flatten one of these things the meter starts to look gummy.

You can tell when they're flat. Shift to your next question. You're trying to cover a subject in the main body of the session, and you are trying to recover a pc for your session in the rudiment approach. So realize that there are two targets for auditing in a session. And that gives you two different endings. You don't want this pc to be dispersed out of what you are already doing, so you put in a rudiment-type approach. "Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed?" Well, you spend fifteen, twenty minutes getting in those "since" BMRs – oh, marvelous! Marvelous! That's good! Now you can start in your main session.

But it is not with the same approach! You're not doing the same thing.

I could be very cruel at this point and say, "Well, I want to congratulate most auditors, because they've gotten up to a point now to where they are ready to learn how to run the body of a session, having handled rudi..." That'd be a shade too cruel, wouldn't it? Bitter! Bitter. But I watch this; I watch this consistently. And I notice that auditors vary in this approach. And they very often start treating body-of-session material as though they're just rudiments. And believe me, they don't do very much for pcs. In fact, they damage pcs. How? By leaving unflat cycles of action.

If you really want to lash a pc around the telegraph pole, man, just start cycle of action after cycle of action and don't flatten any of them. You just get enough cycles of action unflat on your pc and he'll be in a mess.

Now, let me give you some idea of how to *really sock* a pc. Let's take Class VI. Not because we *have* to reach into that zone. Because that is the most brutal area, where things stand up in tremendously bold relief. You make some mistakes in that area and you know it. You get the evidence immediately. The little men in the ambulance backs up to the door, don't you see? And it's quite embarrassing. The neighbors talk.

You start to sort out goal A, but you don't sort it out; and then you get interested in goal B, but you never bring it to a conclusion. And then you wonder if something's happening with the E-Meter, because you don't seem to be able to get any reads. (In other words, you really can't think of anything to ask the pc that gets a read on it.) So you ask... You start asking some questions about the E-Meter. But you really don't clean up the subject of the E-Meter, don't you see? And then you wonder if there's any wrong goals that the person has had that are troubling him, but you really don't find all of those and clean those up.

Believe me, about that time the pc practically goes straight through the bottom of the chair. He will be dealing with a wog and he'll be turning on pain. He will be turning on dizziness. The corners of the room will start going out of plumb on him. He can't focus the auditor. The winds of space start blowing his eyeballs into the back of his skull. You know you've done it!

And what happened? It's just incomplete cycle of action followed by an incomplete cycle of action, followed by an incomplete cycle of action, followed by an incomplete cycle of action. You really didn't do anything *wrong*. You just didn't do anything complete. And that all by itself will wind a pc up in a ball.

Well, now, that's a very exaggerated level, but things stand out in such bas-relief at that level that it brought me around to inspecting the lower levels of auditing. And I found out that the lower levels of auditing are peculiarly subject to this, but it's not so dramatic. In other words, it takes a while for it to sneak up. And you don't see it all in twenty minutes of auditing, you see? You see it over a year's worth of auditing. You get lots less action. And the pc is just feeling sort of groggy these days. He just doesn't feel too good, and so forth.

Well, if you were to take almost any pc in the place and say, "Has any process ever been left unflat on you?" and you just ran that as a process... Don't Q-and-A with him and try to flatten any of the processes, just run a process, "Has any process ever been left unflat on you?" And you'll see your pc start brightening up. Somebody who's had quite a lot of auditing, he'll start brightening up. Even though it is not serious on his case, it is quite capable of producing a considerable improvement or result.

He'll give you the considerations concerning it just in the matter of fact of the question. But it's just a repetitive question process.

Now, what do you think happens when you start a Prepcheck on gooper feathers and shift over to a bad back before gooper feathers are flat? And get into a bad back and then get into this and get into that. All kinds of oddball things start occurring. The pc's ability to be prepchecked starts blowing up, amongst other things. Pc can't be prepchecked easily anymore. The auditing tool starts getting all blunted up and messed up. Oh, I think that's quite remarkable. The tool has been abused.

Now, you can put in bad comm cycle with an auditing tool also, like Prepchecking, and get the tool very badly blunted up.

So that you can actually prepcheck Prepchecking. See? Prepchecking. Just put in all the Prepcheck buttons on Prepcheck. "On Prepchecking..." and so forth. You can do this several ways: "On Suppress, has anything been suppressed? Has anything been invalidated?" You know? Put in all the buttons on Suppress. There are several ways you could go about this. Just as a general subject, put in all the buttons, you see? As each button.

It's quite remarkable. I've seen a case all hung up in a mess on the subject of a goals checkout and so forth, till somebody was suddenly bright enough to say, "On Suppress, has anything been suppressed?" All of a sudden it's an operating button again. Quite a remarkable revelation.

But the basic reason the button goes out is an incomplete cycle of action.

Now, you should, as an auditor, be very, very well aware of this thing called a cycle of action. It predicates this one basis: that things have a point where they start, that they have a period when they continue and that there is a point when they end. Now, that is a cycle of action. It's your create-survive-destroy cycle of action. It's start, change and stop.

Actually, you could put it down probably less effectively as a philosophic definition, but more workably, as "a start and an action and a stop." See? A start and an action and a stop. You could be more explicit by saying, a start, an action which then continues, and then a stop. And that is a cycle of action. That is just in that whole line.

Life is probably cruel because things seldom stop. There is a great deal of thought put into continuation. Continuance is one of the bugs that thetans are addicted to. They like to see things continue.

And you've got actions going right now which began with the beginning of the universe and nobody has stopped them since. See? They've never been stopped. And that alone gives the longevity and mass of the physical universe. Actions which were begun were never unbegun, you know, or stopped. Time itself is probably some basic agreed-upon postulate which nobody has ever thought the end of, so you've still got time, you see?

Now these things, of course, are done by postulate, but at a low level an individual is subject to them. And any case is subject to the cycle of action. Maybe he will get up to a point sooner or later where he is above the cycle of action. Oh, I say maybe: Yes, undoubtedly! Class VI, we've got all the stuff to put him there. And you get such oddities as a guy being able to move around in time. This is one of the more peculiar aspects of high-level action. You're not fixed in a time span. You can widen your time span almost at will. And there doesn't have to be anything there in the past time, but you can be in that past time period, and so on. It gives you all sorts of involvements. For instance, you can be at the event while it is occurring by having been in the future and come back to it, and undo it before it goes on. It's very confusing.

Well, because it's confusing and because it's upsetting – let's take two armies fighting each other. And army A attacks army B. So therefore army B knows that if it is in this position where it is being attacked at the time it is attacked, why then, it will be attacked. So the

thing to do is to be in yesterday and not march to that place. And we very soon have generals out of a job. We have various things going awry. A game becomes very difficult to follow and trace. So the thetan settles for the simpler life. And that is "What is, is. What will be, will be. Inshallah," see? "Fate..."

Well, what they're involved with there – kismet and everything else – they're just involved with the inevitability of a cycle of action. Fatalism is the total subjugation of the individual by the cycle of action. "What will be, will be." "If he starts going the car, he will then go down the road, and eventually the car will stop." Well, they even have it rigged that way. They've got oil prices up to a point where it'll run out of fuel. And they've got tires to a point where they wear out. And the time payments will catch up with him, and the skip men will come and get him. Something will stop this car.

In the main universe by friction and other conflicts, a particle traveling is acted upon until it stops. In other words, it's all... below the level of time, everything is sort of geared up to follow in along the time. If an action begins – I mean a single, individual action, not a postulate like time – if it begins, it is sort of geared up to stop.

Now, there are some of these things have not stopped, as I said a moment ago, which might be the composition of matter and such things as that. But even those things have a tendency to deteriorate as they go along.

Now, the point I'm trying to make here is that everybody is used to and in agreement with this thing called a cycle of action.

You aren't using it in your auditing because it is true. I spoke to you the other day about gradient realities. Well, it's one of the realities and it reaches pretty high at case level. It's a reality which fades out just before a person can put some universal laws under control. I mean, it's way up! So the reality of the pc that you process is tied in from the very lowest to a fairly advanced level with this thing called a cycle of action. And because the pc's reality is tied in with it, violations of it bring about an unreality.

So if you want to tell him "What can you find unreal?" just start busting his cycle of action as part of the auditing. Start a process, don't end it. Get a process going, drop it. And the next thing you know, he starts going all unreal on you.

You've got an agreement with him that he is going to get processed in a certain direction to a certain distance and then that's going to all come about. He's still sitting in the middle of his bank, not yet having as-ised all the material available on this, and suddenly there he is parked. There is nothing more done about it. And he's got this mass now, and these questions which he finished up – (quote) "finished up" with, since he didn't finish up – and he carries those on over into the next process. And then he never gets that finished, so he carries on *both* of these now into the next process. And he never gets that finished so he carries all three into the next process. And you'll find yourself all of a sudden dealing with a pc who is unflat on four processes.

Well, he won't smoothly as-is anything, for the only – only for this reason: because it looks very complicated to him. It's getting more and more complicated. He's not getting free, he's getting bogged down! His idea of freedom is finishing up some cycles of action. And let

me assure you that that is a very, very good observation, well within his zones of agreement. He knows that if he finishes his work he can quit. See? These are realities. Their truth is... Well, it's very funny to tell you this, but their truth is limited. But everybody *agrees* with it.

So therefore, when you start snarling somebody up, you have these two factors: The mass he is mixed up with in his mind is restimulated but not as-ised, so he's left with some mass hanging around. And he carries this incomplete cycle of action over into the next-begun cycle of action. And he will start accumulating mass and start accumulating upsets and he'll start getting loses.

Now, the idea of a win is very closely tied in with the cycle of action. Very intimately. This fellow wins, ordinarily, by having accomplished something. You could even win to the point of having gone to a point and then not having been destroyed when reaching that point, so therefore you would have accomplished something. You could even have a negative approach, you see? "Well, I've accomplished something: I came downtown today and didn't get killed." See? Even at that low level, that's a win.

Now, where does all that come from? Now, what is the upper echelon to what I've just been talking to you about? What is the *upper* echelon of this?

Let's really have an esoteric flight here. It comes under the heading of intention. Intention is part of the comm cycle. But intention is senior to the comm cycle. Intention. The ability to intend. An intention contains in it every power the thetan has. Every power the thetan has. The ability to throw a lightning bolt, the ability to hold something in position, the ability to make something continue, the ability to do away with something, strength, accomplishment, power, wit, ability – these things are all wrapped up on the one common denominator of intention. Intention.

When you're just half... Oh, no, no. Well, when you're just half-shot as a thetan, and you've almost had it and you think you're on your last legs... Not in the condition you're in, I mean, but pretty bad off, you know. You're not yet wearing a body. You're probably packing around an effigy. You have to be recognized and people have to say good morning to you or you're unhappy, this kind of thing. You're pretty gowed-in with mass. Your own actual GPMs are wrapped around your gullet. Your intention (this is a low-level skill, this is not a high-level skill) is quite good enough to, for instance, intend this crayon into the air in front of you, to intend this E-Meter over to the other side of the desk. This is low-level stuff I'm talking to you about. A guy is, oh, practically on his last legs when he can do this.

Answering a telephone, one simply intends the telephone up into his vicinity where he is listening and can talk. He intends it off the cradle up to his (quote) "ear" (unquote) and intends it back onto the cradle. Giving you straight stuff now. This is almost recent time. You've been able to do this in recent times. It baffles you sometimes when a piece of MEST does not instantly and immediately obey you. But that's simply intention. That's low-level intention.

I'm not talking to you now about something very esoteric. This would sound very startling and make a newspaper reporter turn gray overnight. But, intend him in a horizontal position outside the door, five feet off the pavement, and let him stay there for a while and cool off. I doubt he'd write it. Because he of all people knows he couldn't do it.

But there is intention. You get what I mean, now, by intention? You intend something to happen and it happens. The ability to intend. And that is all there is to a thetan's power. There is no more to his power than that. There's his ability to throw a lightning bolt, to set a house on fire, to make the roof fly off, to turn a planet upside down. That is everything – his intention.

So all you have to do to weaken a thetan is to get in the road of his intentions. Foul up his intentions. Now, if you can foul up a thetan's intentions, you can weaken him.

Now, what do I mean by weaken him? A person picks up, on Monday, a five-hundred-pound weight, but on Tuesday can only pick up a three-hundred-pound weight. Between Monday and Tuesday he has been weakened, right? Do you understand? It's this graphic. It's not the philosophic derivation of his morals become weak, don't you know?

Well, on Monday he can throw a raw energy beam a hundred yards. On Tuesday morning he can only throw one ten feet. Between Monday and Tuesday he has become weakened. That's what I mean by weakened, see? And the way that is done is to give him losses on his intentions. All you've got to do is foul up or counter or blunt his intentions and he becomes weaker.

Weakness and strength in a thetan, and of course, well, his weakness is the only thing that holds him entrapped. Weakness is the only thing that keeps masses pulled in on him. Weakness is the only thing that keeps him pinned down. You can only trap a thetan when he is weak.

And you need only really be afraid of things that are very weak, with, of course, the proviso of certain magazine editors; they – skip them. Leave them out of that category, because they've had it.

The main thing that we have to watch in this, then, in auditing, is that we do not weaken the actual intention of the pc by blunting his actual intentions. And in order to do this, we must differentiate between his reactive intention – his dramatization, in other words – and his own intention. So we have the subdivision of the pc and his bank.

A person who is dramatizing during an ARC break actually is not intending anything they say. This is simply bank dramatized, do you see? It's all bank dramatized. "*Rowr, rowr, rowr, rowr, rowr, rowr!*" He isn't intending anything. That falls out, then. That's a recording or something going off, you see? That is not his intention. So we don't say that everything somebody must do we must validate. You start validating the bank a hundred percent and you've had it as an auditor.

But we're talking about, now, the actual intentions of the person.

He intended to have a two-hour-and-a-half session. And you give him a three-hour-and-a-half session. You have blunted his intention. He intended to get off this stuff about Aunt Hattie, and you called the process flat long before it were flat. So therefore, you have blunted his intention.

You can't ruin a pc. I'm just talking about how *smoothly* you can audit. You understand this? Because you're not going to spoil anybody's intentions or cave them in by audit-

ing, let me assure you, see? But you can key in incidents on him, and so forth, where his intention is very badly blunted by simply taking an auditing cycle of action and not completing it. In other words, he intends, so forth. You intend, so on, you... so on. And there you go. And you finish it off, and you wind it up. You've completed a cycle of action. That intention has gone through a complete cycle of action then. If you interrupt it halfway, no intention.

Goals for the session. Goals for the session. Here's a good point. You get a pc to put in goals for the session; that's actually a participating intention. So I always work hard on giving a pc goals for the session. I almost work harder to give the pc his goals for the session than I do to give him a session. See?

I can give anybody a session to cure anything or straighten him up, see? That doesn't worry me. But this pc sitting down there has just got through saying, "To feel better about my lumbosis." I'll put that in. I won't take up the body of the session till I've got the oddball goal out of the road. But I can – any pc that is trying to break or stop or not go through with a flattening and so forth, putting in a bunch of sideways goals, could actually stop you from auditing or completing your cycle of action and roll himself up in a ball.

A reactive barrier can arise out of this situation. So he puts in a lot of oddball goals that don't have anything to do about the price of the thing. I'll still clean them up. I'll still clear them up.

But I take out the little kit, you know? The little kit with the little whisk broom. I get those out of the road. And notice the pc apparently has a present time problem. This is in R6 auditing. This is not our ordinary auditing. This is... therefore, any kind of auditing, if you'd pay attention to the pc's goals for the session at R6 when you're totally capable of getting a hundred TA divisions, you see, in two and a half hours, well, good heavens, how much would it apply down at the levels when he's getting fifteen in a two-and-a-half-hour session and lucky to get it, see? So this very definitely applies.

So here's – here's – the person's got goals for the session. I'd look those things over – *pickety, pow, pow!* "He's got a present time problem here. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ho, ho-ho-ho. Let's get the considerations for that present time problem." "Are you... I suppose you have a present time problem here. What – what considerations have you had about that? All right. That's fine. Okay. And you had a bad neck? Been bothering you, and so forth. All right, is that an R6 phenomenon? Is that from goals and... ? It doesn't seem to be from goals, GPMs.

"Something else seems to have gone on here with regard to this. What was the first you noticed this? All right. Good. All right. Well, let's date this." *Pow! Pow! Pow!*

We're doing about a four- and five-minute process, don't you see? I mean, we're driving it right straight along the line. We got the pc on it. We're just brushing this thing off, see, getting this out of the road. But we're doing this other thing: We're giving him the goal for the session, see?

Oh, we got that out of the road. We dated it, the somatic blew and so forth. You have to be quick on this kind of auditing. He's made that goal for the session right there. I haven't even started the body of the session.

The session, now, is – with "since" mid ruds and everything else that has happened – is only thirty-five minutes deep, and we're away into the body of the session on what I want to do. He's already made his goals for the session.

You want to see the good indicators come in? Ha-ha! Make sure the person gets any PT-problem-type of goal for the session and so forth, get him a win on it in the first five minutes of play. Then get down to something important.

"Oh, yeah," you say, "this takes very skilled, very fast, very tricky auditing. You really have to know what you're doing to be able to get rid of somebody's lumbosis that's been keeping them up all night in the first ten minutes of the session." No. No, no, no. Who's getting rid of it? We just keyed it out. We just gave it a swift kick, so it isn't bothering the pc. Made his goal for the session, too. Therefore his intention level is up. So therefore he's more powerful in the session. Therefore he can look at his bank better. See this?

That's why a person makes no progress while he has a PTP: His intentions are being blunted or overlooked. And so he cannot rise superior to his bank. So he makes no progress.

What is a PTP? It is postulate-counter-postulate. You could just as easy interpret this as intention-counter-intention.

You will not find a present time problem where a person's intentions have not been blunted. Something is fighting his intentions. And he – it seems to him that it's of equal magnitude. Intention versus intention. He has an intention, somebody else has another intention. These two intentions lock together and you get a present time problem. It tends to hang up in time. And that's how you get a time hang-up, basic time hang-up: intention-counter-intention.

Let's look at Class V for a moment – not because we're teaching you anything about Class V but because this is a marvelous field of demonstration.

Why do you think, in the Helatrobus and the trillions-two, and other implant areas, *oppose* was in vogue? It isn't even the actual GPM. The actual GPM is a subvolitional intention which is way downstairs. It goes in with an axe. "Everything inevitably brings about something else. It doesn't matter what happens if something else is going to be brought about." It's very apathetic. Very low.

But these brisker levels, more ambitious levels: how did they knock out the power of a thetan? How could they possibly do anything to a thetan? Well, the implant means, by using key goals like "to go," "to stay," "to move," "to go away," "to forget," "to remember" – this type of goal, all mucked up with innumerable variations of that goal, serve as key intentions. So what he *intends* to remember, he of course will get "nix to remember." He'd get an automatic and instant blunting of intention. That was the intention of the implant.

Very far from flawlessly works. Thetans transcend this stuff rather easily. But there, there is the woof and warp of implants and how they are done and why.

Anybody setting up implants that are going to be successful would simply blunt intentions. Blunt intentions, that's the whole thing. So he says "to move," he immediately gets "not to move." See? And then the implant GPMs interact one against the other, so if he gets the

idea to stay, then he feels he has to move. And if he gets the idea to move, then he feels he's got to stay. So they counter-oppose each other, too.

So opposition or oppose is the keynote to an implant. And this is the only way that they're aberrative. There is no other reason. Bah! The amount of mass and – mass – mass, the thetan only keeps the mass of these things around because he can't get rid of them and he's automatically creating it and he's doing other things, but an implant GPM has too little mass to be very upsetting to the individual, but it upsets his ideas. So he gets the idea to go and he gets the counter-intention – hits him in the face.

The way they "civilize" a child, for instance, is to... all they have to do is break all his intentions. Somebody talking about spoiling a child or upsetting a child: That's very silly to say that by giving a child everything, you spoil the child or by being nice to a child, you spoil the child. They're just drawing a longbow. They couldn't be further from the mark.

It's blunting every intention the child has. And remember that there are reactive intentions and that there are analytical intentions – two varieties.

So we let the reactive intention have its way. Child cries, screams and throws a tantrum, we instantly give him what he wanted. That validated the reactive intention. The child wants to sit quietly and look out the window – analytical intention – so we get him busy doing something else. By the time we've crossed these things – in other words, validated the reactive intentions by rewarding the child and obeying the reactions, and blunted every analytical intention the child has – we'll of course have weakened the thetan (becomes susceptible to illness and that sort of thing), simply because masses move in on him.

I mean, a very... a person who is weakened is unable to hold anything at a distance, so everything collapses on him.

You understand what I'm talking about? This is *terribly* simple. And there it evades understanding just by being in itself so idiotically simple.

So your pc has two types of intentions. And one is totally reactive. It's just a dramatization. So we won't call it an intention; we call it a dramatization. Every time your pc dramatizes, you let him have his way. And every time your pc pleasantly, nicely wants to do something analytically, you blunt his intention. After a while, you're going to have your pc practically spinny on the subject of auditing reaction. He won't be able to handle things in session. You'll find the pc isn't cogniting. You'll find this and that, and so forth. There's many an auditor pays nothing – no attention to the pc until the pc starts ARC breaking.

Now the auditor knows something is happening, so he decides to do something for the pc because the pc has ARC broken. But actually the pc has been sitting there auditing splendidly, beautifully and smoothly. His pc'ing is very nice. And he sort of timidly brings up the fact that he would really like to – you know, he'd really like to look at this engram he's seeing there just a moment longer. He brings this up; he says it's bothering him a little bit. He doesn't quite know what it's all about. It's a little bit of an origin, you see? It isn't going to take any time. You don't give him an additional restimulation. You say, "Yes? All right. All right. Well, what's it all about?" (Something like that.)

"So-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

"All right, that's fine." You get that out of the road and you go on, don't you see?

But every time he says, "Well, I uh... I don't know... I don't really... I don't really have any more answers to that question. Uh... I uh...."

"Well, you're damn well going to answer the question!" See? This is getting on to the borderline of intention, don't you see? So he kind of gets upset one way or the other.

The auditor doesn't pay any attention to what's going on there. We've got an uncomfortable situation. Pc's intention, cycles of action, what he's doing and so forth – they're all kind of getting mixed up. And the auditor's paying no attention to this because the pc is still in a fairly sweet frame of mind, you see, when the pc finally loses... You understand, a pc doesn't turn nasty, a pc gets overwhelmed by his bank. That's always the case. And the pc, own intentions having been blunted badly, then loses control. And the bank, powered up, overwhelms him and takes over control, and on an automaticity, starts blowing its head off! Going into all sorts of dramatization of one kind or other, even though it's just the dramatization of apathy. Bank is in a dramatization.

Well, of course the auditor acts. That's what we know as acting too late. That's catching a slipping situation too late gives you these explosive ARC breaks. They generally telegraph themselves way ahead. But what's happened there is really the pc has become overwhelmed by his own bank. You're not watching the pc's intentions now, you're watching the pc's dramatization. But you don't do anything about the pc's intentions, you will eventually get the pc's dramatizations. It's quite an elementary situation. It's one which an auditor should understand.

Now, I spoke to you some time ago in a lecture about what is a win and what is a lose. Just going over that cursorily, a win is accomplishing what you intend to accomplish or accomplishing the not-accomplishment of something you didn't intend to accomplish. You get the idea? You intended not to have any ARC breaks, and in the session you not-had any ARC breaks. You understand? Well, that's a win, see?

And a lose is just exactly the reverse – just exactly the reverse. Things you intended not to happen happened, and things which you intended to happen didn't happen. And that's a lose. And that's all a win is and that's all a lose is. That's all.

So when we compare this situation to auditing, we find out, then, that the auditor's intention is valuable to the session. And because he's less susceptible to dramatization from the bank in the pc – since he's not really at all greatly susceptible to the bank in the pc; it's the pc's bank, it's not hitting the auditor – and because the auditor is capable of standing outside that perimeter of potential dramatization, the auditor's intention in a session is therefore senior to the pc's intention. But if the pc's intention is totally neglected with regard to a session, we again get a weakening of the pc and an encroachment of dramatization.

So the auditor intends to flatten off such and such a process. And the pc intends to take care of something else he has thought about overnight. Well, that pc has been subject to dramatization because of restimulation. You'd be very foolish not to flatten out the original process, because that was the original intention, wasn't it? That wasn't finished, and yet the pc wants to do another one. Well, this is going to hang him up with an intention loss whether

he likes it or not. And the auditor, standing outside this perimeter, of course, can complete the cycle of action on which he began. And that gives a win to the auditor and the pc. You follow this?

Pc's analytical intentions, then, are valuable to a session. And they are very often expressed in the goals of the session, and they are cared for accordingly. That's the way it is.

Now he intends to get a certain distance, and actually, down deep he really intends to become OT. He's never investigated this. It's running far too deep. But way down underneath all the layers of God-help-us he intends to get to be OT, that's for sure. In other words, he intends to recover. He doesn't even, though, have enough analytical awareness of where he is going to know what he intends. He intends freedom and a return of power – which is to say, he intends freedom and a return of intention. Well, he now can go all the way. He now can go all the way. That is well within grasp. If he walks along a certain path, and doesn't keep jumping off the cliff and so forth, why, he will arrive. Well therefore, the intention for him to arrive is very *sotto voce* in him. And an auditor with some experience and action on this, intending him to arrive. The auditor's intention is actually more reliable than the pc's, even though the pc is more deep and fundamental than the auditor's. Why? Because every time he starts coming up the line, this pc is going to short-circuit into some direction, fail to complete a cycle of action someplace, leave a rock in the road somewhere or another. And he'll get some wild idea and – well, I've seen it happen, man. You... This pc is supposed to be prep-checked on something or other in order to get something or other accomplished so that he won't always be coming to session with this gross PTP about his domestic affairs or something like this, don't you see. And somebody has decided to get this out of the road so they can proceed. And he's thrown that all sideways, and he's spent the night listing goals. See?

Well, in the first place is, the reason he listed goals had to do with the fact that his intention about his marital problem was being blunted. So case advance is now reinterpreted into some kind of an escape from his present time problem. So he doesn't know which way he's going; he doesn't know what cycle of action he's on. Is he on the cycle of action of completing his present time problem with his domestic affairs? Or is he on the cycle of action of becoming a free being? Well, he's on the cycle of action of becoming free from his wife. He's not on the cycle of action of becoming a free being.

Well, something weird goes on when you've got this kind of thing happening. He's on a small perimeter. He's on a little cycle of action, and he's using a huge cycle of action potential to accomplish this little cycle of action, you see? He's using a 20-millimeter machine gun to shoot a grasshopper, see? And of course he can't shoot this grasshopper, because actually you can't get the muzzle depressed enough. You get this kind of... He's got freedom mixed up with escape. He wants to fix it so he doesn't have to confront things any more. All this kind of thing goes on and all that can get in an auditor's road hugely.

I'm talking to you now about fine points. You know – you know, in spite of all this, you can blunder through. You know? I'm just giving you some fine points here.

You could get there somehow, prepchecking the rough edge off of a person's lumbosis, and somehow or another this. And somebody puts him together with sticky plaster because too many unflat processes exist on the case. And then somehow or another you finally

find the GPM, and you get enough tone arm action out of the GPM to – you get the idea – to sort of cancel out some of the other sins and ills that have occurred in it. You'd get there somehow; you could muddle through.

But these are the fine points. These are the fine points of the business. He's as weak as his intentions are blunted. He will become as strong as his intentions are free. The greatest holder-backer of intentions is the person himself. Because he puts himself in danger every time he has a dangerous intention.

I think your international champions in boxing, let us say, or something like that, probably have an awful time. They probably educate themselves right out of a hard punch, merely because they're walking through the society all the time. It'd be very, very dangerous indeed for them to uncork a hard punch in the Bide-a-Wee Cocktail Bar, see? That's supposed to be reserved only for the stage, see? So here's an intention that is becoming narrowed and specialized. They eventually become quite weak.

I'm not talking about something that you could measure by the diameter of the biceps, the number of foot-pounds of punch deliverable. You see, they're having to withhold this intention. This intention has got to be very much pulled down. They've got to condition this intention.

If they have a trainer and a manager that tells them, "Now only hit with your right hand during moments of something or other." Some fellow across – as their opponent in the ring – could stand there with his guard dropped. The person's left hand, in perfectly good condition to deliver the final blow that would end the whole match, you see, and yet would never strike the blow. See, his intention – his intention, now, is far, far too specialized and channeled.

Now, you ask a fellow, "What restraints do you have to put on yourself in your everyday living?" You're going to get almost a roaring automaticity, see? He has been taught that his intentions are dangerous to him. He's been taught that he can get a dangerous intention. He's been taught as well that his intentions can get out of his control and he can accidentally intend something.

So every once in a while you have somebody walking around in circles – there's been a fire in Birmingham or something of the sort – and there will be somebody walking around in circles worrying because he might have let an intention out from underneath his hat and started the fire in Birmingham. See? And he'll actively worry about this. You see? Whereas the guy couldn't even warm up a cup of coffee if he had a stove, see?

But thetans become very worried about this sort of thing. And they become very protestive. And one of the big games is to make somebody protest his intentions, you see. "What are your intentions toward me, sir?" You see, that's the standard girl's question. "Clarify your intentions," and so forth.

Wasn't it Voltaire that won every argument before he even began it? He said somebody had to define his terms before he could argue with him. Well, that's very interesting. But if you carried that a little further, you'd find the guy would get so busy defining his terms that

his intention to have anything else happening would be nil. And you wouldn't find much of a debate in progress here, don't you see?

"You must define your intentions or what you're doing." Society does this to us in Scientology. Fortunately, they don't know what our intentions are. And frankly, we've never really sat down and mapped it all out as to what our intentions should be. Which is probably the way it should be, don't you see? Because therefore there's nothing to blunt. Nobody has ever expressed the matter. That's sort of a lazy way to go about it.

But they have all sorts of assignments to us in Scientology as to what our intentions are. They wouldn't believe our real intentions, so we'll probably make them. But we lose – for instance "a world without insanity or war," or something like that. It's a perfectly valid intention. Well, they consider this too high-flown. "What are their intentions?" So they assign a whole bunch of false intentions to the Scientologists, see? Well, let them. That's what makes their attacks look so silly, because of course they're fighting a set of intentions which don't exist. So it makes them look like they're walking around talking to shadows, or something like that. It leaves us completely free and rather unwound, into the battle.

The intention, actually, any broad intention we have is quite clear-cut, appears in many books, but it's way over their heads, you see? They can't figure they could blunt that intention because that's... Well, you take a war without – I mean a world without insanity; you take this as an intention. Well, that's good roads and good weather; of course, very unreal, unaccomplishable. Anybody'd look this over, they therefore couldn't have anything to do with that. One of these days they're going to be awful surprised! See?

We'll have that intention moving. See? I even spent a little time in on "How would you handle vast numbers of insane?" and so forth, see? Out of that original speculation, we got Scientology 0 processes, by the way. I mean, they're just an offshoot of that. I'd hate to have to confess that to you, but that was the body of research that came out of, which is just destimulate the environment. Give a stable datum for the environment.

So, intention – intention here is everything in case recovery. If a person is regaining his power or ability or something like that, he's merely removing out of his road what blunts his intentions and what has blunted his intentions, and that's really all he's doing. So if we look this over with a very critical eye, we find out that the auditor, going through almost any sincere job of auditing – even if clumsily done – will inevitably unblunt some of this pc's intentions. They will be unblunted one way or the other. And we're talking about the upper esoterics of auditing – how to keep auditing from blunting the pc's intentions, you see.

Well, an intention is a cycle of action. Any time you say "do," you add *time*. So a doingness intention or accomplishingness intention has time added to it.

The moment that you add time or doingness to the thing, you've got a cycle of action. So an intention is at its highest echelon, totally independent of time and the cycle of action. Intention is simply pure intention and is not necessarily tied into time at all! You could just as easily make a postulate in 1492 or in 2658 as you could in 1964. There isn't any intimate and immediate relationship.

But as the individual has gone down scale, he has of course more and more associated his intentions with a cycle of action. You make the intention and then a certain thing occurs, or the intention goes across a space – as in communication, you see – and then it arrives at the other end, and a certain result therefore takes place at the other end. So we have a cycle of action. We have the intention, now, worked into time and space.

So the intention originally is totally free of time and space and has nothing to do with it. And in actual fact, time and space have, as their only reality, the fact that they are made out of an intention. Doesn't matter whether this intention is an agreed-upon intention or otherwise. There's a basic intention which gives us time and space. So it is actually superior to all MEST. And you'll have your fingers on something, it doesn't have to be MEST; but as it comes down scale, this becomes expressed to the pc, particularly at the lower levels of a case.

Lower levels of cases, this fellow's having a *dreadful* time (exclamation point)! See, he's just *staggering* through life, man. He's hitting both walls and walking backwards and falling on his knees every time he turns around. Well, that individual's agreement with a cycle of action means that an intention... There are no intentions any more. There could however – might be a cycle of action. See? The intention has disappeared out of the cycle of action, and you simply have this cycle of action. When he goes down any further, he goes down into pure chaos.

So therefore, you can take a person who is having a terrible time and tell him to touch the wall, and you've shown him an intention and shown him a cycle of action. You can short-session him. You can start a session, run a session and end a session. Ten minutes' worth, see? Then start another session, run a session and end a session. All you're doing is showing him cycle of action, cycle of action, cycle of action. The auditing command: cycle of action. The auditor's command, the acknowledgment... the answer, the acknowledgment: It's a cycle of action. All you're showing him is you're demonstrating the existence of a cycle of action, cycle of action, cycle of action – any one of these things as they come through.

And eventually, his own in... the reason he cognites is his own intentions start to free up out of the obsessive MESTiness of it all. And he starts seeing things. And he starts coming back to battery. He starts adding up what's going on. Well now, the only way the auditor can get in his road in all this, of course, is to foul up his own cycle of action – the auditor's cycle of action. Now we could foul this up. One of the ways of fouling it up is to leave processes unflat. Or misinterpret what we're doing with a process. We're trying to get rid of this fellow's lumbosis or lifetime problem here, so we treat it like it's a rudiment. We give it a little dust-off and so forth. Well, misapplication of tools. Well, you're not going to get the intention clear because that back is not going to get better under that kind of treatment, so the auditor's intention is blunted, the pc's intention to have a better back is blunted, everybody loses under that situation.

So our intention on the thing laid out: If we're going to have wins then we must validate analytical intention, knock out dramatization and be very consistent with completing cycles of action, even though it's an auditing command or getting rid of his lumbosis. And those are the factors with which you are dealing. The auditor must flatten the process within the reality of what he is processing. In other words, within the reality of, *What's he got here?*

He's got a little problem that's been generated since last night. So he stops auditing the back, which has been going on for nine or ten years, and starts using heavy artillery on this little problem that came up last night. Well, he didn't complete the big cycle of action, he's trying to make too much out of this other cycle of action – he's misapplying his tools, in other words.

He's working on this bad back and the only reason he gets last night's problem out of the way with his little dust kit is, well, just so he can go on and complete this bigger cycle of action. You've got to keep the pc on the main chance. You've got to flatten the big stuff that you start. You're doing a Problems Intensive – I don't think you could prepcheck it in under ten or twelve hours. If you did a proper assessment on the thing, you'd – ten or twelve hours, I'd think that'd be a long – a short haul to cover everything, let us say, from 1949 July on up to present time.

Well, how do you make it run that long? Well, it isn't how long you make it run: how much is there there? Well, that depends on how much you impinge on the pc. That depends on how much you make the pc work at it. That depends on how hard you sweat over this particular action, and how clean you keep the pc from ARC breaks, and how clean you keep his interim session difficulties – the between-session difficulties – from interrupting you from doing a cycle of action. And for that kind of thing, we've got little brush-off things. We just destimulate this stuff. The rudiment approach, then the main-session approach. And therefore, we can *achieve* the intentions of the pc, we can *achieve* the intentions of the auditor.

We flatten a process within the reality of what is there to be flattened, and how much is there to be flattened? How much are we tackling here? Well, the fellow was always – had a little problem that had to do with – he's always had this problem, and so forth: he thinks he's inferior. Well, that's great. That's great. Now, you're going to handle this with a rudiments process. No, I don't think so.

The individual comes into session and he stubbed his toe outside the door and it hurts. You're going to give this a fourteen-hour Prepcheck.

So the magnitude of what you're trying to handle, the duration of time of what you are trying to handle, to a large degree establishes how much time it is going to take you and how much heavy action you will have to take on it and how thoroughly you'll have to flatten it. And those are the establishing factors. But when all out – when all else is worked out, you're trying to *complete* a cycle of action. And on the very *bad-off* case, that is all you can do. That is the most basic process there is, is simply get a cycle of action completed. And I imagine that an auditing question like this: "What did you have to eat for breakfast?" Guy is having an awful time. Practically blindstagers, type pc, you see? And two-and-a-half hours later, with a great deal of two-way comm and discussion and so forth, he has answered the auditing question. It sounds incredible, doesn't it? And yet, you know the pc would have a win? Pc would have a big win.

You went in too high. It should have been "Did you come to the session?" That wouldn't have taken so long to do. But if you can get an auditing cycle completed, you get a win, and if you don't get an auditing cycle completed, whatever else you look at or what you think you are looking at, you're going to get a lose. Elementary as that.

So when the whole – when the whole thing is squared away, what you're trying to do as an auditor depends on what you're trying to handle in the pc, the order of magnitude in terms of time and trouble and duration and so forth, and that determines on what kind of flattening you use.

And the flattening of the main chance, the big long-term one and so forth, is done very arduously indeed. It's all done by TA. It's never done by anything else but TA. And of course your little stuff that you're trying to get out of the road so you can keep on with your main action is just a rudiments-type kick-off and you just flatten it to cognition or till it isn't bothering the pc and it's out of the road and you're away. You see why this is now? You see how this is? All right. I hope you can have some wins on this.

Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 OCTOBER 1970

Remimeo
C/Ses
All Auditors
Level 0
HGC Checksheet

C/S Series 20

PERSISTENT F/N

A Floating Needle *can persist.*

This fact tells you at once why you cannot do three major actions in a row in the same ten minutes.

This was the bug behind “Quickie Grades” (0 to IV in one session. This also occurred in Power when it was run all in one day). The auditor would attain a bona fide full dial F/N. The pc was still cogniting, still in a big win. The auditor would “clear the next process command”, he would see an F/N. He would “clear the next process command”, and see an F/N.

But it was the same F/N!

Result was that processes 2 and 3 **were never run on the case.**

This is really what is meant by “Quickie Grades”.

In 1958 we got real Releases. You could not kill the F/N for *days*, weeks.

Several processes had this effect. Today’s real Clear also goes this way. You couldn’t kill the F/N with an axe.

By running a lot of Level Zero processes, for instance, you can get a real swinging unkillable F/N.

It not only gets to the Examiner, it comes in at the start of the next day’s session!

Now if in one session you ran all of Level Zero and went on up to Level One, you would just be *auditing a persistent F/N*. The pc would get no benefit at all from Level One. He’s still going “Wow” on Level Zero.

If you ran Level Zero with one process that got a big wide floating F/N and then “ran” Level I, II, III and IV, you would have just a Level Zero Release. The pc’s bank was nowhere to be found. So next week he has problems (Level I) or a Service Fac (Level IV) and he is only a Grade Zero yet it says right there in Certs and Awards log he’s a Grade IV. So now we have a “Grade IV” who has Level I, II, III and IV troubles!

A session that tries to go beyond a big dial-wide drifting floating F/N only distracts the pc from his win. BIG WIN.

Any big win (F/N dial-wide, Cog, VGIs) gives you this kind of persistent F/N.

You at least have to let it go until tomorrow and let the pc have his win.

That is what is meant by letting the pc have his win. When you get one of these dial-wide F/Ns, Cog, VGIs WOW you may as well pack it up for the day.

GRADUAL WIDENING

In running a Dianetic chain to basic in triple you will sometimes see in one session a half dial on Flow 1, 3/4 of a dial on Flow 2, a full dial on Flow 3.

Or you may have 4 subjects to two-way comm or prepcheck in one session. First action 1/3 dial F/N. Then no F/N, TA up. Second action 1/2 dial F/N. Then no F/N. Third action 3/4 dial F/N. Fourth action full dial-wide floating swinging idling F/N.

You will also notice in the same session-long time for 1st action, shorter, shorter, shorter for the next three actions.

Now you have an F/N that anything you try to clear and run will just **F/N without affecting the case at all.**

If you audit past that you are wasting your time and processes.

You have hit an “unkillable F/N”, properly called a persistent F/N. It’s persistent at least for that day. Do any more and it’s wasted.

If an auditor has never seen this he had better get his TR0 bullbait flat for 2 hours at one unflunked go and his other TRs in and drill out his flubs. For that’s what’s supposed to happen.

F/Ns on pcs audited up to (for that session) a persistent F/N always get to the Examiner.

If you only have a “small F/N” it won’t get to the Examiner. However, on some pcs maybe that’s good enough. May take him several sessions, each one getting a final session F/N a bit wider. Then he gets an F/N that gets to the Examiner. After that, well audited on a continuing basis, the F/N lasts longer and longer.

One day the pc comes into session with a dial-wide floating swinging F/N and anything you say or do does nothing whatever to disturb that F/N.

It’s a real Release man. It may last weeks, months, years.

Tell him to come back when he feels he needs some auditing and chalk up the remaining hours (if sold by the hour) as undelivered. Or if sold by result, chalk up the result.

If the F/N is truly persistent he will have no objections. If it isn’t, he *will* object. So have him come back tomorrow and carry on whatever you were doing.

SUMMARY

The technical bug back of Quickie Grades or Quickie Power was the Persistent F/N.

This is not to be confused with a Stage 4 (sweep, stick, sweep, stick) or an ARC Broke needle (pc Bad Indicators while F/Ning).

This is not to be used to refuse all further auditing to a pc.

It is to be used to determine when to end a series of major actions in a session.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:rr.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MARCH 1974

Remimeo
AO Auditors
Class VIII

END PHENOMENA

(Ref: HCO B 20 Feb 1970,
"Floating Needles and End Phenomena")

Different types of auditing call for different handlings of End Phenomena.

End Phenomena will also vary depending on what you're running.

The definition of **End Phenomena** is "those indicators in the pc and meter which show that a chain or process is ended". Misapplication of this definition can result in underrun and overrun processes or actions and the pc snarled up with BPC.

TYPES OF EPS

In Power Processing the auditor waits for a *specific* EP and does not indicate an F/N until he has gotten the specific EP for the process. To miss on this in Power is disastrous, thus Power auditors are drilled and drilled on the handling of Power EPs.

In Dianetics, the EP of a chain is erasure, accompanied by an F/N, cognition and good indicators. You wouldn't necessarily expect rave indicators on a pc in the middle of an assist, under emotional or physical stress until the full assist was completed though. What you would expect is the chain blown with an F/N. Those two things themselves are good indicators. The cognition could simply be "the chain blew".

In Scientology, End Phenomena vary with what you're auditing. An ARC Broken pc on an L-1C will peel off charge and come uptone gradually as each reading line is handled. Sometimes it comes in a spectacular huge cog and VVGIs and dial F/N, but that's usually after charge has been taken off on a gradient. What's expected is an F/N as that charge being handled moves off.

In Ruds it's the same idea. When you've got your F/N and that charge has moved off, indicate it. Don't push the pc on and on for some "EP". You've got it.

Now a major grade process will run to F/N, Cog, VGIs and release. You'll have an ability regained. But that's a *grade* process on a set up flying pc.

F/N ABUSE

Mistakenly applying the Power EP rule to Ruds will have the pc messed up by overrun. It invalidates the pc's wins and keys the charge back in. The pc will start thinking he hasn't blown the charge and can't do anything about it.

In 1970 I had to write the HCO B "F/Ns and End Phenomena" to cure auditors of chopping pc EPs on major actions by indicating F/Ns too soon. This is one type of F/N abuse which has largely been handled.

That bulletin and Power EP handling have been in some instances misapplied in the direction of overrun. "The pc isn't getting EP on these chains as there's no cognition, just 'it erased'," is one example. Obviously the C/S didn't understand the definition of cognition or what an EP is. Another example is the pc spots what it is and F/Ns and the auditor carries on, expecting an "EP".

OTs AND EPs

An OT is particularly subject to F/N abuse as he can blow things quite rapidly. If the auditor misses the F/N due to too high a sensitivity setting or doesn't call it as he's waiting for an "EP", overrun occurs. It invalidates an OT's ability to as-is and causes severe upsets.

This error can also stem from auditor speed. The auditor, used to auditing lower level pcs or never trained to audit OTs, can't keep up with the OT and misses his F/Ns or reads.

Thus overruns occur and charged areas are bypassed.

This could account for those cases who were flying then fell on their heads with the same problems that blew back again.

REMEDY

The remedy of this problem begins with thoroughly clearing all terms connected with EPs. This is basically Word Clearing Method 6, Key Words.

The next action is to get my HCO Bs on the subject of EPs and also related metering HCO Bs fully understood and starrated. This would be followed by clay demos of various EPs of processes and actions showing the mechanics of the bank and what happens with the pc and meter.

TRs and meter drills on spotting F/Ns would follow, including any needed obnosis drills and correction of meter position so that the auditor could see the pc, meter and his admin at a glance.

Then, the auditor would be gradiently drilled on handling the pc, meter and admin at increasing rates of speed including recognizing and indicating EPs when they occurred. When the auditor could do all of this smoothly at the high rate of speed of an OT blowing things by inspection without fumbling, the last action would be bullbaited drills like TRs 103 and 104,

on a gradient to a level of competence whereby the auditor could handle anything that came up at speed and do so smoothly.

Then you'd really have an OT auditor. And that's what you'll have to do to make them.

SUMMARY

Overrun and underrun alike mess up cases.

Both stem from an auditor inability to recognize and handle different types of EPs and inexpertness in handling the tools of auditing at speed.

Don't overrun pcs and have to repair them.

Let the pc have his wins.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ams.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 SEPTEMBER 1978

Remimeo
Level IV Checksheets
Class IV Auditors
Supervisors
C/Ses

ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE

REF:

HCOB 22 JUL 63	YOU CAN BE RIGHT
HCOB I SEP 63	SCIENTOLOGY THREE CLEARING, CLEARING, CLEARING, ROUTINE THREE SC
HCOB 23 AUG 66	SERVICE FACSIMILE
HCOB 30 NOV 66	ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES
TAPE: 6308C27	SH SPEC 299 RIGHTNESS AND WRONGNESS
TAPE: 6309C04	SH SPEC 302 HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE
TAPE: 6309C03	SH SPEC 302A R3SC
TAPE: 6309C05	SH SPEC 303 SERVICE FACSIMILE ASSESSMENT
TAPE: 6309C18	SH SPEC 308 ST HILL SERVICE FAC HANDLING

Facsimile: A mental picture unknowingly created; a copy of the physical universe environment, complete with all the perceptions, at some time in the past.

Service: A method of providing a person with the use of something; the action or result of giving assistance or advantage; work done; duty performed.

Computation: That aberrated evaluation and postulate that one must be in a certain state in order to succeed.

Service Facsimile: The Service Facsimile is that computation generated by *the preclear* (not the bank) to make self right and others wrong: To dominate or escape domination and enhance own survival and injure that of others.

Note that it is a computation, not a doingness, beingness or havingness. We could call this a “service computation” but we will maintain the term we have used to describe this phenomenon throughout the technology: “service facsimile.”

It is a computation that the pc adopted when, in an extreme situation, he felt endangered by something but could not itsa it.

It is called a service facsimile because he uses it; it is “of service” to him.

Aberration, anybody’s aberration on any subject, has been of some use to them *at some time or other*. You can trace it back. It’s been of some use, otherwise they wouldn’t

keep mocking it up. But *now*, if you put it up against survival standards, you'd find it very non-survival.

The pc adopted this because he couldn't stand the confusion in a situation. So he adopted a safe solution. A safe solution is always adopted as a retreat from the environmental restimulation. He adopted a safe solution in that instance and he survived. His safe solution became his stable datum. He has hung onto it ever since. It is the computation, the fixed idea, he uses to handle life, his service facsimile.

HOW THE SERVICE FACSIMILE BECOMES FIXED

An idea is the thing most easily substituted for a thetan. An idea doesn't have any mass connected with it basically. And it appears to have some wisdom in it so it's very easily substituted for a thetan. Thus the idea, the stable datum he has adopted, is substituted for the thetan.

How does this stable datum become so fixed? It gets fixed, and more and more firmly as time goes on, by the confusion it is supposed to handle but doesn't.

The stable datum was adopted in lieu of inspection. The person ceased to inspect, he fell back from inspecting, he fell back from living. He put the datum there to substitute for his own observation and his own coping with life, and at that moment he started an accumulation of confusion.

That which is not confronted and inspected tends to persist. Thus in the absence of his own confronting mass collects. The stable datum forbids inspection. It's an automatic solution. It's "safe." It solves everything. He no longer has to inspect to solve, so he never as-ises the mass. He gets caught in the middle of the mass. And it collects more and more confusion and his ability to inspect becomes less and less. The more he isn't confronting, the less he can confront. This becomes a dwindling spiral.

So the thing he has adopted to handle his environment for him is the thing which reduces his ability to handle his environment.

Those things which do not respond to routine auditing, that routine auditing won't change, are rooted in this mechanism.

Therefore, it is important to find the idea on which he is so fixed. Pull the fixed idea and you free the individual for a broader perimeter of inspection.

In service fac handling the reason you get tone arm action when the fixed idea has been pulled is that the confusion which has been amassed and dammed up for so long is now running off.

RIGHT/WRONG, DOMINATE AND SURVIVE

Right and wrong are the tools of survival. In order to survive you have to be right. There is a level at which true rightness is analytical, and there is a level at which rightness

and wrongness cease to be analytical or comprehensible. When it drops below that point it's aberration.

The point you degenerate from survive to succumb is the point you recognize you are wrong. That is the beginning of succumb. The moment one becomes worried about his own survival he enters into the necessity to dominate in order to survive.

It goes: the insistence upon survival, followed by the necessity to dominate, followed *then* by the necessity to be right. These postulates go downhill. So you get an aberrated rightness or wrongness. The game of domination consists of making the other fellow wrong in order to be right.

That is the essence of the service facsimile.

The reason the service facsimile isn't rational is because you have A=A=As along the whole line. Coming down the line it works itself back and forth in an aberrated A=A=A. If the individual is surviving he must be right. And people will defend the most fantastic wrongnesses on the basis they are being right.

In PT and at any point along the track, the fellow is trying to be right, trying to be right, trying to be right. *Whatever* he's doing he's trying to be right. In order to survive you have to be right more than you're wrong, so you get the obsession to be right in order to survive. The lie is that he can't do anything else except survive.

It isn't that trying to be right is wrong – it's obsessively being right about something that's obviously wrong. That's when the individual is no longer able to select his own course of behaviour. When he is obsessively following courses of behaviour which are uninspected in order to be right.

There is nothing sane about a service facsimile, there is no rationality to it. The computation does not fit the incident or event occurring. It simply enforces, exaggerates and destroys freedom of choice over the exercise of ability to be happy or powerful or normal or active. It destroys power, destroys freedom of choice.

Wherever that zone or area is you'll see the individual worsening. He is on a dwindling spiral. But he himself is generating it.

The intention to be right is the strongest intention in the universe. Above it you have the effort to dominate and above that you have the effort to survive. These things are strong. But we're talking here about a *mental activity*. A *thinking activity*. An *intentional activity*.

Survival – that just happens. Domination – that just happens. Those are not *intended* things. But you get down along the level of *intended* and it's right or wrong. The strongest intention in the universe.

It is always an aberrated solution. It always exists in PT and is part of the environment of the pc. He's generating it. It's his solution. Overwhelmed as he is by it, he is still generating it. It's aberrated because it's an uninspected solution. And it is something that everyone unintentionally or otherwise is telling the pc is wrong and causing him to assert that it is right. The perfect solution when he first got hold of it. But now it monitors his life; it's living his life for him. And it doesn't even vaguely begin to take care of his life.

That is the anatomy of the service facsimile.

You are going to find these on any pc you audit. A service facsimile is the clue, the key to a pc's case. The route to succumb which he blindly asserts is his route to survival. And every pc has more than one of these.

Fortunately, we have the tech to salvage him. We are the only ones who do.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 SEPTEMBER 1978
Issue II

Remimeo
Level IV
Checksheets
Class IV Auditors
Supervisors
C/Ses

SERVICE FACSIMILES AND ROCK SLAMS

REFERENCE:

HCOB 5 SEP 78	ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE
HCOB 1 SEP 63	SCIENTOLOGY THREE CLEARING, CLEARING, CLEARING, ROUTINE THREE SC
HCOB 6 SEP 78 III	URGENT, IMPORTANT, ROUTINE THREE SC-A, FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING; UPDATED WITH NEW ERA DIANETICS
TAPE: 6308C27	SH SPEC 299 RIGHTNESS & WRONGNESS
TAPE: 6309C04	SH SPEC 302 HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE
TAPE: 6309C03	SH SPEC 302A R3SC
TAPE: 6309C05	SH SPEC 303 SERVICE FACSIMILE ASSESSMENT
TAPE: 6309C18	SH SPEC 308 ST. HILL SERVICE FAC HANDLING
HCOB 3 SEP 78	DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM
HCOB 10 AUG 76R	R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN

A service facsimile is a brother to R/Ses and evil intentions.

This is easily seen when one understands the anatomy of the service fac and the right/wrong, dominate and survive computations that enter into it. And when one understands that an R/S always means a hidden, evil intention and that the total reason for an R/S is to make wrong. In order to get someone to succumb they have to be wrong.

Way back up there the idea preceding the service fac was right, really right. Then it came down a bit and was a method of survival and then it was a method of dominating and then it was a method of being right in order to make others wrong.

And in that contest one got enough overts so that the communication line took a switcheroo. What was right about it is now wrong about it and what was once wrong is now *right*. A=A=A enters into the situation where rightness becomes wrongness. All of his overts get piled up on one of these fixed ideas, or what we call a service facsimile.

It isn't actually a facsimile at all. It's the guy himself keeping facsimiles in restimulation because he "knows" what's best. The person himself is generating the fixed idea; it is not the bank.

It isn't what aberration the individual is dramatizing. It's what aberration does the individual *dredge up* in order to make somebody wrong. It isn't the accidental thing you think it is. It's *intended*.

The intention is to be right and make others wrong, to dominate others and escape domination oneself, to aid own survival and hinder the survival of others. That is the service fac – blood brother to the hidden, evil intention that is behind the rock slam.

This does not mean you will necessarily see R/Ses on every service fac you run. It does mean that **where a pc is R/Sing in an area you have an area of a heavy, a severe, service fac.**

Know when you see an R/S that the individual is in the grip of an evil intention which he himself is generating. He intends that area or subject on which he is R/Sing nothing but harm. Calculatingly, covertly, he will go to great lengths to carry his intentions out, at all times carefully concealing the fact.

The evil intention is not limited to terminals. He's not R/Sing on a terminal; he's R/Sing on the evil intention. The evil intention can associate with many terminals.

The R/S dominates the individual; it is the person. He has been overwhelmed by it. In that area he has no ability to reason; he has no freedom to choose. The evil intention is substituted for livingness. It is his safe solution to life, his service facsimile.

The service fac does not respond to ordinary auditing because in the course of ordinary auditing it does not get inspected. It, by its nature, forbids inspection. But when addressed at the right/wrong level the pc gives it up easily because in that area he has no power of choice.

MORE THAN ONE SERVICE FAC PER PC

We have had, for many years, service fac processing with which to handle these ob-sessions, and thus to handle the person who R/Ses.

But it is not just finding one service facsimile. You find many service facs which then add up to the big one. At Saint Hill in the mid-60s this was commonly associated with R/Ses.

It was what the pc had *done* with the service fac to make others wrong which was im-portant, not just finding it. Early on, the tech included auditing them out with Dianetics. And you found many, many more than one on each pc. We used to get complete character changes with this.

The full tech on this has been submerged over the past several years. It is probably this omission of requiring several service facs to be run and then auditing them out with Dianetics that has resulted in so many R/Sers going on up undetected.

As of this writing the full tech has been exhumed and we have now New Era Dianetics tech to help strip these packages down and take them apart at their basics.

So we not only have a more thorough means of handling service facs than ever before – we also have a more reliable route to the handling of an R/Ser.

But it's more than one service fac per pc.

You may audit off one, two or three apparent service facsimiles that all answer up to the complete description of a service fac. And they will run. But all are actually leaning on the central service fac that is in restimulation in PT. As you take these lesser service facs off the central one comes to view.

On the first ones you find, the most you can hope for is you found something that blew the TA down and moved you closer to finding the main service fac. So you take them.

If you've found a service fac the needle will be looser and the TA in reasonable range. And it will run on the right/wrong, etc. brackets and the pc will get off automaticities. When you've finally found several and walked it all the way through to *the* service fac it's as if all the other service facs you've been peeling off are like the bands of trees and sod that lie up against the mountain peak. So you take the service facsimiles and run them as you find them. You unburden the cliffs before you pull the mountain out by the roots.

As you're running out the first service facs you're reversing the dwindling spiral, you're restoring the individual's ability to handle his environment because he's now seeing it, he's now beginning to confront it.

And by the time you've pulled the main one – the mountain – out by its roots you've returned him to sanity. He is now able to inspect; he no longer needs a "safe solution."

It is the most dangerous thing in the world to have a safe solution, because that is the hole out of which sanity drains.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 22 APRIL 1980

Remimeo
Auditors
Surveyors
Examiners
Ethics Officers

ASSESSMENT DRILLS

Refs:	HCOB 6 Dec. 73	C/S Series 90	THE PRIMARY FAILURE
	HCOB 28 Feb. 71	C/S Series 24	METERING READING ITEMS
	HCOB 15 Oct. 73	C/S Series 87	NULLING AND F/Ning PREPARED LISTS
	HCOB 22 July 78		ASSESSMENT TRs
	Book:		The Book of E-Meter Drills

(Note: It is required that anyone doing the following drills shall have done a TR course, an Upper Indoc course and the drills of the E-Meter Drill Book.)

According to HCOB 6 Dec. 73, the make or break point of an auditor was his ability to get reads on a prepared list. This depended upon (a) his TR 1 and (b) his metering.

In 1978 this was further studied, and in HCOB 22 July 78, ASSESSMENT TRs, it was found that correct voice pitches had everything to do with assessment.

I have just developed drills which improve this ability to make lists read and to improve an auditor's auditing in general.

These drills will also be found to have great value to people who do surveys, to Examiners and to Ethics Officers.

E-METER

To begin, an auditor should review his E-Meter drills and practice E-Meter Drill 27 on page 52 of the Book of E-Meter Drills, E-Meter Drill CR0000-4 and, if found necessary, E-Meter Drill CR0000-3. It is called to attention that E-Meter Drill 5 of the Book of E-Meter Drills has been replaced with E-Meter Drill 5RA and if not done, should be done. This E-Meter Drill 5RA is the only change in the original book. Further, it applies to the Mark VI just as well as it applied to the Mark V for which the book was written - the controls and actions of the Mark V and Mark VI are practically identical, though the Mark VI moves up to higher level cases.

Being able to see and read and operate an E-Meter has everything to do with getting reads off a prepared list. Where an auditor misses it is simply that he has not adequately done the drills in the Book of E-Meter Drills and has not practiced up to a point of full, easy famili-

arity with the E-Meter. The point of being able to make lists read is pointless unless the auditor can set up, handle and read an E-Meter. But the skill is easily acquired.

ASSESSMENT TRAINING DRILLS

The following drills have the letter “Q” after them to mean that they are used for QUESTIONS. The Q is followed by a number to show that they are drilled in that sequence.

In these Q drills, the practice of twinning and any other TR tech normal to TRs is followed.

TR 1-Q1


NUMBER: TR 1-Q1

NAME: Pitch of the Question.

POSITION: Coach sitting at the keyboard of a piano or organ or any usable instrument, student standing beside instrument.

PURPOSE: To establish the pitch differences of statements and questions.

DATA:



TRAINING PROCEDURE: If the student is a girl, the coach asks her to say “Apple” as a statement. The coach then strikes the C above middle C (as given in the data above) and then the G above middle C. If the student is a man, the coach asks him to say “Apple” as a statement and then strikes middle C and then the F below middle C. This is repeated - saying “apple” and striking the two notes until the pitch of a statement can be duplicated by the student. In the event, the student has a voice pitch at variance with these notes, other notes can be found and used by the coach so long as the higher note is first and the second note is four or five whole notes below the first note. It must sound like a statement with the higher, then lower note.) Once the student has grasped this and can duplicate it, have the student use other two syllable words (or single syllable words preceded by an article), using these notes of the statement. Then, using these two notes, have the student make up sentences as statements, the bulk of the sentence said at the pitch of the higher note, but the end of the sentence at the

pitch of the lower note. Once the student has this down and can easily do it and it sounds natural and he is satisfied that it does, go on to the question step.

The coach has the student say “apple” as a question. Then the coach (for a male student) strikes the F below middle C and then middle C. For a woman the coach strikes the A above middle C and then the D an octave above middle C. (In case this does not agree with the voice pitch of the student, the coach must work it out providing only that the upper note is three or four whole notes above the lower note. It must sound natural and must sound like a question.) The coach has the student say “apple” as a question and then strikes the lower and higher note until the student can duplicate it. Now take other two syllable words (or single syllable words preceded by an article) and have the student say these as a question, following each one with the two instrument notes, lower to higher. When the student can do this, is satisfied that it sounds natural and doesn’t have to think about drolling it, go on to the next step. Here the student makes up banal questions. The first part of the question is said at the lower note and the last part is said at the higher note. At each question, the coach strikes the lower note and then the upper note. When this sounds natural and the student does not have to think to do it and is satisfied with it, the drill is ended.

END PHENOMENA: A person who can state statements and questions that sound like statements or questions.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard, April 1980, while doing the script for the soon to be produced training film “Tone 40 Assessment”.

TR 1-Q2

NUMBER: TR 1-Q2

NAME: Walkabout Questions.

POSITION: There is no coach. Two students separate and walk around their neighborhood and then meet and compare notes. The object is to detect personal *habits* in questioning.

PURPOSE: To enlighten the student as to his own communication habits and people’s reactions to his questions.

COMMANDS: The most common everyday social questions such as “How’s it going?” “Do you like the weather?”, etc. *appropriate* to the activities and circumstances of the person. Only one or two questions to a separate person. The questions must be banal, social and ordinary but they must be questions.

TRAINING STRESS: The two students agree on the areas they will cover next time they will meet again. They then go over individually, not together. The student pauses next to people encountered and asks a social question, *listens to his OWN voice tones* and notes the reaction of the person asked. In this drill the student does not necessarily try to use TR 1-Q1 but is just himself, speaking as he would normally speak. The students then meet and compare notes and discuss what they have discovered about themselves on the subject of asking questions. If they have not learned or observed anything, the drill must be repeated.

END PHENOMENA: A person who has detected any habits he has in handling pitch of voice in asking questions so that he can cure these in subsequent drills.

HISTORY: Recommended by L. Ron Hubbard in February 1978, in the pilot for HCOB 22 Jul 78 ASSESSMENT TRs. Developed into a TR in April 1980, by L. Ron Hubbard.

TR 1-Q3

NUMBER: TR 1-Q3

NAME: Single Word Question.

POSITION: Student and coach facing each other with a table in between them. The E-Meter is not used. The Book of E-Meter Drills used by student and another copy by coach.

PURPOSE: To be able to ask questions using a single word read from a list.

COMMANDS: The coach uses the usual TR directions of start, flunk, that's it. The student uses single words from the prepared lists of the Book of E-Meter Drills, pages 66 to 72 of the Appendix.

TRAINING STRESS: To get the student to use the pitch of his voice to deliver a question consisting of a single word. It must sound like a question per TR 1-Q1 and use similar pitch's to TR 1-Q1. The student is flunked for out TR-l, for keeping his eyes glued to the list, for sounding unnatural. The student is also flunked for slow or comm laggy delivery or pauses. The coach designates the list to be used, changes lists. When the student can do this easily, a second part of the drill is entered and the coach begins to use the PC Origination List on Page 58 so as to interrupt the student and make him combine his questions with TR 4. In this case the student acknowledges appropriately, uses "I will repeat the Question." and does so.

END PHENOMENA: The ability to ask single word questions that will be responded to as questions and to be able to handle pc origins while doing so.

HISTORY: Developed in April 1980, by L. Ron Hubbard.

TR 1-Q4

NUMBER: TR 1-Q4

NAME: Whole Sentence Questions.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other across a table. The E-Meter is set up and used. Copies of the Book of E-Meter Drills are used.

PURPOSE: To train the student to ask whole questions that sound like questions, read an E-Meter and handle a session at the same time.

COMMANDS: The usual coach commands of TR drills. The Prepared Lists of the Appendix of the Book of E-Meter Drills; the questions in these drills are reworded so that the item occurs as the last word; Example: List 2, pg. 65 or the Book of E-Meter Drills states that the

Assessment Question is “Which tree do you like best?”. This is converted, for each question, to “Do you like _____?”; Prepared List 4 is converted to “Do you dislike _____?”; etc. A whole sentence is used in every case.

TRAINING STRESS: The usual TR commands are used by the coach. E-Meter Drill #5RA must be used to start. Any TR errors or Metering errors may be flunked, but special attention is paid to the student’s ability to ask a question that sounds like a question in accordance to TR 1-Q1 and that sounds natural. The drill has three parts. In the first part, although the coach is on the meter, the ability to ask the question is concentrated upon. The second part concentrates upon the student’s ability to look at the written question and then ask the coach directly without undue comm lag or hesitation. The third part is to do the first two parts and read the meter (in accordance with E-Meter Drills 27 and CR0000-4 which may have to be reviewed if flubby) and to keep session admin, all smoothly and accurately. If a question arises about meter accuracy, a third person who can read a meter or a video tape is employed to ensure that the student is actually not missing or dubbing in reads.

END PHENOMENA: A person who can do all the necessary actions of asking questions from a prepared list and run a session smoothly without errors or confusion’s and be confident he can.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in April 1980.

TR 8-Q

NUMBER: TR 8-Q

NAME: TONE 40 ASSESSMENT

POSITION: Same as TR 8 where the student is in one chair facing another chair on which sits an ashtray, the coach sitting beside the student in a third chair. A square four-cornered ashtray is used.

PURPOSE: To deliver the THOUGHT of a question into an exact position, wide or narrow at decision, that is a question, with or without words.

COMMANDS: For the first part of the drill: Are you an ashtray? Are you made of glass? Are you sitting there? Second part of drill: same questions silently. Third part of drill: Are you a corner? to each corner of the ashtray, verbal and with intention at the same time. Fourth part of drill: Any applicable question, verbal and with intention at the same time put broad and narrow at choice into the ashtray, exact parts of it and the surroundings.

TRAINING STRESS: The coach uses usual TR coaching commands. There are four stages to the drill. The first stage is to land a verbal command into the ashtray. The second stage is to put the question with full intention silently into the ashtray. The third stage is to put verbal command and silent intention at the same time into exact parts of the ashtrays The fourth stage is to put any applicable question both verbally and with intention into any narrow or any broad portion of the ashtray or its surrounds at choice and at will. At the conclusion of the

whole drill imagine the ashtray saying “Yes, yes, yes, yes” in an avalanche of yeses to balance the flow (in actual life, people, pcs and meters do respond and return the flow).

END PHENOMENA: The ability to land a question with full intention into an exact target area, broad or narrow, at will and effectively, whether verbally or silently.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in April 1980, as an extension of all earlier work on intention and Tone 40, as now applied to questions and assessments.

TR 4/8-Q1

NUMBER: TR 4/8-Q1 (TR 4 for Pc Origin, TR 8 Intention + Q for Question, 1 for first part.)

NAME: Tone 40 Assessment Prepared List Session Drill.

POSITION: Student and coach sitting across from each other at a table, E-Meter set up and in use, session admin, using prepared lists.

PURPOSE: To train a student to do all the actions necessary to a full, smooth, accurate session using prepared lists and to do Tone 40 Assessment of them.

COMMANDS: Coach commands are the usual TR commands of start, flunk, that’s it. For the student, all commands relating to starting a session, giving an R factor, assessing a prepared list, keeping -the admin, indicating any item found and ending a session. The Book of E-Meter Drills for Prepared Lists as in TR 1-Q4. Origins for coach as per pages 58, 59 and 60 of that book. “Squeeze the cans”, “Take a deep breath and let it out”, “This is the session”, “We are going to assess a prepared list” (assessment), “Your item is _____“ (indicate any F/N) “End of Assessment” “End of Session”.

TRAINING STRESS: Permit the student to continue to his first error, then have him drill and correct that error and continue. Finally, to conclude, let the student go through the entire sequence of the drill beginning to end three times without error or flunk for a final pass. It is expected that the student will not flub any TRs or metering or session patter. metering may be finally verified by a third student or video. All assessing must be in proper tone 40 with full intention exactly placed. The student must not wait to see if the meter read but catch the read of the last question as he starts the next one. His vision may shift from list to pc but at all times must embrace list, meter and pc. (This drill also would be the one used for tape or video passes as it includes all elements of metering and TRs.)

END PHENOMENA: A person who can do a flawless and productive assessment session, Tone 40.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard, April 1980.

TR 4/8-Q2

NUMBER: TR 4/8-Q2

NAME: Listing and Nulling Tone 40 Assessment.

POSITION: Same as TR 4/8-Q1.

PURPOSE: To teach a student to do the action of Listing and Nulling with all metering and admin, using Tone 40 Assessment.

COMMANDS: The usual coach TR commands. Two copies of the Book of E-Meter Drills. A prepared list is chosen by the coach and both use the same prepared list. The student reads the question and asks it and the coach reads the replies from the same list but in his own copy. The student must write down the answers in a proper session worksheet and note and write down any reads. (An F/N terminates the listing if it occurs.) The coach need not use the whole list of replies but only half a dozen chosen at random. The sequence of commands is the same as TR 4/8-Q1 except that the R factor is "We are going to list a question." And, if no item F/Ns and no significant read has occurred, the additional action of nulling the list is undertaken with the command, "I will now assess the list."

TRAINING STRESS: The laws of Listing and Nulling HCOB 1 Aug 68 apply in full as these are very important laws and ignoring them can result in severe ARC breaks not so much in this drill but in actual sessions. The coach may also require suppress and invalidate buttons be put in on the whole list. All errors, omissions, hesitations and lapses from Tone 40 on the part of the student are flunked. Coach similarly to TR 4/8-Q1. Pass when the student can do it flawlessly three consecutive times. (This drill may be used for internship tapes and videos for assessing and metering passes.)

END PHENOMENA: A person able to do a flawless L & N list as the session or as part of a session, with all TRs in, with perfect metering and proper admin and using Tone 40 in his listing and assessing.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in April, 1980.

SUMMARY

The purpose of these drills is to train the student to ask questions that will get answers and to assess prepared lists that will get accurate reads. If a student drolling these drills has difficulty it will be traced to false data, misunderstood words or not having passed earlier TRs including Upper Indoc or his metering drills as contained in the Book of E-Meter Drills. If a satisfactory result is not obtained, the faults in the above items should be located and remedied and these drills repeated. If any earlier omissions are found and repaired and if these drills are honestly done, heightened success as an auditor (or a surveyor or examiner or ethics officer) is assured.

**L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER**

LRH:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 13 JUNE 1984R
REVISED 1 AUGUST 1990

Remimeo
False Purpose RD Auditors
and C/Ses
Cramming Officers

False Purpose Rundown Series 9R

FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN CORRECTION LIST

This list is used in repairing flubs or case upsets on persons receiving the False Purpose RD.

If after a session on the False Purpose Rundown the person red tags at the Examiner or if he gets sick or upset or falls on his head shortly after the auditing, this list should be assessed and handled to straighten the matter out. The repair action would be a 24-hour repair priority per policy.

If there is a bog during a False Purpose Rundown session, the auditor uses this list to sort the matter out and get the pc rolling again.

This list would normally be done *Method 3*, as the questions are written in a precise sequence: The initial questions cover those items which would have to be handled first, and the rest of the questions are laid out generally in the order of likelihood of what would be found to have caused the difficulty.

The list should be used with a prefix which acts as a time limiter, such as "In this session, ____?" or "On the False Purpose Rundown, ____?"

The majority of the questions on this list are handled by fully clearing a withhold or withholds that were left unhandled in a session. Once such a question is handled, it is rechecked—as per Sec Checking procedure—to ensure that there is no more to be gotten on that question.

1. **You went exterior?** _____
(Indicate it. If pc has never had an Int RD, give him a standard Int RD per Int RD Series 2. On a Clear or OT, do not run any Dianetics; do an End of Endless Int RD. If you are not a Class V Graduate Auditor, end off for a Class V Grad or above to handle.)
2. **List error?** _____
(Indicate. If Class III or above, find out what list, and repair with L4BRB. If not Class III, end off for handling by a Class III or above.)
3. **Wrong item?** _____
(Handle as in #2.)

4. **Did you have an ARC break?** _____
(ARCU, CDEINR, E/S to F/N.)
5. **Were you audited over a problem?** _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
6. **Was a withhold missed?** _____
(Pull it fully, and handle as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
7. **Did you tell part of a withhold but not the rest?** _____
(Get all of the withhold, and handle as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
8. **Did you misdirect the auditor?** _____
(Treat as a M/W/H. Find out what the overt was that the pc misdirected the auditor away from, and handle the overt as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
9. **Withheld saying something for fear of getting into ethics trouble?** _____
(Pull it fully, as per Sec Checking procedure, to find out what exactly the pc withheld. After getting the what, when, etc., also ask:
I. "What appeared there?"
II. "What didn't appear there?"
and then carry on with the False Purpose RD procedure steps —A, B and so on.)
10. **Did you withhold something because of what others might think?** _____
(Handle as in question #9.)
11. **Did you avoid telling one overt by giving a different one?** _____
(Treat as a M/W/H. Find out what the overt was that the pc avoided telling the auditor, and handle the overt as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
12. **Did the auditor fail to find out something about you?** _____
(Pull it fully and complete its handling as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
13. **Was there an earlier overt undisclosed?** _____
(Pull it, and complete its handling as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
14. **Was a chain of overts not taken back to basic?** _____
(Flatten the overt chain and complete its handling as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)

15. **Overt too late on the chain?** _____
(Get the earlier overt and complete its handling as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
16. **Was an earlier whole track overt on the chain missed?** _____
(Get the earlier overt and complete its handling as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
17. **Has an overt been justified?** _____
(Pull the justifications off the overt, then complete its handling as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
18. **Was there some other way you justified the overt?** _____
(Pull the justifications off the overt, then complete its handling as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
19. **Have you tried to lessen an overt?** _____
(Find out how he tried to lessen the overt. Then get all of the overt, pull all justifications and complete its handling with steps A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
20. **A chain or incident that was too incredible to be believed?** _____
(Get what the chain or incident was. Put in the buttons:
Suppressed, Invalidated, Protested, Anxious About, Rejected. It will probably blow and F/N. If it doesn't, handle per the appropriate step of the False Purpose RD procedure, depending on whether the incident was an overt or evil purpose or whatever.)
21. **Were you worried about reputation?** _____
(Clean it up 2WC E/S to F/N. Then check for an overt or overts before pc became worried about reputation, and handle with False Purpose RD procedure.)
22. **Jumped to a different overt chain?** _____
(Find out what overt was being pulled just before the pc jumped to some other overt chain, and complete that original overt chain as per A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure. Then take up the overt chain that the pc had jumped to, and handle that one similarly
23. **Went past basic on an overt chain?** _____
(Indicate it. Spot the flat point and indicate the overrun. Rehab if needed, to F/N. Continue with False Purpose RD procedure, step B.)
24. **Was there an evil purpose that did not fully blow?** _____
(Find the prior confusion and handle as per step C of False Purpose RD procedure. If still not blown, continue assessing this repair list.)

25. **On an evil purpose, was the prior confusion not found?** _____
(Find the prior confusion and handle as per step C of False Purpose RD procedure.)
26. **On an evil purpose, was the wrong prior confusion found?** _____
(Find the correct prior confusion and handle as per the False Purpose RD procedure, from step C onwards.)
27. **On an evil purpose, failed to get the exact prior confusion?** _____
(Find the exact prior confusion and handle as per the False Purpose RD procedure, from step C onwards.)
28. **Was there an earlier time when you had that same evil purpose?** _____
(Find the earlier time the pc had that same evil purpose, as per step D of False Purpose RD procedure, and if no spectacular release or persistent F/N, carry on with steps E, etc.)
29. **On an evil purpose, did not get the first moment of the first prior confusion?** _____
(Reorient to the earliest prior confusion found and get the first moment of that confusion. If no EP, continue as per step D of False Purpose RD procedure.)
30. **Has a service fac been missed?** _____
(2WC to F/N. If no spectacular blow on just getting off the service fac, and if you are a Class IV Auditor or above, run it out fully with the R3SC brackets. If you are not Class IV, end off for handling by a Class IV.)

(Note: R3SC is a major action and must not be run over out-ruds; the pc must be F/N and VGIs before embarking on the R3SC brackets. If in doubt, end off for a new C/S.)
31. **Is there some computation that you use to make others wrong?** _____
(2WC to F/N. If no spectacular blow on just getting off the service fac, and if you are a Class IV Auditor or above, run it out fully with the R3SC brackets. If you are not Class IV, end off for handling by a Class IV.)

(Note: R3SC is a major action and must not be run over out-ruds; the pc must be F/N and VGIs before embarking on the R3SC brackets. If in doubt, end off for a new C/S.)
32. **Prior to having the evil purpose was there a misunderstood word?** _____
(Get what the word was and clear it up to F/N. This may be what was holding the confusion in place and, on finding this, may result in a spectacular release and persistent F/N. If not, continue as per step D of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
33. **No prior confusion?** _____
(2WC to F/N. Depending on what comes up in reply to this question, the auditor would continue with the evil purpose chain being addressed or, in the case of a spectacular release and persistent F/N, would end off for that session.)

34. **Undisclosed out-ethics situation?** _____
(Pull it as an overt and carry on from there as per the False Purpose RD procedure, steps A, B and so on.)
35. **Has a crime been covered up?** _____
(Pull the crime and carry on from there as per the False Purpose RD procedure, steps A, B and so on.)
36. **Did you withhold telling the auditor what the evil purpose was?** _____
(Get what the evil purpose is, and continue on as per step C of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
37. **Have you been giving false reports or pr to cover up a crime?** _____
(Get what the false reports or PR were, then get the crime that was being covered up. Treat the crime as per the False Purpose RD procedure, steps A, B, etc.)
38. **Did the auditor try to run out a good intention?** _____
(Indicate the BPC and that this was incorrect and should not have been done. If no relief, 2WC E/S "times when an auditor tried to run out a good intention" to F/N.)
39. **Not your evil purpose?** _____
(If so, indicate to the pc this was not his item. Don't try to find whose it was.)
40. **Was there some evil purpose you didn't dare mention?** _____
(Get what the evil purpose is, and continue on as per step C of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
41. **Have you been involved in a black PR campaign?** _____
(Pull as a withhold, finding out the specific black PR he has spread, about whom and to whom, and handle this as an overt as per the False Purpose RD procedure, steps A, B, etc. Then, get the prior overt the pc committed and handle with steps A to G. Then check for and handle any other such overt. When these have been handled, re-check the original question, #41.)
(Note for C/S to program the case for additional FPRD actions as needed.)
42. **Was a postulate missed?** _____
(Get what the postulate was. It may be a false purpose or evil purpose, in which case carry on as per step C of the False Purpose RD procedure. Do not try to run out a good [pro-survival] intention or postulate.)
43. **Had the evil purpose already blown?** _____
(Rehab.)

44. **Was it not an evil purpose but some other sort of non-survival consideration?** _____
(Get what it is. Then do steps C to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
45. **Was there a crashing misunderstood word?** _____
(Find and handle the Mis-U word as per HCOB 17 JUNE 79, CRASHING MIS-US: THE KEY TO COMPLETED CYCLES OF ACTION AND PRODUCTS.)
46. **Was an F/N overrun?** _____
(Rehab.)
47. **Was an F/N missed?** _____
(Find out on what and rehab.)
48. **Was an implant restimulated?** _____
(Indicate. The pc may BD and F/N with relief and VGIs. If not get the pc to recall moments before the implant, until it blows. If still no blow, date/locate it.)
49. **Did you fail to answer a confessional question?** _____
(Find out which question and handle with the False Purpose RD procedure, starting with step A.)
50. **Is there more that should be known about some overt?** _____
(Get all of it, using Sec Checking tech, and then carry on with the False Purpose RD procedure, steps A, B, etc.)
51. **Was there a question that the auditor said didn't read that should have?** _____
(Find out what question and get in Suppress and Inval on it. Then handle it fully with the False Purpose RD procedure.)
52. **Was a question or item taken up that wasn't charged?** _____
(Get what, indicate it was a false read. Itsa E/S to F/N.)
53. **Was a hot question not taken up?** _____
(Find out what question and get in Suppress and Inval on it. Then handle it fully with the False Purpose RD procedure.)
54. **Did you tell a lie?** _____
(Pull this as per Sec Checking tech, including getting what overt he was covering up with the lie—with all specifics—and handle it using the False Purpose RD procedure, steps A, B, etc.)

55. **Was a question left unflat?** _____
(Find out which one and flatten it with the appropriate step of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
56. **Had you told all?** _____
(Indicate it if so. 2WC E/S to F/N.)
57. **Has an overt been protested?** _____
(Get what it was and get in the Protest button on it. Then handle it fully with False Purpose RD procedure.)
58. **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.)
59. **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.)
60. **Has something been misunderstood?** _____
(Clean it up, clearing any Mis-U words, each to F/N.)
61. **Was anything protested?** _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
62. **Missed withhold of nothing?** _____
(Indicate it, and 2WC E/S to F/N.)
63. **Wrong date?** _____
(Correct the date to a blow, as per the HCOBs on Dating/ Locating.)
64. **Wrong location?** _____
(Correct the location to a blow, as per the HCOBs on Dating/ Locating.)
65. **Earlier incident missed?** _____
(Get the earlier incident and complete handling from the appropriate step of False Purpose RD procedure.)
66. **Are there opinions you don't dare say?** _____
(Get what. 2WC E/S to F/N. Then check for an overt or overts before the pc felt he couldn't state his opinions. Handle with False Purpose RD procedure.)
67. **Were you waiting for a differently worded overt or withhold question?** _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Then pull any overt chain that was missed and handle with False Purpose RD procedure, steps A, B, etc.)

68. **Are you withholding anything?** _____
(Get what it is and handle with False Purpose RD procedure.)
69. **Did you tell any half-truths?** _____
(Get all of the withhold and handle with False Purpose RD procedure.)
70. **Was there something the auditor should have known about you that he didn't?** _____
(Pull it and handle with False Purpose RD procedure.)
71. **Prior to committing the overt was there an evil purpose or destructive intention?** _____
(Get what the evil purpose is, and continue on as per step C of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
72. **Do you have a harmful intention toward others?** _____
(Pull the harmful intention and continue on as per step C of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
73. **Is there some purpose or consideration you have that conflicts with scientology?** _____
(Get what the evil purpose is, and continue on as per step C of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
74. **Was some hidden impulse not revealed?** _____
(Get what it is and continue its handling as per step C of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
75. **Did you pr an ethics officer into believing a situation was handled when it wasn't?** _____
(Handle as a withhold and continue with step A of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
76. **Do you intend to go on committing overt s similar to those you've gotten off?** _____
(Handle as a withhold and continue with step A of the False Purpose RD procedure.)
77. **Were you pretending to be pts to avoid taking responsibility for some overt or intention?** _____
(Handle as a withhold and continue handling the overt or intention with the False Purpose RD procedure.)

78. **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 was being run and complete its handling to F/N. If this turns out to be an unflat overt chain, flatten it fully with the False Purpose RD procedure.)
79. **Did you have to get the same W/Hs off more than once?** _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
80. **Someone demanded a w/h you didn't have?** _____
(Indicate if so. 2WC E/S to F/N.)
81. **Was there a withhold that kept coming up?** _____
(Get what it was and then clean up anything that wasn't gotten off about the withhold, any unhandled misses of that withhold, and if not then fully handled, take it E/S and find and handle the underlying, unhandled incident as per False Purpose RD. [REF: HCOB 21 MAR. 62, PREPCHECKING DATA, WHEN TO DO A WHAT; TAPE: 6201C11, THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD])
82. **Were there auditor's code breaks?** _____
(Get what. Indicate it was illegal and 2WC E/S to F/N. C/S to program for a QUESTIONABLE AUDITING REPAIR LIST, HCOB 11 JULY 8 2 I.)
83. **Have you wanted this rundown to fail?** _____
(Handle as a W/H. Pull all of the W/H, and then take the O/W E/S to a full handling as per steps A to G of the False Purpose RD.)
84. **Were you afraid of what might happen?** _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
85. **Was there an injustice?** _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Then check for any similar overt of the pc's own and handle any found with False Purpose RD procedure.)
86. **Was there a betrayal?** _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Then check for any similar overt of the pc's own and handle any found with False Purpose RD procedure.)
87. **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.)
(C/S to program for a QUESTIONABLE AUDITING REPAIR LIST, HCOB 11 JULY 82 I.)
88. **Was anything suppressed?** _____
(Clean it up E/S to F/N.)

89. Was anything invalidated? _____
(Clean it up E/S to F/N.)

90. Have you never really done anything bad? _____
(Handle with "murder routine," getting an overt or overts and handling with steps A to G of the False Purpose RD procedure.)

91. Was anything falsified? _____
(Clean it up as a W/H and complete its handling with False Purpose RD procedure.)

92. Was there any evaluation? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)

93. Were you tired or hungry? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)

94. Had you recently taken drugs? _____
Medicine? _____
Alcohol? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Note for C/S.)

95. 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.)

96. Was there a false accusation? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)

97. Was there something wrong with the meter or cans? _____
(False TA handling.)

98. Bypassed charge from some other auditing error? _____
(Find out what auditing action and handle with the appropriate repair list.)

99. Drug incident restimulated? _____
(Handle with L3RH. On a Clear or above, only indicate the reads.)
(Note for C/S.)

100. Was there an overt on some other dynamic? _____
(Pull the overt and handle as per steps A, B, C, etc., of False Purpose RD procedure.)
(Note for C/S to program the case for any additional Sec Check forms needed, to be done after the current form has been completed.)

101. Was there an overt on some other subject or area of life? _____

(Pull the overt and handle as per steps A, B, C, etc., of False Purpose RD procedure.)

(Note for C/S to program the case for any additional Sec Check forms needed, to be done after the current form has been completed.)

102. In this lifetime, have you been implanted by a psychiatrist or priest? _____

(Applying the tools of Sec Checking tech, find out all of the data of the incident, including: name of implanter; the time, place, form and event of the incident; any commands that were given to pc and to what degree the pc has carried out or executed these commands and suggestions.)

(Note for C/S for further PDH follow-up actions.)

103. In this lifetime, have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis? _____

(Applying the tools of Sec Checking tech, find out all of the data of the incident, including: name of implanter; the time, place, form and event of the incident; any commands that were given to pc and to what degree the pc has carried out or executed these commands and suggestions.)

(Note for C/S for further PDH follow-up actions to be programed.)

104. In this lifetime, have you ever been drugged and then electric shocked without knowing it? _____

(Handle as in question #103.)

105. In this lifetime, have you ever had a strange, destructive impulse you couldn't account for? _____

(Handle as in question #103.)

106. In this lifetime, was there a time when you saw a psychiatrist but afterward could not remember everything that had taken place? _____

(Handle as in question #103.)

107. When asked for an overt or earlier-similar overt, could you only see blackness? _____

(Have the pc close his eyes and then do the following:

I. Date/Locate the overt—whatever the pc can see of it—as exactly as you can. This may blow it and result in a persistent F/N. Or it may just change the view slightly.

II. If no persistent F/N, run this command repetitive to EP:

"What part of that scene you're looking at could you be responsible for?" continuing to repeat the question no matter how many times the pc repeats the same answer and even if the pc gives you the most strained or vague answers. Run the process to F/N, cognition, VGIs.

III. If no spectacular release and persistent F/N, Sec Check the overt as per step A of the rundown and continue with steps B, C, etc.)

108. **Was there something else wrong?** _____

(If so and it doesn't clean up on 2WC, GF M5 and handle.)

109. **Has the upset been handled?** _____

(2WC. If so, indicate it to F/N.)

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Revision assisted by LRH Technical
Research and Compilations

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 14 JUNE 1984

Remimeo
C/Ses
False Purpose RD
Auditors and C/Ses
Tech
Qual
MAA/EOs

False Purpose Rundown Series 10-A

FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN BASIC FORM

(Ref: HCOB 5 Jun 84 False Purpose Rundown Series 1, FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN
HCOB 9 Jun 84 False Purpose Rundown Series 5, AUDITING THE FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN
HCOB 1 Mar 77 III FORMULATING CONFESSONAL QUESTIONS
HCOB 1 Mar 77 II CONFESSONAL FORMS)

Here is the basic form employed on the False Purpose Rundown. It is written for use on any pc or PreOT beginning the rundown.

This list may have questions added to it by the C/S, but questions are not deleted from it in any case. Other False Purpose RD forms may also be used in the course of the rundown, but this list is given as the basic list to be used for any pc beginning the rundown.

AUDITOR INSTRUCTIONS

The auditor does the whole form on the pc, starting with the Section I questions and proceeding on through to the end of the Section II questions. Every question is cleared and checked on the meter per standard sec checking tech.

Reading questions on this list are handled with False Purpose Rundown procedure. The form itself is composed of two sections of questions.

Questions in Section I of this form ask for overts, which are handled with steps A through G of the False Purpose Rundown procedure.

Questions in Section II ask directly for evil purposes and destructive intentions, and are handled using steps C through G of False Purpose Rundown procedure.

SECTION I QUESTIONS:

1. **Do you have a back-off in handling some area of your life?** _____
(Find which area he has a back off on handling, get when it started and then pull the prior overt. Handle that overt per steps A to G of False Purpose RD procedure. Then re-check the original Question, #1.)
2. **Is there some overt act you've had to restrain yourself from committing?** _____
3. **Is there something you have done you have successfully withheld in auditing or sec checking?** _____
4. **Do you have a secret overt?** _____
5. **Do you have a back-off on handling some person?** _____
(Find out which person he has a back off on handling, get when it started and then pull the prior overt. Handle that overt per steps A to G of False Purpose RD procedure. Then re-check the original question, #5.)
6. **Have you done something that you could get into serious trouble for?** _____
7. **Have you been reasonable with persons you should have handled?** _____
(Find out what person(s) he has been reasonable with in handling, get when it started and then pull the prior overt. Handle that overt per steps A to G of False Purpose RD procedure. Then re-check the original question, #7.)
8. **Do you have some withhold you haven't wanted to discuss?** _____
9. **Have you ever betrayed a friend?** _____
10. **Have you committed an overt against yourself?** _____
11. **Have you done anything that was harmful to your own body?** _____
12. **Is there something you regret having done to someone?** _____
13. **Have you ever been sexually unfaithful?** _____
14. **Have you ever deliberately hurt someone you loved?** _____
15. **Have you ever compromised your integrity?** _____
16. **Have you ever used drugs or alcohol to trap someone?** _____
17. **Have you ever ill-treated children?** _____
18. **Have you committed any overts against your family?** _____
19. **Have you ever done something harmful to another's mind?** _____

- 20. Have you deliberately quickied any product or important cycle on your job? _____
- 21. Have you done a brush-off job of something? _____
- 22. Have you knowingly gone by Mis'Us on your job? _____
- 23. Is there something you have done you think might get you removed from your job or group, if it were known? _____
- 24. Have you ever consistently made a practice of sexual perversion? _____
- 25. Have you cheated someone who trusted you? _____
- 26. Have you done something to make your group or organization lose? _____
- 27. Have you ever caved someone in? _____
- 28. Have you misrepresented your knowledge or skill? _____
- 29. Have you ever participated in electric shocking or implanting someone? _____
- 30. Have you ever deliberately injured someone? _____
- 31. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology? _____
- 32. Have you committed an overt on a Scientology organization? _____
- 33. Is there an overt that you have covered up with false PR?
(The act of false PRing should be gotten off, but then pull the actual overt that was being covered up, E/S to F/N.) _____
- 34. Have you altered LRH tech? _____
- 35. Is there some other overt you have committed that would be awful to have to get off? _____
- 36. Have you ever caved yourself in? _____

SECTION II QUESTIONS

- 37. Do you have a secret desire to see someone fail? _____
- 38. Have you ever had an impulse to commit suicide? _____
- 39. Have you had some purpose which is in opposition to the purpose of Scientology? _____
- 40. Do you have some secret purpose? _____
- 41. Do you intend to harm Scientology dissemination? _____
- 42. Have you had a hidden evil purpose on some other dynamic? _____
- 43. Have you had a feeling of wanting to get even for something? _____

44. Have you ever had a vicious, cruel intention towards someone? _____

45. Is there some out-ethics impulse that you have failed to restrain? _____

(Pull the overt.)

END RUDS:

(Session withholds are handled with usual withhold rudiment procedure.

Undisclosed overts missed in doing the questions on the list are handled with steps A – G of False Purpose RD procedure.)

1. In this confessional, have you told a half-truth? _____

2. In this confessional, have you told an untruth? _____

3. In this confessional, have you said something only to impress me? _____

4. In this confessional, have you tried to damage someone? _____

5. In this confessional, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-meter? _____

6. In this confessional, have you successfully withheld something? _____

7. In this confessional, have you covered up for someone else? _____

8. In this confessional, has anything been falsified? _____

9. In this confessional, has anything been asserted? _____

10. In this confessional, has anything been suppressed? _____

11. In this confessional, has anything been invalidated? _____

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:rw:iw