

*The*  
**Technical Bulletins**  
*of*  
**Dianetics and Scientology**

*by*  
**L. Ron Hubbard**

FOUNDER OF DIANETICS AND SCIENTOLOGY


**Volume**  
**V**  
**1962-1964**

---

*I will not always be here on guard.  
The stars twinkle in the Milky Way  
And the wind sighs for songs  
Across the empty fields of a planet  
A Galaxy away.*

*You won't always be here.  
But before you go,  
Whisper this to your sons  
And their sons —  
“The work was free.  
Keep it so. “*

**L. RON HUBBARD**



**L. Ron Hubbard**  
*Founder of Dianetics and Scientology*

## EDITORS' NOTE

“A chronological study of materials is necessary for the complete training of a truly top grade expert in these lines. He can see how the subject progressed and so is able to see which are the highest levels of development. Not the least advantage in this is the defining of words and terms for each, when originally used, was defined, in most cases, with considerable exactitude, and one is not left with any misunderstandings.”

—L. Ron Hubbard

The first eight volumes of the *Technical Bulletins of Dianetics and Scientology* contain, exclusively, issues written by L. Ron Hubbard, thus providing a chronological time track of the development of Dianetics and Scientology. Volume IX, The Auditing Series, and Volume X, The Case Supervisor Series, contain Board Technical Bulletins that are part of the series. They are LRH data even though compiled or written by another.

So that the time track of the subject may be studied in its entirety, all HCO Bs have been included, excluding only those upper level materials which will be found on courses to which they apply. If an issue has been revised, replaced, or cancelled, this has been indicated in the upper right-hand corner along with the page number of the issue which should be referred to.

The points at which Ron gave tape recorded lectures have been indicated as they occurred. Where they were given as part of an event or course, information is given on that event or course on the page in the chronological volumes which corresponds to the date. The symbol “\*\*\*” preceding a tape title means that copies are available from both Publications Organizations. A tape preceded by “\*” means that it will soon be available. No asterisk (\*) means that neither Publications Organization nor Flag has a master copy of that lecture. If you have, or know anyone who has, copies of *these* tapes, please contact the Flag Audio Chief, P.O. Box 23751, Tampa, Florida, 33623, U.S.A. The number in the tape title is a code for the date; example: 5505C07—55 = year, 1955; 05 = month, May; C = copy; 07 = day, 7th; 7 May 1955. The abbreviation tells what group the tape is a part of. For an explanation of the abbreviations see Volume X, page 539.

At the back of this volume is a Subject Index covering only the material in this volume. Use the index to locate the LRH source material in context, don't just get data from the index. This index has been combined with indexes from other volumes to form the Cumulative Index which is in Volume X, starting on page 287.

# TECHNICAL BULLETINS

## 1962-1964

### CONTENTS

#### 1962

6	Jan.	Laudatory Withholds (HCO PL)	
9	Jan.	3D Criss Cross (HCO Info. Ltr.)	4
11	Jan.	Security Checking—Twenty-Ten Theory	6
17	Jan.	Responsibility Again (HCO PL) (reissued 7 June 1967)	8
22	Jan.	3D Criss Cross—Method of Assessment (HCO Info. Ltr.)	10
22	Jan.	Crash Programme (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—26</i>
25	Jan.	Flow Process	14
	Feb.	Flows, Basic	16
	Feb.	3D Criss Cross—Assessment Tips (HCO Info. Ltr.)	17
3	Feb.	3DXX Flows Assessment (HCO Info. Ltr.)	19
8	Feb.	Missed Withholds	20
12	Feb.	How to Clear Withholds and Missed Withholds	23
13	Feb.	3D Criss Cross Items (HCO PL)	25
15	Feb.	Co-Audit & Missed Withholds	25
22	Feb.	Withholds, Missed and Partial	26
27	Feb.	Clean Hands Clearance Check (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 5—358</i>
1	Mar.	Prepchecking	28
8	Mar.	The Bad “Auditor”	32
15	Mar.	Suppressors	36
21	Mar.	Prepchecking Data—When to Do a What	39
29	Mar.	CCHs Again—When to Use the CCHs	43
5	Apr.	CCHs—Auditing Attitude	45
11	Apr.	Determining What to Run	48
12	Apr.	CCHs—Purpose	50
26	Apr.	Recommended Processes HGC	51
29	Apr.	Routine 3G (Experimental) (HCO Info. Ltr.)	53
3	May	ARC Breaks—Missed Withholds	58
10	May	Prepchecking and Sec Checking	62
10	May	Routine 3GA (Experimental) (HCO Info. Ltr.)	64
14	May	Case Repair	67
21	May	Missed Withholds, Asking About	71
21	May	Training—Classes of Auditors (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—315</i>
22	May	Model Session Change	72
23	May	E-Meter Reads—Prepchecking—How Meters Get Invalidated	73

## 1962 (cont.)

24	May	Training—Session Cancellation—Auditing Section (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—318</i>
24	May	Q and A	74
25	May	E-Meter Instant Reads	77
26	May	Training Drills Must Be Correct (HCO PL)	79
	June	Auditing—Rudiments Check Sheet (HCO PL)	81
8	June	Rudiments Checking	82
11	June	Prepchecking the Middle Rudiments	83
14	June	Checking Needle in Rudiments Checks	84
23	June	Model Session Revised ( <i>canceled—see 398</i> )	85
24	June	Prepchecking	88
25	June	E-Meter Standards	91
27	June	Rundown on Routine 3GA	92
28	June	Dirty Needles—How to Smooth Out Needles	93
30	June	ARC Process	95
ca.	June	How to Study Scientology (Ability 139)	<i>see footnote Vol. III—426</i>
2	July	Repetitive Rudiments—How to Get the Rudiments In	96
3	July	Repetitive Prepchecking	98
4	July	Bulletin Changes	101
4	July	Coachless Training—Use of a Doll	103
14	July	Auditing Allowed (HCO PL)	104
15	July	Goals Prepcheck Form—Routine 3GA (HCO PL)	106
17	July	Routine 3GA—HCO WW R-3GA Form 1—Listing Prepcheck (HCO PL)	109
19	July	Clearing—Free Needles (HCO PL)	112
21	July	Instant Reads	113
21	July	Rudiments, Repetitive or Fast	<i>see footnote—113</i>
22	July	Routine 3GA—Listing Wording (HCO PL)	114
24	July	R3GA—HCO WW Form G3—Fast Goals Check (HCO PL) (revised—see 165)	115
30	July	A Smooth HGC 25 Hour Intensive	116
	Aug.	Routine 3GA—Goals—Nulling by Mid Ruds	118
	Aug.	Routine 3GA—Nulling Drills for Nulling by Mid Ruds ( <i>replaced—see 196</i> )	122
2	Aug.	CCH Answers	126
7	Aug.	Running CCHs	127
10	Aug.	How It Feels to Go Clear	128
13	Aug.	Rock Slams and Dirty Needles	129
13	Aug.	Clearing (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—553</i>
21	Aug.	3GA—Line Wording	130
22	Aug.	3GA—Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam—Dynamic Assessment Tip ( <i>canceled—see footnote on 132</i> )	131

## 1962 (cont.)

23	Aug.	3GA—Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam	<i>see footnote—132</i>
30	Aug.	Order of Prepcheck Buttons	133
31	Aug.	3GA—Expanded Line Wording	134
31	Aug.	3GA—Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam	135
	Sept.	3GA—Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam	135
	Sept.	<i>Clearing Success Congress Lectures (1 Sept.—3 Sept.)</i>	136
2	Sept.	Account of Congress Goal	137
3	Sept.	3GA—Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam	138
8	Sept.	3GA—To Be Goals Line Listing	139
12	Sept.	Security Checks Again	140
12	Sept.	Authorized Processes (HCO PL)	141
17	Sept.	An Arrangement of the Academy (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—327</i>
19	Sept.	3GA—Tips on Dynamic Assessment—Rules of Thumb	142
23	Sept.	A 40-Line List on a Doingness Goal	143
27	Sept.	Valid Processes (HCO PL)	145
27	Sept.	Problems Intensive Use	146
	Oct.	3GA—Listing by Tiger Buttons—114 New Lines for Listing	147
2	Oct.	When You Need Reassurance	149
3	Oct.	Tiger Drilling	150
8	Oct.	HGC Clearing (HCO PL)	152
13	Oct.	Processes	156
15	Oct.	Goal Finder's Model Session ( <i>canceled—see 243</i> )	157
16	Oct.	Routine 3GA—Listing	159
17	Oct.	Auditor Failure to Understand	161
18	Oct.	3GA—Listing by Prehav	163
19	Oct.	R3GA—HCO WW Form G3, Revised—Fast Goals Check (HCO PL)	165
29	Oct.	Pre-Clearing Intensive	166
7	Nov.	Wrong Goals, Importance of Repair of	167
7	Nov.	Routine 3-21—The Twenty-One Steps—Finding Goals	170
7	Nov.	“Roll Your Own” Prehav	173
8	Nov.	Somatics—How to Tell Terminals and Opposition Terminals	175
11	Nov.	3GAXX—Straightening up 3GAXX Cases	179
12	Nov.	3GAXX—Dirty Needles and Incomplete Lists—How to Assess	180
17	Nov.	Routine 3-21	182
23	Nov.	Routine Two-Twelve—Opening Procedure by Rock Slam —An HPA/HCA Skill	185
24	Nov.	Routine 2-12—List One—Issue One—The Scientology List	191
28	Nov.	R2-12—Practical Drills	193
29	Nov.	Routine 2-12—List One—Issue Two—The Scientology List	195
29	Nov.	Routines 2-12, 3-21 and 3GAXX—Tiger Drill for Nulling by Mid Ruds	196

## 1962 (cont.)

	Dec.	Goals & Prepchecking (HCO PL)	201
	Dec.	V Unit—New Students—Saint Hill Special Briefing Course (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—421</i>
2	Dec.	Instructors' Stable Data (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—161</i>
4	Dec.	Routine 2-12—List One—Issue Three—The Scientology List	202
5	Dec.	2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21 and Routine 2-10—Modern Assessment	203
6	Dec.	R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX—Data, The Zero A Steps and Purpose of Processes	210
8	Dec.	Training—Saint Hill Special Briefing Course—Summary of Subjects by Units (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—423</i>
8	Dec.	Training—X Unit	214
8	Dec.	Corrections—HCO Bulletin of December 5, AD12	<i>see footnote—209</i>
9	Dec.	Routine 2-12—List One—Add to List One Issue Three	215
15	Dec.	R2-12—The Fatal Error	216
17	Dec.	Correction to HCO Bulletin of December 5, 1962	<i>see footnote—209</i>
30	Dec.	Routines 2-12 & 2-10—Case Errors—Points of Greatest Importance	217

## 1963

	Jan.	Academy Curriculum—How to Teach Auditing and Routine 2	227
3	Jan.	Routine 2—Opposition Lists—Right and Wrong Oppose	230
15	Jan.	Routine 2-12 (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—563</i>
27	Jan.	Routine 2—Simplified	233
8	Feb.	Curriculum Change (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—424</i>
11	Feb.	Current Auditing	239
12	Feb.	Routines 2-12, 3-21 and 3GAXX—Tiger Drill for Nulling by Mid Ruds (Franchise reissue)	196
13	Feb.	V Unit (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—427</i>
13	Feb.	Academy Taught Processes (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—339</i>
15	Feb.	R2—R3—Listing Rules	241
20	Feb.	Routine 2 & 3 Model Session ( <i>canceled—see 278</i> )	243
21	Feb.	Goals Check (HCO PL)	246
4	Mar.	Routine 2-10, 2-12, 2-12A	247
8	Mar.	Use of the Big Middle Rudiments	248
10	Mar.	Routine 2-10, 2-12, 2-12A—Vanished RS or RR	249
14	Mar.	Routine 2—Routine 3—ARC Breaks, Handling of	251
18	Mar.	R2—R3—Important Data—Don't Force the Pc	255
23	Mar.	Classification of Auditors—Class II & Goals (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—340</i>
23	Mar.	Clear & OT	260
13	Apr.	Routine 2-G—Original Routine 2, 3GA, 2-10, 2-12, 2-1 2A and Others Specially Adapted—Goals Finding—Designation of Routines	262
25	Apr.	Meter Reading TRs	264



## 1963 (cont.)

29	Apr.	Modernized Training Drills Using Permissive Coaching ( <i>canceled—see Vol. VII, 8</i> )	266
15	May	The Time Track and Engram Running by Chains—Bulletin 1	273
21	May	Routine 3—R-3 Model Session ( <i>canceled—see 381</i> )	278
27	May	Cause of ARC Breaks	281
8	June	The Time Track and Engram Running by Chains—Bulletin 2 —Handling the Time Track	287
10	June	Scientology Training—Technical Studies (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—342</i>
24	June	Routine 3—Engram Running by Chains—Bulletin 3 —Routine 3-R—Engram Running by Chains	292
25	June	Routine 2H—ARC Breaks by Assessment	297
	July	Routine 3R—Bulletin 4—Preliminary Step	299
5	July	ARC Break Assessments	306
5	July	CCHs Rewritten ( <i>replaced—see Vol. VI, 118</i> )	310
9	July	A Technical Summary—The Required Skills of Processing and Why	314
11	July	Auditing Rundown—Missed Withholds—To Be Run in XI Unit	318
21	July	Co-Audit ARC Break Process	319
22	July	You Can Be Right	321
22	July	Org Technical—HGC Processes and Training	324
23	July	Auditing Rundown—Missed Withholds—To Be Run in XI Unit	328
25	July	Diagrams for LRH Lecture to the SHSBC on 25 July 1963	<i>see—339</i>
28	July	Time and the Tone Arm	329
29	July	Scientology Review	332
30	July	Current Planning (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—344</i>
2	Aug.	Public Project One (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 2— 93</i>
4	Aug.	E-Meter Errors—Communication Cycle Error	334
7	Aug.	Diagrams for LRH Lecture to the SHSBC on 7 Aug. 1963	<i>see—339</i>
8	Aug.	Diagrams for LRH Lecture to the SHSBC on 8 Aug. 1963	<i>see—339</i>
9	Aug.	Definition of Release	338
11	Aug.	ARC Break Assessments	338
14	Aug.	Lecture Graphs	339
19	Aug.	How to Do an ARC Break Assessment	345
20	Aug.	R3R—R3N—The Preclear's Postulates	349
21	Aug.	Change of Organization Targets—Project 80 (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 2— 95</i>
22	Aug.	Project 80—The Itsa Line and Tone Arm	351
	Sept.	Routine Three SC	353
6	Sept.	Instructing in Scientology Auditing—Instructor's Task —D of P's Case Handling	357
9	Sept.	Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking	361
22	Sept.	Prepcheck <i>Buttons</i> ( <i>canceled—see 446</i> )	363
23	Sept.	Tape Coverage of New Technology	365

## 1963 (cont.)

25	Sept.	Adequate Tone Arm Action	367
	Oct.	Assists in Scientology (Ability 154)	<i>see footnote Vol. III—264</i>
	Oct.	How to Get Tone Arm Action	369
2	Oct.	GPMs—Experimental Process Withdrawn	376
8	Oct.	How to Get TA—Analysing Auditing	377
16	Oct.	R3SC Slow Assessment	379
19	Nov.	Routine 3—R-3 Model Session Revised ( <i>canceled—see 420</i> )	381
25	Nov.	Dirty Needles	384
26	Nov.	Certificate and Classification Changes—Everyone Classified (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—360</i>
26	Nov.	A New Triangle—Basic Auditing, Technique, Case Analysis	385
14	Dec.	Case Analysis—Health Research	388
28	Dec.	Indicators—Part One: Good Indicators	390
30	Dec.	<i>Saint Hill Staff Course Lectures (30 Dec.—1 June 1964)</i>	393

## 1964

21	Jan.	Meter Level Warning—How to Kill a Pc in Level 5	394
24	Jan.	Case Supervisor (HCO PL—excerpt)	395
	Mar.	Meter Reads, Size of	396
4	Mar.	Class II Model Session ( <i>canceled—see 428</i> )	398
15	Mar.	Overwhelming the Pc	400
15	Mar.	Meter—Everything Reading	402
18	Mar.	HGC Allowed Processes (HCO PL)	406
2	Apr.	Two Types of People (HCO Info. Ltr.)	407
7	Apr.	Q and A	410
10	Apr.	Auditing Skills	411
13	Apr.	Tone Arm Action	413
20	Apr.	Model Session—Levels III to VI ( <i>canceled—see 448</i> )	420
23	Apr.	Auditing by Lists ( <i>replaced—see Vol. VII, 316</i> )	423
	May	The Workability of Scientology ( <i>The Auditor 1</i> )	425
5	May	Summary of Classification and Gradation and Certification (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—373</i>
19	May	Class II Model Session ( <i>canceled—see Vol. VI, 44</i> )	428
27	May	Auditing Assignments	431
29	June	Central Org and Field Auditor Targets	432
30	June	Field Auditor Targets	<i>see footnote—435</i>
7	July	Justifications	436
8	July	More Justifications	437
10	July	Overts—Order of Effectiveness in Processing	438
12	July	More on O/Ws	441

## 1964 (cont.)

24	July	TA Counters, Use of	443
29	July	Good Indicators at Lower Levels	445
14	Aug.	Prepcheck Buttons	446
14	Aug.	Model Session—Levels III to VI ( <i>canceled—see Vol. VI, 60</i> )	448
17	Aug.	Clay Table Work in Training and Processing	451
18	Aug.	Clay Table Work Covering Clay Table Clearing in Detail	456
23	Aug.	HQS Course	461
24	Aug.	Session Must-Nots	463
7	Sept.	Clay Table Levels	466
7	Sept.	PTPs, Overts and ARC Breaks	468
8	Sept.	Overts, What Lies Behind Them?	471
9	Sept.	Clay Table Healing	472
9	Sept.	Clay Table Clearing	475
12	Sept.	Clay Table, More Goofs	476
24	Sept.	Instruction & Examination: Raising the Standard of (HCO PL)	478
27	Sept.	Clay Table Clearing	483
28	Sept.	Clay Table Use (HCO PL)	487
4	Oct.	Theory Check-out Data (HCO PL) (reissued 21 May 1967)	488
17	Oct.	Clay Table Data	490
17	Oct.	Getting the Pc Sessionable	491
17	Oct.	Clearing—Why It Works—How It Is Necessary	493
27	Oct.	Policies on Physical Healing, Insanity and Potential Trouble Sources (HCO PL) (reissued 23 June 1967)	<i>OEC Vol. 1—517</i>
	Nov.	<i>The Book of Case Remedies</i>	495
	Nov.	More Clay Table Clearing Goofs	496
6	Nov.	Styles of Auditing	498
12	Nov.	Definition Processes	505
16	Nov.	Clay Table Label Goofs	509
10	Dec.	Listen Style Auditing	511
11	Dec.	Curriculum for Level 0—HAS	514
11	Dec.	Scientology 0—Processes	516
26	Dec.	Routine 0-A (Expanded)	520
		Subject Index	522
		Alphabetical List of Titles	552

# LONG CONTENTS

## **HCO PL 6 Jan. 1962 LAUDATORY WITHHOLDS,**

Know to Mystery Processing Check,

## **HCO Info. Ltr. 9 Jan. 1962 3D CRISS CROSS, 4**

3D Criss Cross steps, 4

## **HCO B 11 Jan. 1962 SECURITY CHECKING—TWENTY-TEN THEORY, 6**

Withholds cut havingness down, 6

Requisites for Twenty-Ten, 6

Twenty-Ten procedure, 6

Application of Twenty-Ten procedure to Goals Problem Mass, 7

## **HCOPL 17 Jan. 1962 RESPONSIBILITY AGAIN, 8**

Common denominator of the Goals Problem Mass is “no responsibility”, 8

Responsibility as the concept of being able to care for, to reach or to be, 8

## **HCO Info. Ltr. 22 Jan. 1962 3D CRISS CROSS—METHOD OF ASSESSMENT, 10**

Proper sequence of action in a 3D Criss Cross Assessment, 10

List a list, 10

Run Havingness, 10

Differentiate the list, 11

Null the list, 11

Check the item, 12

Terminal gives pain, oppterm gives sensation, 12

Errors in assessment, 13

## **HCO B 25 Jan. 1962 FLOW PROCESS, 14**

Compulsive outflow and obsessive withhold are alike aberrated, 14

List of most important flows, 14

Commands of Flow Process, 15

## **HCO B 1 Feb. 1962 FLOWS, BASIC, 16**

CDEI Scale on inflow and outflow, 16

## **HCO Info. Ltr. 1 Feb. 1962 3D CRISS CROSS—ASSESSMENT TIPS, 17**

Complete list in 3DXX, 17

Ways to start a 3DXX line, 17

Differentiation step in 3DXX, 18

## **HCO Info. Ltr. 3 Feb. 1962 3DXX FLOWS ASSESSMENT, 19**

## **HCO B 8 Feb. 1962 MISSED WITHHOLDS, 20**

What is a missed withhold, 20

How to audit missed withholds, 21

Sample missed withhold session, 21

**HCO B 12 Feb. 1962 HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS, 23**

Auditor objective, 23  
Withhold system (difficulty, what, when, all, who), 23  
Use a Mark IV, 23  
The questions of the withhold system, 24

**HCO PL 13 Feb. 1962 3D CRISS CROSS ITEMS, 25**

**HCO B 15 Feb. 1962 CO-AUDIT & MISSED WITHHOLDS, 25**

**HCO B 22 Feb. 1962 WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL, 26**

Natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, are restimulated but missed or partially missed withholds, 26  
Knowledge to the average person is only this: a knowledge of his or her withholds, 26

**HCO B 1 Mar. 1962 PREPCHECKING, 28**

Mechanics of Prepchecking, 28  
Administration of Prepchecking, 29  
The magic phrase of Prepchecking, 29  
Prepcheck example, 29  
Control pc's attention, 30  
Don't use O/W, 30  
How to derive Zeros and Zero A questions, 30  
Asking the What question, 31

**HCO B 8 Mar. 1962 THE BAD "AUDITOR", 32**

The natural auditor and the dangerous auditor described, 32  
Remedies for the dangerous auditor, 34  
Revelation Process X1, 34  
Prepchecking Zero Question, 34  
3D Criss Cross, 34

**HCO B 15 Mar. 1962 SUPPRESSORS, 36**

"Afraid to find out" type of case, 36  
The rough pc, 36  
"Suppressor"—the impulse to forbid revelation in another, 37  
"Dangerous auditor" symptoms, 37  
Commands of Revelation Process X2, 38

**HCO B 21 Mar. 1962 PREPCHECKING DATA—WHEN TO DO A WHAT, 39**

Prechecking example, 39  
Moving tone arm, 40  
Overts depend on social mores, 40  
Don't forget "guilty" in Zero questions, 40  
Add "appear, not appear" after "all" in withhold system, 41  
Whole track, 41  
Unknown incident pins chains, 41  
Recurring withholds, 41  
Missed withholds, 42  
Rudiments in Prepchecking, 42

**HCO B 29 Mar. 1962 CCHs AGAIN—WHEN TO USE THE CCHs, 43**

Three major processes: the CCHs, Prepchecking, 3D Criss Cross, 43  
CCHs must be run right, 44

**HCO B 5 Apr. 1962 CCHs—AUDITING ATTITUDE, 45**

Description of how to run CCHs properly, 46  
Purpose of the CCHs, 47

**HCO B 11 Apr. 1962 DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN, 48**

Tone arm action as indicator of what to run, 48  
Tone arm moves because mass is changing, 48

**HCO B 12 Apr. 1962 CCHs—PURPOSE, 50**

Purpose of the CCH drills—getting the pc out of the past and into present time, 50

**HCO B 26 Apr. 1962 RECOMMENDED PROCESSES HGC, 51**

CCHs, Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross combination, 51  
Alternating CCHs and Prepchecking, 51  
Limitations of use of Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross, 52

**HCO Info. Ltr. 29 Apr. 1962 ROUTINE 3G (EXPERIMENTAL), 53**

Routine 3G steps in brief, 53  
How a goal is checked, 54  
Steps of Routine 3D Criss Cross, 55  
Steps of Routine 3G, 56  
Cautions regarding Routine 3G and 3D Criss Cross, 57

**HCO B 3 May 1962 ARC BREAKS—MISSED WITHHOLDS, 58**

All ARC breaks stem from missed withholds, 58  
Picking up missed withholds keeps pcs in session, 58  
Pc manifestations cured by asking for missed withholds, 59  
Missed withhold commands, 60

**HCO B 10 May 1962 PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING, 62**

Combining Sec Checking with Prepchecking, 62  
Use of rudiments in Prepchecking, 63  
Help the pc, 63

**HCO Info Ltr. 10 May 1962 ROUTINE 3GA (EXPERIMENTAL), 64**

Difficulties and liabilities in a Routine 3 process, 64  
Routine 3GA steps, 64  
Step one, find a goal, 64  
Step two, list four lists, 65  
Step three, null each list, 66  
Step four, find a new goal, 66

**HCO B 14 May 1962 CASE REPAIR, 67**

Routine 1 a, 67  
Sec Checking, 67  
CCH blowy pcs, 67  
Prepchecking repair, 67  
CCHs, 68  
S-C-S, 68  
Op Pro by Dup, 68  
Routine 2, 68  
Routines 3, 3A and 3D, 69  
Routine 3D Criss Cross, 69  
General repair, 70

**HCO B 21 May 1962 MISSED WITHHOLDS, ASKING ABOUT, 71**

**HCO B 22 May 1962 MODEL SESSION CHANGE, 72**

Beginning rudiments withhold question change, 72

**HCO B 23 May 1962 E-METER READS—PREPCHECKING—HOW METERS GET INVALIDATED, 73**

Questions to handle missed meter reads, 73

**HCO B 24 May 1962 Q AND A, 74**

The 3 Qs and As, 74

The double question, 74

Changing because the pc changes, 75

Following the pc's instructions, 76

**HCO B 25 May 1962 E-METER INSTANT READS, 77**

Major thought and minor thought, 77

Reactive mind is composed of: timelessness, unknownness, survival, 78

**HCO PL 26 May 1962 TRAINING DRILLS MUST BE CORRECT, 79**

All TRs must contain the correct data of auditing, 79

**HCO PL 1 June 1962 AUDITING—RUDIMENTS CHECK SHEET, 81**

Rudiments check, 81

**HCO B 8 June 1962 RUDIMENTS CHECKING, 82**

Two protests sometimes occur when checking a pc's rudiments, 82

**HCO B 11 June 1962 PREPCHECKING THE MIDDLE RUDIMENTS, 83**

List of Prepchecking Zero questions to be prepchecked, 83

**HCO B 14 June 1962 CHECKING NEEDLE IN RUDIMENTS CHECKS, 84**

Needle characteristics defined, 84

**HCO B 23 June 1962 MODEL SESSION REVISED, 85 [CANCELED]**

Start of session, 85

Beginning rudiments, 85

Start of process, 86

Middle rudiments, 86

End rudiments, 86

End of session, 86

End of process non-cyclical, 86

End of process cyclical, 87

Patter on rudiments, 87

**HCO B 24 June 1962 PREPCHECKING, 88**

Prepcheck procedure, 88

The What question, 89

Testing What questions, 90

**HCO B 25 June 1962 E-METER STANDARDS, 91**

**HCO B 27 June 1962 RUNDOWN ON ROUTINE 3GA, 92**

**HCO B 28 June 1962 DIRTY NEEDLES—HOW TO SMOOTH OUT NEEDLES, 93**

Reasons for dirty needle, 93

**HCO B 30 June 1962 ARC PROCESS, 95**

Commands of ARC Process, 95

**HCO B 2 July 1962 REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS—HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN, 96**

Repetitive rudiment cycle, 96

Fast checking on rudiments, 97

**HCO B 3 July 1962 REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, 98**

Repetitive Prepchecking replaces Prepchecking by the withhold system, 98

Repetitive Prepchecking procedure, 98

Zero questions time limiter, 99

Middle rudiments, 99

Prepchecking the middle rudiments, 99

O/W assists, 99

**HCO B 4 July 1962 BULLETIN CHANGES, 101**

Havingness rud, 101

Missed withholds rudiment, 101

General Overt/Withhold before session, 101

End words of rudiments questions, 102

Double cleaning of rudiments, 102

**HCO B 4 July 1962 COACHLESS TRAINING—USE OF A DOLL, 103**

**HCO PL 14 July 1962 AUDITING ALLOWED, 104**

Auditors must be perfect on a meter—defined, 104

What is perfect meter reading, 104

**HCO PL 15 July 1962 GOALS PREPCHECK FORM—ROUTINE 3GA, 106**

**HCO PL 17 July 1962 ROUTINE 3GA—HCO WW R-3GA FORM 1—LISTING PREPCHECK, 109**

**HCO PL 19 July 1962 CLEARING—FREE NEEDLES, 112**

State of a “first goal clear”, 112

**HCO B 21 July 1962 INSTANT READS, 113**

Instant read anticipated on rudiments, 113

**HCO PL 22 July 1962 ROUTINE 3GA—LISTING WORDING, 114**

**HCO PL 24 July 1962 R3GA—HCO WW FORM G3—FAST GOALS CHECK, 115  
[REVISED]**

**HCO B 30 July 1962 A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE, 116**

Pattern for a new Problems Intensive, 116

**HCO B 1 Aug. 1962 ROUTINE 3GA—GOALS—NULLING BY MID RUDS, 118**

The goals list, 118

Test for charge, 118

Nulling by mid ruds, 119



**HCO B 1 Aug. 1962 ROUTINE 3GA—NULLING DRILLS FOR NULLING BY MID  
RUDS, 122 [REPLACED]**

Drill on new nulling procedure for Routine 3GA (Tiger Drill), 122

**HCO B 2 Aug. 1962 CCH ANSWERS, 126**

How to handle originations on CCHs, 126

**HCO B 7 Aug. 1962 RUNNING CCHs, 127**

Correct version of CCHs, 127

**HCO B 10 Aug. 1962 HOW IT FEELS TO GO CLEAR, 128**

Success stories on Routine 3GA, 128

**HCO B 13 Aug. 1962 ROCK SLAMS AND DIRTY NEEDLES, 129**

What rock slams and dirty needles mean, 129

**HCO B 21 Aug. 1962 3GA—LINE WORDING, 130**

Listing session, 130

**HCO B 22 Aug. 1962 3GA—DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM  
—DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT TIP, 131 [CANCELED]**

Goals formulae, 132

**HCO B 30 Aug. 1962 ORDER OF PREPCHECK BUTTONS, 133**

**HCO B 31 Aug. 1962 3GA—EXPANDED LINE WORDING, 134**

**HCO B 31 Aug. 1962 3GA—DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM, 135**

**HCO B 1 Sept. 1962 3GA—DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM, 135**

**HCO B 2 Sept. 1962 ACCOUNT OF CONGRESS GOAL, 137**

Demonstration of Dynamic Assessment by rock slam, 137

**HCO B 3 Sept. 1962 3GA—DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM, 138**

**HCO B 8 Sept. 1962 3GA—TO BE GOALS LINE LISTING, 139**

**HCO B 12 Sept. 1962 SECURITY CHECKS AGAIN, 140**

Security Check by rock slam, 140

**HCO PL 12 Sept. 1962 AUTHORIZED PROCESSES, 141**

Assists, Problems Intensives (modern version), ordinary 3GA, 3GA by Dynamic  
Assessment, 141

**HCO B 19 Sept. 1962 3GA—TIPS ON DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT—RULES OF  
THUMB, 142**

**HCO B 23 Sept. 1962 A 40-LINE LIST ON A DOINGNESS GOAL, 143**

**HCO PL 27 Sept. 1962 VALID PROCESSES, 145**

**HCO B 27 Sept. 1962 PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE, 146**

What Problems Intensive does for pc, 146

**HCO B 1 Oct. 1962 3GA—LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS—114 NEW LINES  
FOR LISTING, 147**

Directions for 3GA listing by Tiger buttons, 148

**HCO B 2 Oct. 1962 WHEN YOU NEED REASSURANCE, 149**

**HCO B 3 Oct. 1962 TIGER DRILLING, 150**

Altered goal wording prevents clearing, 150

New line listing success story, 151

**HCO PL 8 Oct. 1962 HGC CLEARING, 152**

Auditing sold by intensives, 153

Clearing assembly line, 153

Pc forms, 154

Accidental goal finding, 154

**HCO B 13 Oct. 1962 PROCESSES, 156**

SHSBC X Unit processes, 156

SHSBC Y Unit processes, 156

SHSBC Z Unit processes, 156

**HCO B 15 Oct. 1962 GOAL FINDER'S MODEL SESSION, 157 [CANCELED]**

Mid Ruds, 157

Ending the session, 157

End of session, 158

**HCO B 16 Oct. 1962 ROUTINE 3GA—LISTING, 159**

Dominant rules of Routine 3GA listing, 159

Scale of answering comm lags, 159

**HCO B 17 Oct. 1962 AUDITOR FAILURE TO UNDERSTAND, 161**

Invalidation, avoid use of “you” to pc, 161

Evaluation, auditor repeating what pc says, 161

Driving in anchor points, 161

Rock slammer, 161

**HCO B 18 Oct. 1962 3GA—LISTING BY PREHAV, 163**

3GA listing by Prehav, directions, 164

**HCO PL 19 Oct. 1962 R3GA—HCO WW FORM G3, REVISED—FAST GOALS  
CHECK, 165**

**HCO B 29 Oct. 1962 PRE-CLEARING INTENSIVE, 166**

Assessment for clearing intensive, 166

**HCO B 7 Nov. 1962 WRONG GOALS, IMPORTANCE OF REPAIR OF, 167**

Symptoms of a right goal listed wrongly, 167

Symptoms of a wrong or improperly cleaned goal unlisted, 168

Symptoms of a wrong goal listed, 168

Symptoms of a right goal unlisted, 169

**HCO B 7 Nov. 1962 ROUTINE 3-21—THE TWENTY-ONE STEPS—FINDING GOALS, 170**

Rock slamming items, 172

**HCO B 7 Nov. 1962 “ROLL YOUR OWN” PREHAV, 173**

How to do “Roll Your Own” Prehav, 173

Terms defined, 173

The most accurate assessment, 173

Doing the Prehav assessment, 174

**HCO B 8 Nov. 1962 SOMATICS—HOW TO TELL TERMINALS AND OPPOSITION TERMINALS, 175**

Definitions of important terms, 175

Testing for the character of an item, 177

Ways of asking for terminal and opposition terminal, 177

Using Tiger Drill buttons, 177

The line plot, 178

**HCO B 11 Nov. 1962 3GAXX—STRAIGHTENING UP 3GAXX CASES, 179**

**HCO B 12 Nov. 1962 3GAXX—DIRTY NEEDLES AND INCOMPLETE LISTS —HOW TO ASSESS, 180**

Assessment steps of 3GAXX, 180

**HCO B 17 Nov. 1962 ROUTINE 3-21, 182**

By-passed item defined, 182

Exact way to do Routine 3-21 Step 6, 183

**HCO B 23 Nov. 1962 ROUTINE TWO-TWELVE—OPENING PROCEDURE BY ROCK SLAM—AN HPA/HCA SKILL, 185**

The slow-gain, no-gain cases, 185

Routine Two-Twelve procedure, 186

Questions for the second pair, 188

R2-12 lists, 1 88

Skills required to accomplish a 3GAXX for rock slammers, 189

Fast step resume, 190

**HCO B 24 Nov. 1962 ROUTINE 2-12—LIST ONE—ISSUE ONE —THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST, 191**

**HCO B 28 Nov. 1962 R2-12—PRACTICAL DRILLS, 193**

Basic auditing skills needed to audit with 2-12, 193

Coaching notes, 194

**HCO B 29 Nov. 1962 ROUTINE 2-12—LIST ONE—ISSUE TWO —THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST, 195**

**HCO B 29 Nov. 1962 ROUTINES 2-12, 3-21 AND 3GAXX—TIGER DRILL FOR NULLING BY MID RUDS, 196**

Drill on new nulling procedures, 196

**HCO PL 1 Dec. 1962 GOALS & PREPCHECKING, 201**

**HCO B 4 Dec. 1962 ROUTINE 2-12—LIST ONE—ISSUE THREE —THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST, 202**

**HCO B 5 Dec. 1962 2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21 AND ROUTINE 2-10—MODERN ASSESSMENT, 203**

What assessment is prevented by, 203  
Definitions of important terms, 203  
Writing the list, 204  
Nulling, 206  
List appearances, 207  
Assessments, 208  
Routine 2-10 (R2-12 short form for beginners), 208

**HCO B 6 Dec. 1962 R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX—DATA, THE ZERO A STEPS AND PURPOSE OF PROCESSES, 210**

Zero list questions or R2-12, 21 1  
“Never RSing” pcs, 212  
Rocket reads vs. RSes, 212  
Purpose of processes, 213

**HCO B 8 Dec. 1962 TRAINING—X UNIT, 214**

**HCO B 9 Dec. 1962 ROUTINE 2-12—LIST ONE—ADD TO LIST ONE ISSUE THREE, 215**

**HCO B 15 Dec. 1962 R2-12—THE FATAL ERROR, 216**

**HCO B 30 Dec. 1962 ROUTINES 2-12 & 2-10—CASE ERRORS—POINTS OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE, 217**

Auditing errors, 217  
The errors of Routine Two, 218  
Auditor responsibility, 219  
Duration of process, 219  
No auditing, 219  
Failure to save records, 220  
Failing to find RSs on List One, 220  
Representing an RSing item, 221  
Oppose RIs, 221  
Incomplete lists, 221  
Wrong way oppose, test for, 222  
Lists that won’t complete, 223  
Long long lists, 223  
Case remedy, 226

**HCO B 1 Jan. 1963 ACADEMY CURRICULUM—HOW TO TEACH AUDITING AND ROUTINE 2, 227**

Check sheets, 227  
V Unit Class 0, first phase, 227  
W Unit Class Ia, second phase, 227  
X Unit Class Ib, third phase, 228  
Y Unit Class IIa, fourth phase, 228  
Z Unit Class IIb, fifth phase, 229  
Post Graduate Unit—Class II, sixth phase, 228

**HCO B 3 Jan. 1963 ROUTINE 2—OPPOSITION LISTS—RIGHT AND WRONG OPPOSE, 230**

Potential miscalling a reliable item, 230  
Oppose list, right way indications, 231  
Oppose list, wrong way oppose indications, 231  
On an oppose list, what a dirty needle means, 232

**HCO B 27 Jan. 1963 ROUTINE 2—SIMPLIFIED, 233**

Tone arm, 233  
List beyond last rock slam, 233  
Test list both ways, 233  
Wrong way list, 234  
Vanished RS, 234  
Four item packages, 234  
Packaging, 234  
Nulling, 235  
Wrong item signs, 236  
Right item signs, 236  
Dirty needle, 236  
Rock slam matching, 236  
Using ARC breaks, 237  
Case repair, 237  
Dope-off, 237  
Never represent a rock slam item, 237  
Allow no self listing of goals, 238  
Never steer items, 238

**HCO B 11 Feb. 1963 CURRENT AUDITING, 239**

R3-MX becomes R3-M, 239  
R2- 12A, 240  
Valid processes list, 240

**HCO B 15 Feb. 1963 R2—R3—LISTING RULES, 241**

Rules of a complete list for R2 or R3, 241

**HCO B 20 Feb. 1963 ROUTINE 2 & 3 MODEL SESSION, 243 [CANCELED]**

Session preliminaries, 243  
Start of session, 243  
Rudiments, 244  
Running O/W, 244  
Running the mid rudiments, 244  
Running the random rudiment, 244  
End of session, 245

**HCO PL 21 Feb. 1963 GOALS CHECK, 246**

Goals and reliable items found on students, staff or HGC pcs must be checked out, 246

**HCO B 4 Mar. 1963 ROUTINE 2-10, 2-12, 2-12A, 247**

Cease to use Routine 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A in the HGC and Academy and on staff clearing,  
with two exceptions, 247

**HCO B 8 Mar. 1963 USE OF THE BIG MIDDLE RUDIMENTS, 248**

Order of big mid rud buttons, 248

**HCO B 10 Mar. 1963 ROUTINE 2-10, 2-12, 2-12A—VANISHED RS OR RR, 249**

What makes rocket reads and rock slams vanish, 249  
Restoring the RR & RS, 249  
All items count, 250  
Four RIs, 250

**HCO B 14 Mar. 1963 ROUTINE 2—ROUTINE 3—ARC BREAKS, HANDLING OF, 251**

The R2 or R3 ARC break, 251  
Cause of R2 and R3 ARC breaks, 251

- ARC break rule, 251
- Mid rud rule, 251
- The sad effect, 251
- Sad effect rules, 252
- ARC break cause rule, 252
- The fifteen principal causes of ARC break in R2 and R3, 252
- The cycle of the ARC break, 253
- The auditor's view on ARC break, 253
- The D of P's view on ARC break, 253
- R2 and R3 Drill One, 254

**HCO B 18 Mar. 1963 R2—R3—IMPORTANT DATA—DON'T FORCE THE PC,**  
255

- Listing, wrong way to symptoms, 255
- Body vs. thetan, 255
- How listing a wrong item can happen, 256
- Travelling rocket read, 257
- Wrong wording of item or goal, 257
- Item from another GPM, 258
- Minimize goal oppose lists, 258
- Clear test, 259

**HCO B 23 Mar. 1963 CLEAR & OT, 260**

- GPM left uncleaned gives liabilities, 261

**HCO B 13 Apr. 1963 ROUTINE 2-G—ORIGINAL ROUTINE 2, 3GA, 2-10, 2-12,  
2-12A AND OTHERS SPECIALLY ADAPTED—GOALS  
FINDING—DESIGNATION OF ROUTINES, 262**

- Routine 2-G1, 262
- Routine 2-GPH, 262
- Routine 2-2, 262
- Routine 2-G3, 262
- Routine 2-G4, 262
- Routine 2-G5, 262

**HCO B 25 Apr. 1963 METER READING TRS, 264**

- E-Meter TR 20—Reach and withdraw on the E-Meter, 264
- E-Meter TR 21—Reading E-Meter accurately, 265

**HCO B 29 Apr. 1963 MODERNIZED TRAINING DRILLS USING PERMISSIVE  
COACHING, 266 [CANCELED]**

- TR 0, Confronting Preclear, 266
- TR 0 (A), 267
- TR 0 (B), 267
- TR 0 (C), 267
- TR 0 (D), 267
- TR 1, Dear Alice, 268
- TR 2, Acknowledgments, 269
- TR 3, Duplicative Question, 269
- TR 4, Preclear Originations, 271
- Coaches' Drill, 272

**HCO B 15 May 1963 THE TIME TRACK AND ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS  
—BULLETIN 1, 273**

- Engram running simplified, 273
- Why people have trouble running engrams, 273
- The time track, 274

Definitions, 274  
The influence of the time track, 275  
The creation of the time track, 275  
Apparent faults in the time track, 275  
The origin of the time track, 276

**HCO B 21 May 1963 ROUTINE 3—R-3 MODEL SESSION, 278 [CANCELED]**

Session preliminaries, 278  
Start of session, 278  
Rudiments, 278  
Running O/W, 279  
Running the mid rudiments, 279  
Order of big mid rud buttons, 279  
Pulling missed withholds, 279  
Body of session, 280  
End body of session, 280  
Smooth out session, 280  
Goals and gains, 280  
Havingness, 280  
Ending session, 280

**HCO B 27 May 1963 CAUSE OF ARC BREAKS, 281**

How charge can be by-passed, 281  
How Q and A causes ARC breaks, 283  
ARC Break Processes, 284  
Rudiments, 284  
Q and A ARC breaks, 285  
Echo metering, 285  
Missed withholds, 285  
Apparent bad morale, 285

**HCO B 8 June 1963 THE TIME TRACK AND ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS  
—BULLETIN 2—HANDLING THE TIME TRACK, 287**

Reasons why some cannot run engrams on pcs, 287  
Three ways to move a time track, 287  
Charge and the time track, 289  
State of Case Scale, 289  
Charge, 290  
Auditing theory of charge erasure, 291

**HCO B 24 June 1963 ROUTINE 3—ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS—  
BULLETIN 3—ROUTINE 3-R—ENGRAM RUNNING BY  
CHAINS, 292**

Example of Q and A, 292  
ARC breaks, 293  
Early engram running, 294  
Routine 3-R, 294  
R3-R by steps, 294

**HCO B 25 June 1963 ROUTINE 2H—ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT, 297**

R2H by steps, 297  
R2H assessment form, 298

**HCO B 1 July 1963 ROUTINE 3R—BULLETIN 4—PRELIMINARY STEP, 299**

R3R procedure of assessment, 300  
ARC breaks in preliminary step, 300  
Development of assessments, 300

Three most important visible factors in R3R, 301  
R3R assessment, 302

**HCO B 5 July 1963 ARC BREAK ASSESSMENTS, 306**

General ARC break assessment—List L-1, 307  
Assessment sessions—listing sessions—preliminary step R3 R  
—the ARC break for assessments list—List L-2, 307  
Routine R3R—engram running by chains—List L-3, 308  
Routine 3N—GPMs, all goals sessions—List L4, 308

**HCO B 5 July 1963 CCHs REWRITTEN, 310 [REPLACED]**

CCH 1, Give Me That Hand, 310  
CCH 2, Tone 40 8-C, 311  
CCH 3, Hand Space Mimicry, 312  
CCH 4, Book Mimicry, 312

**HCO B 9 July 1963 A TECHNICAL SUMMARY—THE REQUIRED SKILLS OF  
PROCESSING AND WHY, 314**

Auditor skills by case level, 314  
Basic skills of an auditor, 315  
Former training was not wasted, 316  
Hours of processing required, 317  
Difficulty of clearing, 317

**HCO B 11 July 1963 AUDITING RUNDOWN—MISSED WITHHOLDS —TO BE  
RUN IN XI UNIT, 318**

**HCO B 21 July 1963 CO-AUDIT ARC BREAK PROCESS, 319**

Despatch regarding ARC Break 1963 Process, 319

**HCO B 22 July 1963 YOU CAN BE RIGHT, 321**

Overt acts, 321  
*Asserting* rightness vs. *being* right, 322  
Rehabilitating the ability to be right, 322

**HCO B 22 July 1963 ORG TECHNICAL—HGC PROCESSES AND TRAINING,  
324**

Programming pcs, 324  
Pc gains, 325  
Auditing precautions, 325  
Auditor skill, 326

**HCO B 23 July 1963 AUDITING RUNDOWN—MISSED WITHHOLDS —TO BE  
RUN IN X1 UNIT, 328**

**HCO B 28 July 1963 TIME AND THE TONE ARM, 329**

Tone arm motion, 329  
The mechanics of time, 330  
Programming cases, 331

**HCO B 29 July 1963 SCIENTOLOGY REVIEW, 332**

Wins on PTPs of Scientology, 332  
Between lives implants, 333



**HCO B 4 Aug. 1963 E-METER ERRORS—COMMUNICATION CYCLE ERROR,**  
334

E-Meter dependence, 334  
Dating dependence, 334  
RIs and use of E-Meter, 334  
E-Meter invalidation, 335  
Cleaning cleans, 335  
Dirty needle, 335  
Basic error of the auditing cycle (diagram), 337

**HCO B 9 Aug. 1963 DEFINITION OF RELEASE, 338**

**HCO B 11 Aug. 1963 ARC BREAK ASSESSMENTS, 338**

**HCO B 14 Aug. 1963 LECTURE GRAPHS, 339**

SHSBC LRH Lecture 25 July 63 graph—Comm Cycles in Auditing, 340  
SHSBC LRH Lecture 7 Aug. 63 graph—R-2H Fundamentals, 343  
SHSBC LRH Lecture 8 Aug. 63 graph—R-2H Assessment, 344

**HCO B 19 Aug. 1963 HOW TO DO AN ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT, 345**

ARC break assessment by steps, 345  
Purpose of ARC break assessment, 346  
Two conditions of living, 347

**HCO B 20 Aug. 1963 R3R—R3N—THE PRECLEAR’S POSTULATES, 349**

Don’t leave postulates charged, 349

**HCO B 22 Aug. 1963 PROJECT 80—THE ITSA LINE AND TONE ARM, 351**

SHSBC lectures necessary for great technical improvement in the organization, 351  
Keep staff attention squarely on: the itsa line, the tone arm, proper use of ARC break assessments, and directing pc’s attention adroitly, 352

**HCO B 1 Sept. 1963 ROUTINE THREE SC, 353**

What a service facsimile is, 353  
What a service facsimile is used for, 354  
Steps to make a Clear, 354  
Completing clearing, 355  
Faults present in the auditing if clearing did not occur, 355

**HCO B 6 Sept. 1963 INSTRUCTING IN SCIENTOLOGY AUDITING—  
INSTRUCTOR’S TASK—D of P’s CASE HANDLING, 357**

Drawing A—auditor’s perception of the pc as limited by auditor’s own service facsimile, 357  
Drawing B—auditor’s perception of the pc with service fac removed, 357  
Drawing C—safe assumptions, 357  
Drawing D—instruction which produces Drawing B, 358  
Auditor’s conditions of observation of pc: Drawings A, B, C and D, 360

**HCO B 9 Sept. 1963 REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE  
PREPCHECKING, 361**

How to get the rudiments in, 361  
Fast checking on rudiments, 361  
Repetitive Prepchecking, 361  
End words, 362  
Double cleaning of rudiments, 362

**HCO B 22 Sept. 1963 PREPCHECK BUTTONS, 363 [CANCELED]**

18 Prepcheck buttons, 363  
Big mid ruds, 363  
Two useful pairs—suppress and invalidate, and protested and decided, 364  
Dirty needle, 364  
The old order of Prepcheck buttons, 364

**HCO B 23 Sept. 1963 TAPE COVERAGE OF NEW TECHNOLOGY, 365**

List of tapes containing a full progressive summary of modern Scientology, 365

**HCO B 25 Sept. 1963 ADEQUATE TONE ARM ACTION, 367**

TA amount per session, 367  
TA amount per intensive, 367

**HCO B 1 Oct. 1963 HOW TO GET TONE ARM ACTION, 369**

New data on the E-Meter, 369  
Tone arm assessment, 369  
What tone arm action comes from, 370  
Over-restimulation, 371  
Sources of restimulation, 372  
List for assessment, 372  
Measure of auditors, 373  
Slow assessment means letting the pc itsa while assessing, 373  
How to get TA action, 374  
What is itsa, 374  
The theory of tone arm action, 375

**HCO B 2 Oct. 1963 GPMs—EXPERIMENTAL PROCESS WITHDRAWN, 376**

R4MTA has been canceled, 376

**HCO B 8 Oct. 1963 HOW TO GET TA—ANALYSING AUDITING, 377**

Data of listen style auditing, 377  
Basic crimes of listen style auditing, 377  
Listen style auditing, steps to learn, 378

**HCO B 16 Oct. 1963 R3SC SLOW ASSESSMENT, 379**

Report from SHSBC student on auditing success, 379

**HCO B 19 Nov. 1963 ROUTINE 3—R-3 MODEL SESSION REVISED, 381  
[CANCELED]**

Session preliminaries, 381  
Start of session, 381  
Rudiments, 381  
Running O/W, 382  
Running the mid rudiments, 382  
Order of big mid rud buttons, 382  
Pulling missed withholds, 382  
Body of session, 382  
End body of session, 383  
Smooth out session, 383  
Goals and gains, 383  
Havingness, 383  
Ending session, 383

**HCO B 25 Nov. 1963 DIRTY NEEDLES, 384**

Cause of dirty needles, 384

**HCO B 26 Nov. 1963 A NEW TRIANGLE—BASIC AUDITING, TECHNIQUE, CASE ANALYSIS, 385**

Basic auditing, 385

Auditing techniques, 385

Case analysis, 386

**HCO B 14 Dec.. 1963 CASE ANALYSIS—HEALTH RESEARCH, 388**

Steps for case analysis, 388

Example of case analysis on chronic bronchitis, 388

**HCO B 28 Dec.. 1963 INDICATORS—PART ONE: GOOD INDICATORS, 390**

List of good indicators on R6, 390

R6 auditor musts, 392

**HCO B 21 Jan. 1964 METER LEVEL WARNING—HOW TO KILL A PC IN LEVEL 5, 394**

Breath and body motion, 394

**HCO PL 24 Jan. 1964 CASE SUPERVISOR, 395**

Establishment and purpose of Case Supervisor, 395

**HCO B 1 Mar. 1964 METER READS, SIZE OF, 396**

Reads are bigger on higher levels, 396

How to get TA action, 397

**HCO B 4 Mar. 1964 CLASS II MODEL SESSION, 398 [CANCELED]**

Session preliminaries, 398

Start of session, 398

Beginning rudiments, 398

Running O/W, 398

Start of process, 399

Middle rudiments, 399

End rudiments, 399

Goals and gains, 399

End of session, 399

End of process non-cyclical, 399

End of process cyclical, 399

**HCO B 15 Mar. 1964 OVERWHELMING THE PC, 400**

Consequences of pc being overwhelmed, 400

Examples of overwhelm, 400

**HCO B 15 Mar. 1964 METER—EVERYTHING READING, 402**

E-Meter ability, 402

The abandoned item or goal—another way everything reads, 403

Wrong goals, 404

**HCO PL 18 Mar. 1964 HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES, 406**

ARC '63; Recall a Terminal and Problems Intensive, alternated with R-2H; 8-C and any older processes the auditor has confidence in, 406  
Avoid R-2-12, R-3 and R-4 type processes, 406

**HCO Info. Ltr. 2 Apr. 1964 TWO TYPES OF PEOPLE, 407**

Two types of behavior—that calculated to be constructive and that calculated to be disastrous, 407  
The same being at different lifetimes is good and evil, 408

**HCO B 7 Apr. 1964 Q AND A, 410**

Q and A is a failure to complete a cycle of action on a preclear, 410  
Cycle of action is redefined as start—continue—complete, 410

**HCO B 10 Apr. 1964 AUDITING SKILLS, 411**

Auditing skills by Scientology levels, 411  
Things a Class VI auditor should know, 412

**HCO B 13 Apr. 1964 TONE ARM ACTION, 413**

Auditor failure to understand, 414  
Invalidation, 414  
Evaluation, 414  
Dirty needles, 414  
Cleaning cleans, 415  
Echo metering, 415  
Don't echo invalidate, 415  
E-Meter invalidation, 415  
E-Meter dependence, 416  
Charge, 416  
By-passed charge, 417  
The cycle of the ARC break, 417  
ARC break assessment, 418  
Q and A ARC breaks, 419  
Pc tone, 419

**HCO B 20 Apr. 1964 MODEL SESSION—LEVELS III TO VI, 420 [CANCELED]**

Session preliminaries, 420  
Start of session, 420  
Rudiments, 420  
Running O/W, 420  
Running the mid rudiments, 421  
Order of big mid rud buttons, 421  
Pulling missed withholds, 421  
Body of session, 421  
End body of session, 421  
Smooth out session, 422  
Goals and gains, 422  
Havingness, 422  
Ending session, 422

**HCO B 23 Apr. 1964 AUDITING BY LISTS, 423 [REPLACED]**

Auditing by lists—L.1 and L.4, 423

**The Auditor, Issue 1, May 1964 THE WORKABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY, 425**

Auditor becomes an auditor when he or she finds out that it's the basics that count, 425  
Auditor makes the session always and the preclear never, 425  
What is a good auditor, 426

**HCO B 19 May 1964 CLASS II MODEL SESSION, 428 [CANCELED]**

Session preliminaries, 428  
Start of session, 428  
Beginning rudiments, 428  
Running O/W, 428  
Start of process, 429  
Middle rudiments, 429  
End of process non-cyclical, 429  
End of process cyclical, 429  
End rudiments, 429  
Goals and gains, 429  
End of session, 430

**HCO B 27 May 1964 AUDITING ASSIGNMENTS, 431**

Student auditing assignments, 431  
Student auditor training, 431

**HCO B 29 June 1964 CENTRAL ORG AND FIELD AUDITOR TARGETS, 432**

Master one action and center people's attention upon it, 433  
Drawbacks of Level VI, 433  
Type A and Type B pcs, 434  
Your programme, 43 5

**HCO B 7 July 1964 JUSTIFICATIONS, 436**

The reasons overts are overts to people is justifications, 436  
New overt process, 436

**HCO B 8 July 1964 MORE JUSTIFICATIONS, 437**

List of Scientology justifications, 437

**HCO B 10 July 1964 OVERTS—ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING, 438**

Responsibility, 438  
ARC breaks, 438  
Forbidden words, 439  
Why overts work, 439

**HCO B 12 July 1964 MORE ON O/Ws, 441**

Its processes for O/W, 441

**HCO B 24 July 1964 TA COUNTERS, USE OF, 443**

How to record TA motion, 443  
How often one reads and notes TA action, 444

**HCO B 29 July 1964 GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS, 445**

List of good indicators, 445

**HCO B 14 Aug. 1964 PREPCHECK BUTTONS, 446**

18 Prepcheck buttons, 446  
Big mid ruds, 446  
Two useful pairs: suppress and not-ised, protested and decided, 447  
Dirty needle, 447  
The old order of Prepcheck buttons, 447

**HCO B 14 Aug. 1964 MODEL SESSION—LEVELS III TO VI, 448 [CANCELED]**

Session preliminaries, 448  
Start of session, 448  
Rudiments, 448  
Running O/W, 448  
Running the mid rudiments, 449  
Order of big mid rud buttons, 449  
Pulling missed withholds, 449  
Body of session, 449  
End body of session, 449  
Smooth out session, 449  
Goals and gains, 450  
Havingness, 450  
Ending session, 450

**HCO B 17 Aug. 1964 CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING AND PROCESSING, 451**

The construction of clay tables, 451  
Clay table use on courses, 452  
Clay table work in processing, 453  
Clay Table Healing, 453  
Intelligence, 454  
Clay Table IQ Processing, 454  
Handling clay, 455

**HCO B 18 Aug. 1964 CLAY TABLE WORK COVERING CLAY TABLE CLEARING IN DETAIL, 456**

Hidden standard mechanism, 456  
Clay Table Clearing, 457  
The steps of Clay Table Clearing, 458

**HCO B 23 Aug. 1964 HQS COURSE, 461**

Purpose of HQS Course, 461  
“Therapeutic” TRs, 461  
End product of HQS Course, 462

**HCO B 24 Aug. 1964 SESSION MUST-NOTS, 463**

Never tell a pc what his present time problem is, 463  
Never set a goal for a pc, 463  
Never tell a pc what’s wrong with him physically or assume that you know, 463  
Permitted auditor statements, 464  
In the overt-motivator sequence, 464  
In the ARC break, 465

**HCO B 7 Sept. 1964 CLAY TABLE LEVELS, 466**

Clay table work is Level III, 466  
What clay table work handles, 466

**HCO B 7 Sept. 1964 PTPs, OVERTS AND ARC BREAKS, 468**

How to handle present time problems, 468  
Overts must be handled, 468  
Handling ARC breaks, 469

**HCO B 8 Sept. 1964 OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?, 471**

Cycle of an overt, 471  
Overts and misunderstood words, 471

**HCO B 9 Sept. 1964 CLAY TABLE HEALING, 472**

Clay Table Healing and Clay Table Clearing are different, 472  
Clay Table Healing steps, 472  
Clay Table Healing don'ts, 473

**HCO B 9 Sept. 1964 CLAY TABLE CLEARING, 475**

Clay Table Clearing goof in "didn't understand" step two, 475

**HCO B 12 Sept. 1964 CLAY TABLE, MORE GOOFS, 476**

Not using correct wording, 476  
Not using data pc gives, 476  
Auditing over an ARC break, 476  
Not knowing the full definition—misunderstanding—overt—motivator cycle, 476  
Turning the get-the-word into a kind of listing session; not accepting the word the pc thinks it is, 477  
Failure to get a label written and placed on the object, 477

**HCO PL 24 Sept. 1964 INSTRUCTION & EXAMINATION: RAISING THE STANDARD OF, 478**

Instruction is done on a gradient scale, 479  
Bulletin checkouts, 480  
First phenomenon of misunderstood word, 480  
Second phenomenon of misunderstood word, 480  
Demonstration, 481

**HCO B 27 Sept. 1964 CLAY TABLE CLEARING, 483**

Clay Table Clearing don'ts, 483  
Clay Table Clearing steps, 484  
Routine auditing vs. remedies, 485  
Future errors, 486  
E-Meter, 486  
Session form, 486

**HCO PL 28 Sept. 1964 CLAY TABLE USE, 487**

Who may use clay table auditing, 487

**HCO PL 4 Oct. 1964 THEORY CHECK-OUT DATA, 488**

Theory check-out system, 488  
The "bright" ones, 488  
Coaching in theory, 489  
Dictionaries, 489

**HCO B 17 Oct. 1964 CLAY TABLE DATA, 490**

Importance of getting auditing questions answered in clay table auditing, 490

**HCO B 17 Oct. 1964 GETTING THE PC SESSIONABLE, 491**

The liabilities of auditing new pcs, 491 Covert auditing, 491

**HCO B 17 Oct. 1964 CLEARING—WHY IT WORKS—HOW IT IS NECESSARY, 493**

Mechanics of the reactive bank, 493 Gradient scale of auditing, 493

**HCO B 1 Nov. 1964 MORE CLAY TABLE CLEARING GOOFS, 496**

Goof is that the pc did not *represent* the word, 496  
Causes of a pc just doodling in clay, 496  
Resolutions of pc doodling in clay, 497  
Auditing cycle vital in Clay Table Clearing, 497

**HCO B 6 Nov. 1964 STYLES OF AUDITING, 498**

Listen style auditing, 498  
Muzzled auditing, 499  
Guiding style auditing, 500  
Abridged style auditing, 501  
Direct style auditing, 502  
All style auditing, 503

**HCO B 12 Nov. 1964 DEFINITION PROCESSES, 505**

Auditing style, 505  
Assists, 505  
Secondary styles, 50 5  
Remedies, 506  
Guiding style, 506  
Guiding secondary style, 506  
Definitions processing, 506  
Remedy A patter, 506  
Remedy B, 507  
Purpose of Definitions Processing, 507  
Understanding, 508  
Cycle of mis-definition, 508

**HCO B 16 Nov. 1964 CLAY TABLE LABEL GOOFS, 509**

Pc *must* label *everything* he or she makes in clay table work, 509

**HCO B 10 Dec. 1964 LISTEN STYLE AUDITING, 511**

Listen style co-audit, 511  
Procedure for running listen style co-audit, 511  
Listen style auditing for an individual, 512  
Prompts, 5 12

**HCO B 11 Dec. 1964 CURRICULUM FOR LEVEL 0—HAS, 514**

Theory requirements, 514  
Practical requirements, 514  
Auditing requirements, 515  
Study goal, 515  
Goals as an auditor and as a pc, 515

**HCO B 11 Dec. 1964 SCIENTOLOGY 0—PROCESSES, 516**

Pc end phenomena of Level 0, 516  
Routines, 5 17  
Wordings of routines, 518  
Routine 0-0 (Zero-Zero), 518  
Routine 0-A, 518  
Routine 0-B, 518  
Routine 0-C, 519

**HCO B 26 Dec. 1964 ROUTINE 0-A (EXPANDED), 520**

Steps of Routine 0-A (Expanded), 520  
Listen style co-audit, 521



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 JANUARY 1962

CenOCon  
Franchise

*HCO SECURITY FORM 19*

**LAUDATORY WITHHOLDS**

**Know to Mystery Processing Check**

(A Class II Auditor's Skill)

This is a most interesting and revelatory processing check. It may be done at any time but preferably after the last two pages of the Joburg (Form 3) and Form 6 on old Scientologists and Form HCO B 21 September 1961, Children's Sec Check, on others. Doing this check at once on brand-new people engages their interest and eases the way to more severe checks.

This check is run as follows:

Run 3 questions or 20 minutes of the check. Then run 10 minutes of the pc's havingness process. On any particularly hot trio of this check, go over the three again and again. It will be noticed that the check is divided in sections of 3 questions each for that purpose.

Use the current HCO British E-Meter. Many withholds dc; *not* show on other meters even when their *electrical* responses are the same as the British meter. The *mental* responses are not the same.

NEVER LEAVE A QUESTION UNFLAT ON ANY PROCESSING (SECURITY) CHECK. Nul the needle reaction before leaving any question (although an unflat question can be interrupted to run havingness).

Run in Model Session 21 December 1961 or later with Rudiments *IN*. Short session a pc to keep them in when the pc is restive. Do a thorough job on the withhold question in the rudiments even when doing a Processing (Sec) Check.

Use only instant reads. Repeat question exactly as written and see if it is nul before leaving it.

1. Have you ever withheld a vital piece of information?
2. Have you ever made anyone guilty of withholding vital information?
3. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others give vital information?
4. Have you ever withheld looking?
5. Have you ever made anyone guilty of not looking?
6. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others look?
7. Have you ever withheld emotion?
8. Have you ever made anyone guilty of being emotional?
9. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others emotional?

10. Have you ever withheld effort?
11. Have you ever made anyone guilty of using effort?
12. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others use effort?
13. Have you ever withheld thinking?
14. Have you ever made anyone guilty of thinking?
15. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others think?
16. Have you ever withheld symbols (words)?
17. Have you ever made anyone guilty of using symbols (words)?
18. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others use symbols (words)?
19. Have you ever withheld eating?
20. Have you ever made anyone guilty of eating?
21. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others eat?
22. Have you ever withheld sex?
23. Have you ever made anyone guilty of sex?
24. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others have sex?
25. Have you ever withheld a mystery?
26. Have you ever made anyone guilty of a mystery?
27. Have you ever prevented anyone from causing others a mystery?
28. Have you ever withheld waiting?
29. Have you ever made anyone guilty of waiting?
30. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others wait?
31. Have you ever withheld unconsciousness?
32. Have you ever made anyone guilty of unconsciousness?
33. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others unconscious?

34. Have you ever withheld anything?
35. Have you ever made anyone guilty of withholding?
36. Have you ever prevented anyone from telling a withhold?
37. Have you ever withheld security checking?
38. Have you ever made anyone guilty of security checking?
39. Have you ever sought to prevent another from security checking?

-----

The check may be continued using any specific knowledge, any perception, any emotion (see Tone Scale), any version of effort (force, strength), any version of thinking including doubt and suspicion, any version of symbols (including books), any version of sexual actions, any eating or consumption of anything (including money), any version of mystery including stupidity, any version of waiting, and any version of unconsciousness including sleep and chemical or physical means of producing sleep.

By running the general version first and then doing a survey of any pc's announced difficulties along the Know to Mystery Scale and then by putting down these items on the appropriate places in the check, great case gains can be made.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: sf jh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 9 JANUARY 1962

Sthil Course  
3D List

**3D CRISS CROSS**

To prevent misassessment I have been developing some new methods of obtaining a 3D package. Because goals lists get lost there is need also for ways of getting a 3D package without having the goal.

One of these is to run O/W on self, list the pc's answers and then ask the pc, "Who would you treat like that?" Bleed the meter and nul and you will find an item of the 3D package you can then use, either as criss cross or to get a goal and modifier. This is very workable and useful. It is most useful in 3D Criss Cross.

Further, if a pc blows clear on assessment, you can do the above, find his goal and modifier and get the Goals Problem Mass keyed back in again. The GPM will always key back in by finding the modifier to a goal.

-----

Criss Cross, complete, consists of the following steps:

1. Ask the pc "What kind of person or being haven't you liked?" and make a complete list.
2. Nul the list and locate one item that remains in (or was the last in). (Make sure ruds are in in all nulling.) (There may be more than one item staying in. If so take strongest read.)
3. Ask the pc "What kind of person or being have you liked?" and make a complete list.
4. Nul the list and locate one item as in 2.

The two resulting items are called TEST ITEMS. They are not necessarily 3D package items.

5. Write the item found in 2 at the top of a sheet of paper. Ask the pc "Who or what would oppose (item)?" Make a complete list. (Never suggest any item to a pc ever.) Bleed the meter for all items.
6. Nul this list down to one item (assessment by elimination as always, of course).
7. Write the item found in 4 down at the top of a sheet of paper and proceed as in 5.
8. Nul this list down to one item.
9. Write the item found in 5 at the top of a sheet and proceed as before.
10. Nul the list to one item.
11. Write the item found in 8 at the top of a sheet and proceed as before.
12. Nul down to one item as before.

Continue to do lists and items as in 9, 10, 11 and 12.

BE VERY ACCURATE IN FINDING THE RIGHT ITEM EACH TIME.

The two lists will eventually collide as a solid package. It will not be easy (or perhaps even possible) to find anything else on the case. When this condition is reached, you have 3D package items of high level, capable of being run.

When doing listing and nulling, carefully note whenever an item gave the pc a painful somatic or a dizziness. It will be the painful somatic type of item that is the terminal, the dizzy or “winds of space” item that is the oppterm.

13. Select which is terminal, which is oppterm by usual tests.
14. Find the goal, oppgoal and Modifier for the package.
15. Run with 3D type commands.

When this package is well discharged or blows, do another 3D Criss Cross using the items that were being run in 15 as the starting points for steps 5 on.

You will be rather amazed how much this type of assessment does for the case and how low a level case it can be done upon.

You're welcome.

L. RON HUBBARD  
LRH:cw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES  
9—10 January 1962

** 6201C09	SHSBC-97	Twenty-Ten—3DXX
** 6201C10	SHSBC-98	Sec Checks—Withholds

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JANUARY 1962

CenOCon  
Franchise

**SECURITY CHECKING  
TWENTY-TEN  
THEORY**

All valences are circuits are valences.

Circuits key out with knowingness.

This is the final definition of havingness.

*Havingness is the concept of being able to reach. No-havingness is the concept of not being able to reach.*

A withhold makes one feel he or she cannot reach. Therefore withholds are what cut havingness down and made runs on havingness attain unstable gains. In the presence of withholds havingness sags.

As soon as a withhold is pulled, ability to reach is *potentially* restored but the pc often does not discover this. It requires that havingness be run to get the benefit of having pulled most withholds.

Therefore on these principles, I have developed Twenty-Ten. Providing the following items are observed and the procedure followed exactly, Twenty-Ten will appear to work miracles rapidly.

**REQUISITES**

1. That the auditor is Class II (or Class IIb at Saint Hill).
2. That a British HCO WW Tech Sec approved meter is employed and no other.
3. That the auditor knows how to find the pc's havingness process (36 Havingness processes).
4. That the havingness process is tested for loosening the needle at the beginning of each time used.
5. That standard HCO Policy Letter Form Sec Checks are used. The last two pages of the Joburg and Form 6 for Scientologists, the childhood check and Form 19 for newcomers, the remainder of the Joburg and other checks for all
6. That the procedure of Twenty-Ten is exactly followed.

**TWENTY-TEN  
A Class II Auditor's Skill**

1. Use Model Session HCO B of 21 December 1961 or as amended.
2. For every Twenty Minutes of Security Checking run Ten Minutes of Havingness.

3. If the Security question is not nul when the Twenty Minutes period is ended, say to the pc, "Although there may be withholds remaining on this question, we will now run Havingness."
4. If an unflat question is left to run havingness, return to it after Ten Minutes of havingness and complete it.
5. Run by the clock, not by the state of the question or meter on both security questions and havingness.
6. Be prepared to have to find a new havingness process any time the one being used fails to loosen needle after 8 to 10 commands. Do can squeeze test before first havingness command and after 8 to 10 questions every time havingness process is used.
7. Do not count time employed in finding a havingness process as part of time havingness is to be run.
8. Use "Has a withhold been missed on you?" liberally throughout session. Use it heavily in end rudiments.

-----

### **Application to Goals Problem Mass**

The GPM is often curved out of shape by present life enturbulence to such an extent that only lock valences are available for assessing. This gives "scratchy needle" and also can lead to finding only lock valences.

Lock valences are appended to a real GPM 3-D item. They register and even seem to stay in but are actually impossible to run as 3-D items. An item found by an auditor and then proven incorrect by a checker was usually a lock item. If this happens, even the new item found by the checker may also be a lock item.

To uncover correct 3-D items it is better to run Twenty-Ten and other preparatory processes for 75 to 200 hours before attempting to get a 3-D package.

If the whole GPM keys out, one need only find a goal and MODIFIER to key it in again.

Preparatory time is not wasted as the same or greater amount of time is all used up anyway, at a loss to the pc, if a pc has a twisted GPM with earlier lock circuits abundantly keyed in in present time. In such cases (the majority) the preparatory time would be eaten up in keeping the pc in session, let alone improper items.

-----

Twenty-Ten is urgently recommended for immediate use in all HGCs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### **SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

11—16 January 1962

- |            |           |                     |
|------------|-----------|---------------------|
| ** 6201C11 | SHSBC-99  | How to Audit        |
| ** 6201C16 | SHSBC-100 | Nature of Withholds |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JANUARY 1962  
Reissued on 7 June 1967

Gen Non  
Remimeo  
Qual Hats  
Tech Hats  
Level VI Students  
& Above

## RESPONSIBILITY AGAIN

The common denominator of the Goals Problem Mass is “No Responsibility”. This is the end product that continues any circuit or valence.

This is a deterioration of Pan Determinism over a game into “No responsibility” as follows:

*No Previous or Current Contact* — No responsibility or liability.

*Pan Determinism* — Full responsibility for both sides of game.

*Other Determinism* — No responsibility for other side of game.

*Self Determinism* — Full responsibility for self, no responsibility for other side of game.

*Valence (Circuit)* — No responsibility for the game, for either side of the game or for a former self.

The Goals Problem Mass is made up of past selves or “valences”, each one grouped and more or less in a group.

Therefore, the characteristic of the part (the valence) is the characteristic of the whole, the collection of valences known as the Goals Problem Mass.

-----

The way a being is hung with persistent masses is the mechanism of getting him to believe certain things are undesirable. These, he cannot then have. He can only combat or ignore them. Either way, they are not as-ised. Thus they persist.

Only undesirable characteristics tend to persist. Therefore the least desirable valences or traits of valences persist.

The way not to have is to ignore or combat or withdraw from. These three, ignoring or combatting or withdrawing sum up to no having. They also sum up to no responsibility for such things.

Thus we can define responsibility as the concept of being able to care for, to reach or to be. To be responsible for something one does not actually have to care for it, or reach it or be it. One only needs to believe or know that he has the ability to care for it, reach it or be it. “Care for it” is a broader concept than but similar to start, change or stop it. It includes guard it, help it, like it, be interested in it, etc.

When one has done these things, and then had failures through overts and withholds, one cycles down through compulsive and obsessive care, reach and be and inverts to withdraw from, combat or ignore.



Along with ignore goes forgetting or occlusion. Thus a person has occlusion on past valences and past lives go out of sight. These return to memory only when one has regained the concept that they can be reached, or that one dares be them again or that one can care for them.

Herein is the cause and remedy of whole track occlusion.

-----

There are many uses of these principles.

Sec Checking gets off the overts and withholds and opens the gates.

All chronic somatics and behavior patterns are contained in valences and are not traceable to the current lifetime since one can reach present life, is caring for present life and is being present life, so present life is an area of responsibility.

All real difficulty stems from no responsibility.

However, one can use these principles even on present life with considerable gain.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:sfjp.cden  
Copyright © 1962, 1967  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
17—18 January 1962

** 6201C17	SHSBC-101	Anatomy of 3D GPM
6201C18	SHSBC-102	3D Criss Cross—GPM

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 22 JANUARY 1962

Sthil  
CenOCon

**3D CRISS CROSS  
METHOD OF ASSESSMENT**

The proper sequence of action in a 3D Criss Cross Assessment is as follows:

(1) LIST LIST

However the test item of a list is determined, the essence of the first step is to list a list. This can be the list to determine a test item or an opposition list.

There are several LINES in 3D Criss Cross. Each line is derived from a test item and is thereafter continued by opposition items. LINES are lettered. Each line is an independent zig-zag of opposition items. A line can begin by using any terminal established in old Routine 3, 3A or original 3D. Or it can begin by a test item derived from an arbitrary list such as Dislike, Like, Who by O/W, Dynamic Assessment, a Pre-hav level assessment on the pc and Who or what would \_\_\_\_\_, a list of withholds or outflows.

The essence of all this is that one takes a button and pushes it to get a list.

The List is *always* derived from the pc, without suggestion by the auditor. It is the *pc's* list and what happens to it is up to the pc.

The auditor pushes the button and thereafter is an interested writer of a list (while keeping the pc in session).

We do not care how short or how long this list is. The average list is about 25 items. If less than 12, we consider the pc is ARC broke. If more we only know that the "can't reach phenomenon" has set in. In the "can't reach phenomenon" the pc keeps listing because he "can't quite say exactly what it is". This is an actual sensation. The answer is to go on listing until the pc has expressed it to his satisfaction. The phenomenon is: the pc *couldn't* reach the right wording as it is too heavily charged and only by giving more and more items is the charge bled off and then the pc, able to reach it, can say it.

The essence is to get a list as thorough as possible without putting the pc under a strain. Pc must remain interested. Forcing pc to list more and more and more when he's had enough wrecks the value of 3D Criss Cross.

The list should be numbered, should be on legal (foolscap) in two columns. *Readable.* You don't recopy lists.

Date the list, put the pc's name on it, and the full question the pc is being asked to get it at the top of the page. The back side of the paper can be used.

Additional sheets can be used. But if so, name, date and item from which list is coming must be written at the top of second sheets.

Numbering the items has little value but it may be done.

Do not keep pc on meter while listing.

(2) RUN HAVINGNESS

You will see a pc getting dopey or drowsy while listing or nulling. It is good auditing to run the pc's havingness process each time you notice this. Nulling is

accurate even when the pc is anaten, but things blow *much* faster if havingness is run.

After listing (or during listing if, as rarely happens, pc goes drowsy) run some havingness.

Put pc on meter while running havingness. Test havingness process each time used.

### (3) DIFFERENTIATE THE LIST

Assessment in 3D Criss Cross is aimed at straightening up the bank as much as obtaining items.

Lists which won't nul on repetitive assessment by elimination have not been differentiated, or the ruds are out, or the list is incomplete in that the wanted item isn't on it. A 3D item is heavily charged and when mentioned discharges much of the list.

The essence of this Differentiation Step is to read each item to the pc and have pc briefly explain how the item\_\_\_\_\_ (whatever the list came from).

This is done easily and in a friendly and interested fashion. It's the pc's list. The answer that must be ascertained by the auditor is whether the *pc* wants the item left on or taken off the list. This makes the pc look. And it blows charge rapidly.

This step is done with the pc *off* the meter. The atmosphere is easy and pleasant.

When the differentiation is in progress pc may want to add to the list. Let the pc add what he or she likes. Put whatever is added always at the bottom of the list.

Pc is taken off the meter for this step.

### (4) NUL LIST

Put the pc on the meter. Make sure there are no *session* invalidations or withholds (as different from life invalidations and withholds) and begin nulling out the list.

This action is done in a brisk, business-like, staccato fashion. Each item on the list is said exactly three times with only enough pause to see if there is an instant read (about 1/2 second between speaking the item each time). The auditor then acknowledges and says, "It's in" or "It's out." Patter would be, "Tiger, Tiger, Tiger. Thank you. It's in." Mark.

"Cat, Cat, Cat. Thank you. It's out." Mark. No interval between items read except the split second necessary to mark.

Pc is expected to be silent during nulling. One does not consult the pc unless the ruds go out. One answers the pc if the pc originates but then only TR 4. One doesn't enter into discussions with the pc. If ruds go out all will go nul. If this happens, quickly pull *session* invalidations or withholds, and get going with nulling.

If the item clearly reads in any one of the three reads leave it in. If in doubt leave it in.

Nul with sensitivity at 16.

If consecutive items which have heretofore been live vanish, suspect session invalidations and withholds, clear them, and pick up the earliest consecutive X where this might have happened and carry forward with nulling as before.

Treat the list as a wheel. When you arrive at the bottom begin at once at the top.

Use a slash mark / before the item if it is in. Use a cross if the item goes out. If whole list goes bad and you have to re-nul it, use other side of item (to right of item), then use a different coloured ball-point. Black for original and second nulling. Red for third nulling. Green for fourth nulling. A second nulling goes after the item. This code applies only to flubbed lists as a whole—for instance whole list goes nul.

You can be left with two items in a list derived from a *test* item. Use both, but only if they are clearly of opposite character, not the same thing in another form.

At the end of nulling a test item list (first item of a line), you should have one or two live items. If one, put it under the line you're doing on a Line Plot. If two, put one under the line you are doing and use the other for a new line. There are rarely two left on opposition lists.

## (5) CHECK ITEM

When the item is found, check it out.

Get ruds in, run a bit of havingness.

See if item is still registering. If not get the ruds in better and do so until item reads well.

Now read an already nulled item on the list, then read the found item, then read a nulled item, then the found item.

Do this until you are sure all items on the list except the found item are nul.

If found item goes out, get the ruds in.

-----

When you have found the item and checked it out, put it under its proper Line on the Pc's Line Plot.

The Line Plot is a sheet of white foolscap (legal) with three columns across the top of each side, Line A, Line B, etc, with an indication of how each line was derived (Dislike, Like, Who O/W, Dynamic Assessment, etc).

Every one of these lines is itself. It does not cross over to other lines.

A Line is a list of found 3D items each in opposition to the last item on that Line. The Line is a series of zig-zags, with an item at each zig and at each zag. Any pair, a zig plus a zag, could be a 3D package that would run. We want at least five lines. We want all the items we can get on one line.

Inevitably, sooner or later, all lines will either coincide into a 3D package that will only derive itself when listed or the pc goes to OT by assessment.

There is a basic problem between every pair of items on one line in a Line Plot. Getting the pc to describe that problem helps blow charge.

-----

When listing, differentiating or nulling, every time the pc gets a pain, write "PN" after the item. Every time an item makes a pc feel dizzy or he gets winds of space, write "SEN" after that item. When you finally come to run a package you could tell what is the pc's term (pain) and what is the pc's oppterm (sen) by studying the lists to see what *type* of item consistently gives the pc pain or sensation. Thus no error is made on selecting the terminal or further test needed.

## ERRORS IN ASSESSMENT

The whole action 1 to 5 above is called *Assessment*.

The first error is poor E-Meter skill.

The second error is just lousy, ARC breaky auditing.

The third error is carrying a line by oppters too deep beyond the other lines. Do lines one at a time in rotation. Don't keep oppterming a line on and on and forget the other lines.

Fourth error is failing to note the ruds going out and getting off *session* invalidations and withholds.

Fifth error is not getting a long enough list to include the 3D item you're after.

-----

You can unburden a case of hundreds of found 3D items (thousands of list items). This makes terrific case gains, item by item found. You have never seen such fast case gains as a well done 3D Criss Cross by assessment alone providing the auditing is well done and these steps are followed.

-----

Use only a Mark IV E-Meter. The others don't register well enough to detect 3D Criss Cross reads.

-----

Chanting a Modifier is not done in 3D Criss Cross.

-----

Don't let anybody not a Class II even attempt to learn 3D Criss Cross.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:sf.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 23 - 25 January 1962

** 6201C23	SHSBC-103	Basics of Auditing
** 6201C24	SHSBC-104	Training—Duplication
** 6201C25	SHSBC-105	Whole Track

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 JANUARY 1962

Franchise  
Sthil

**FLOW PROCESS**

(A Class I or Class IIb Skill)

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

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

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

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

The most important flows can be listed as follows:

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

All ridges and masses develop around these flows.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## *FLOW PROCESS*

WHAT HAD TO BE OUTFLOWED?

WHAT HAD TO BE WITHHELD?

WHAT HAD TO BE INFLOWED?

WHAT HAD TO BE HELD OFF?

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:sf.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## **SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

30 January—1 February 1962

** 6201C30	SHSBC-106	In-sessionness
** 6201C31	SHSBC-107	Usages of 3DXX
** 6202C01	SHSBC-108	Flows

Franchise

## FLOWS, BASIC

A flow is a progress of energy between two points. The points may have masses. The points are fixed and the fixedness of the points and their opposition produce the phenomena of flows.

There are two flows, when viewed from one point.

- (a) Outflow.
- (b) Inflow.

These flows are modified by being accelerated and restrained.

The acceleration and restraint as applied by a thetan can be classified by many attitudes. The basic attitudes are covered in the CDEI Scale—Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit.

For purposes of processing these attitudes become

- 1. Permissible.
- 2. Enforced.
- 3. Prohibited.
- 4. Inhibited.

This scale inverts from outflow to inflow so that you have

PERMISSIBLE  
ENFORCED  
PROHIBITED  
INHIBITED  
INHIBITED  
PROHIBITED  
ENFORCED  
PERMISSIBLE.

This gives us eight attitudes toward flows. We have two flows, Inflow and Outflow and so there are then sixteen Basic Flows that affect a case strongly. As we add brackets (another for another, self for others, etc) we get additional flows, of course. But these sixteen are basic.

Since it is an *inversion*, expressed in the same way above and below Inhibited, we can list flows for processes, rudiments, assessments, sec checks and other purposes as *eight*, remembering we have an inversion that will occur in the processing, but the lower and upper harmonic covered by the same words.

For all general purposes, these then are the listed flows that are actually used by the auditor in lists, commands, etc.

PERMISSIBLE OUTFLOW.  
PERMISSIBLE INFLOW.  
ENFORCED OUTFLOW.  
ENFORCED INFLOW.  
PROHIBITED OUTFLOW.  
PROHIBITED INFLOW.  
INHIBITED OUTFLOW.  
INHIBITED INFLOW.

If you wish to “see” this better, make a point on a piece of paper and draw the flows. Or audit them or get audited on them.

The basic aberration is *withheld* flow and all of these flows in a session are aberrative only if the pc is withholding telling the auditor about the flow.

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 1 FEBRUARY 1962

All Auditors doing  
3DXX

**3D CRISS CROSS  
ASSESSMENT TIPS**

LISTING: To get a list to Differentiate and Nul rapidly, the list must be *complete*.

It is assumed there will be one or more heavily charged items on a list. Unless this charge is blown, a SCRATCHY NEEDLE, DISINTEREST IN DIFFERENTIATION and HARD NULLING may result. The bulk of the list consists, not of errors, but of LOCK VALENCES. When the lock valences are off the top of the Item, the pc can state the item.

There is a phenomenon here wherein the pc “can’t quite say it”, “can’t reach it”, “hasn’t said it right ..” “All this adds to an actual feeling of distance from the item, or wrongness. It is a feeling. It has flows connected with it. So long as the pc has this *feeling* of not quite right, the list does *not* contain the actual item. And if it does not, then disinterest in Differentiation, hard nulling and scratchy needle may result.

The answer to this phenomenon (call it Incompleteness) is to get more items listed. Do *not* let the pc just sit and comm lag and reject wordings. Take them all down. Every one rejected is really a lock valence, so get it down on the list. Keep the pc giving items, “trying to phrase it right”. And put down whatever pc says.

If pc is on meter during listing, you’ll see a heavy fall when the item comes on.

Don’t consider a list complete until the pc can answer an unequivocal “Yes” to this question: “Are you sure that you’ve stated the correct item yet?” or “Are you satisfied we’ve got all the things that would \_\_\_\_\_?” or “Have you phrased the item to your complete satisfaction?”

This is the complete list. It is better to complete a list by questioning the pc about its completeness than by bleeding meter, as an unskilled auditor can get a read on ARC Break and keep asking for items each time he gets the ARC Break read caused by asking for items.

A poor list can be caused by:

1. Line being started is of no possible interest to pc. (True only of the start of a line and for the question being used to get a line.)
2. A dissatisfaction on the part of the pc as to having stated the item correctly.

**METHODS FOR LINES**

The best ways to start a line in order of workability are:

1. Assessment of the 8 flows for the pc’s chronic flow and use it for a line “Who, what would (flow)”. This can be done over and over, getting one flow, then another, each time by assessment of remaining flows.

2. Assessment of Pre-Hav Scale on “You” for a level and getting items for that PH Level. (Aux PH Scale.) Listing “Who—what would\_\_\_\_\_” or appropriate wording. Then doing new PH assessment for next line.
3. A Problems Intensive to locate chronic problems, etc, and listing “Who—what would oppose \_\_\_\_\_”.
4. Dynamic Assessment.  
Finding Dynamic, listing “Who or what would represent (dynamic)”.  
Finding new Dynamic when first items found.
5. The direct question, “What do you really consider is wrong with you?” or “What are you being audited to change?” (Best for new HGC pcs on their *first* intensive.)
6. Assessing whole Know-to-Mystery Scale for most reaction. Then “Who or what would\_\_\_\_\_?”
7. Arbitrary selection, dislike, like, first dynamic o/w, etc.

-----

## DIFFERENTIATION

There is no pat wound-up doll question for Differentiation. The more the wound-up doll repetitive question approach is used the less good the pc gets out of Differentiation.

In Differentiation of a list, we want the pc to:

1. Look.
2. Decide if item belongs or doesn't.
3. What the item named is in relation to the item the list came from.

To do Differentiation, the pc must be in session.

Differentiation *blows* the lock valences. A pc with ruds out blows nothing. Therefore, there is no substitute for ruds in and pc in session.

Auditors who interpret this on their own flow patterns, think In session means different types of flow from pc. It's just “Willing and able to talk to the auditor”. And “Interested in own case”.

An auditor who's interested in the pc is also interested in the list. Stiff, rugged, mechanical formality and Differentiation just don't go together.

During Differentiation remove any item from the list that the pc says to remove, add any new item pc wants added.

Don't suggest any item to pc ever or suggest the removal of an item.

-----

Nulling and Checking are covered earlier.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 3 FEBRUARY 1962

All Sthil Students

**3DXX FLOWS ASSESSMENT**

Assess the following by elimination (as in nulling).

List "Who or what would (line found)". Complete list. (Continue listing until pc knows he's said it.) Find item by usual steps.

Do whole operation twice for two items. Both go on same line.

All items on a flow line are done by assessing flows not by oppterming as in other lines. You can continue to repeat the same operation for item after item:

PERMISSIBLE OUTFLOW  
ENFORCED OUTFLOW  
PROHIBITED OUTFLOW  
INHIBITED OUTFLOW  
PERMISSIBLE INFLOW  
ENFORCED INFLOW  
PROHIBITED INFLOW  
INHIBITED INFLOW

PERMISSIBLE OUTFLOW FROM SELF  
ENFORCED OUTFLOW FROM SELF  
PROHIBITED OUTFLOW FROM SELF  
INHIBITED OUTFLOW FROM SELF  
PERMISSIBLE INFLOW ON SELF  
ENFORCED INFLOW ON SELF  
PROHIBITED INFLOW ON SELF  
INHIBITED INFLOW ON SELF

PERMISSIBLE OUTFLOW FROM ANOTHER  
ENFORCED OUTFLOW FROM ANOTHER  
PROHIBITED OUTFLOW FROM ANOTHER  
INHIBITED OUTFLOW FROM ANOTHER  
PERMISSIBLE INFLOW ON ANOTHER  
ENFORCED INFLOW ON ANOTHER  
PROHIBITED INFLOW ON ANOTHER  
INHIBITED INFLOW ON ANOTHER

PERMISSIBLE OUTFLOW FROM OTHERS  
ENFORCED OUTFLOW FROM OTHERS  
PROHIBITED OUTFLOW FROM OTHERS  
INHIBITED OUTFLOW FROM OTHERS  
PERMISSIBLE INFLOW TO OTHERS  
ENFORCED INFLOW TO OTHERS  
PROHIBITED INFLOW TO OTHERS  
INHIBITED INFLOW TO OTHERS

There are thirty-two flows on a flows assessment for sec checks, or 3DXX.

LRH:sf.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 FEBRUARY 1962

Franchise

*URGENT*

**MISSED WITHHOLDS**

The one item Scientologists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is MISSED WITHHOLDS and the upsets they cause.

EVERY upset with Central Orgs, Field Auditors, pcs, the lot, is traceable to one or more MISSED WITHHOLDS.

Every ARC Breaky pc is ARC Breaky because of a Missed Withhold. Every dissatisfied pc is dissatisfied because of MISSED WITHHOLDS.

We've got to get a flaming reality on this.

**WHAT IS A MISSED WITHHOLD?**

A missed withhold is not just a withhold. Please burn that into the stone walls. A Missed Withhold is a withhold that existed, *could have been picked up* and was MISSED.

The mechanics of this are given in the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Lecture of 1 February 1962.

The fact of it is stated in the Congress Lectures of the D.C. Congress of December 30-31, Jan. 1, 1962.

Since that Congress even more data has accumulated. That data is large, voluminous and overwhelming.

The person with complaints has MISSED WITHHOLDS. The person with entheta has MISSED WITHHOLDS. You don't need policies and diplomacy to handle these people. Policy and diplomacy will fail. You need expert auditing skill and a British Mark IV meter and the person on the cans and that person's MISSED WITHHOLDS.

A MISSED WITHHOLD is a withhold that existed, was tapped and was not pulled. Hell hath no screams like a withhold scorned.

A MISSED WITHHOLD programme would not be one where an auditor pulls a pc's withholds. A MISSED WITHHOLD programme would be where the auditor searched for and found when and where withholds had been available but had been MISSED.

The withhold need not have been asked for. It merely need have been available. And if it was not pulled, thereafter you have a natterly, combative, ARC Breaky or entheta inclined person.

THIS is the only dangerous point in auditing. This is the only thing which makes an occasional error in the phrase, "Any auditing is better than no auditing." That line is true with one exception. If a withhold were available but was missed, thereafter you have a bashed-up case.

## HOW TO AUDIT IT

In picking up *Missed Withholds* you don't ask for withholds, you ask for missed withholds.

Sample question:

"What withhold was missed on you?"

The auditor then proceeds to find out what it was and who missed it. And the Mark IV needle is cleaned of reaction at Sensitivity 16 on every such question.

Gone is the excuse "She doesn't register on the meter." That's true of old meters, not the British Mark IV.

And if the pc considers it no overt, and can't conceive of overts, you still have "didn't know". Example: "What didn't an auditor know in an auditing session?"

### SAMPLE MISSED WITHHOLD SESSION

Ask pc if anyone has ever missed a withhold on him (her) in an auditing session. Clean it. Get all reactions off the needle at Sensitivity 16.

Then locate first auditing session pc had. Flatten "What didn't that auditor know?" "What didn't that auditor know about you?"

For good measure get the ruds in for that first session. In auditing an auditor, also do the same thing for his or her first pc.

Then pick up any stuck session. Treat it exactly the same way. (If you scan the pc through all his auditing ever from the cleaned first session to present time, the pc will stick in a session somewhere. Treat that session the same as the first session. You can scan again and again, finding the stuck sessions and get the withholds off in that session and the ruds in as above.)

Clean up all sessions you can find. And get what the auditor didn't know, what the auditor didn't know about the pc, and for good measure, get in the other ruds.

Cleaning up an old session will suddenly give you all the latent gain in that session. It's worth having!

This can be extended to "What didn't the org know about you?" for those who've had trouble with it.

And it can be extended to any life area where the pc has had trouble.

### SUMMARY

If you clean up as above withholds that have been missed on any pc or person, you will have any case flying.

This then is not just emergency data for use on flubbed intensives. It is vital technology that can do wonders for cases.

ON ANY CASE THAT HAS BEEN AUDITED A PART OF AN INTENSIVE, BEFORE GOING ON THE AUDITOR SHOULD SPEND SOME TIME LOCATING WITHHOLDS HE OR SHE MIGHT HAVE MISSED ON THAT PC.

Any pc that is ending a week's auditing should be carefully checked over for withholds that might have been missed.

Any pc that is ending his or her intensives should be most carefully checked out for missed withholds. This makes sudden auditing gains.

Any case not up to recognizing overts will respond to “didn’t know about you” when the case doesn’t respond to “withhold”.

Any student should be checked weekly for missed withholds.

Any person who is giving an auditor, the field, the Organization, a course or Scientology any trouble should be gotten hold of and checked for missed withholds.

It is provenly true on five continents that *any* other meter reaches only occasionally below the level of consciousness and the British Mark IV reaches deeply and well. It is dangerous to audit without a meter because then you really miss withholds. It is dangerous to audit without knowing how to really use a meter because of missing withholds. It is dangerous to audit with any other meter than a British Mark IV. It is SAFE to audit if you can run a meter and if you use a British Mark IV and if you pull all the withholds and missed withholds.

EVERY blow-up you ever had with a pc was due ENTIRELY to having missed a withhold whether you were using a meter or not, whether you were asking for withholds or not.

Just try it out the next time a pc gets upset and you’ll see that I speak the usual sooth.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: sf.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
2—8 February 1962

** 6202C06	SHSBC- 111	Withholds
** 6202C07	SHSBC- 112	Missed Withholds
** 6202C08	SHSBC- 109	3DXX Assessment

sthil  
CenOCon

## HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS

I have finally reduced clearing withholds to a rote formula which contains all the basic elements necessary to obtain a high case gain without missing any withholds.

These steps now become THE way to clear a withhold or missed withhold.

### AUDITOR OBJECTIVE

The auditor's object is to get the pc to look so that the pc can tell the auditor.

The auditor's objective is *not* to get the pc to tell the auditor. If the pc is *in session* the pc will talk to the auditor. If the pc is not in session, the pc won't tell the auditor a withhold. I *never* have any trouble getting the pc to tell me a withhold. I sometimes have trouble getting the pc to *find out* about a withhold so the pc can tell it to me. If the pc will not tell the auditor a withhold (and the pc knows it) the remedy is rudiments. I always assume, and correctly, that if the pc knows about it the pc will tell me. My job is to get the pc to find out so the pc has something to tell me. The chief auditor blunder in pulling withholds stems from the auditor assuming the pc already knows when the pc does not.

If used exactly, this system will let the pc find out and let the pc get all the charge off of a withhold as well as tell the auditor all about it.

Missing a withhold or not getting all of it is the *sole source* of ARC break.

Get a reality on this now. All trouble you have or have ever had or will ever have with ARC breaky pcs stems only and wholly from having restimulated a withhold and yet having failed to pull it. The pc never forgives this. This system steers you around the rock of missed withholds and their bombastic consequences.

### WITHHOLD SYSTEM

This system has five parts:

0. The Difficulty being handled.
1. What the withhold is.
2. When the withhold occurred.
3. All of the withhold.
4. Who should have known about it.

Numbers (2) (3) and (4) are repeated over and over, each time testing (1) until (1) no longer reacts.

(2) (3) and (4) clear (1). (1) straightens out *in part* (0).

(0) is cleaned up by finding many (1)'s and (1) is straightened up by running (2) (3) and (4) many times.

These steps are called (0) Difficulty, (1) What (2) When (3) All (4) Who. The auditor must memorize these as What, When, All and Who. The order is never varied. The questions are asked one after the other. None of them are repetitive questions.

### USE A MARK IV

The whole operation is done on a Mark IV. Use no other meter as other meters may read right electronically without reading *mental* reactions well enough.

Do this whole system and all questions at sensitivity 16.

## THE QUESTIONS

0. The suitable question concerning the Difficulty the pc is having. Meter reads.
1. What. "What are you withholding about .....?" (the Difficulty) (or as given in future issues).  
  
Meter reads. Pc answers with a w/h, large or small.
2. When. "When did that occur?" or "When did that happen?" or "What was the time of that?"  
  
Meter reads. Auditor can date in a generality or precisely on meter. A generality is best at first, a precise dating on the meter is used later in this sequence on the same w/h.
3. All. "Is that all of that?" Meter reads. Pc answers.
4. Who. "Who should have known about that?" or "Who didn't find out about that?" Meter reads. Pc answers.

Now test (1) with the same question that got a read the first time. (The question for (1) is never varied on the same w/h.)

If needle still reads ask (2) again, then (3), then (4), getting as much data as possible on each. Then test (1) again. (1) is only *tested*, never worked over except by using (2), (3) and (4).

Continue this rotation until (1) clears on needle and thus no longer reacts on a test.

Treat every withhold you find (or have found) in this fashion always.

## SUMMARY

You are looking at a preview of PREPARATORY TO CLEARING. "Prepclearing" for short. Abandon all further reference to security checking or sec checking. The task of the auditor in Prepclearing is to prepare a pc's rudiments so that they *can't* go out during 3D Criss Cross.

The value of Prepclearing in case gain, is greater than any previous Class I or Class II auditing.

We have just risen well above Security Checking in ease of auditing and in case gains.

You will shortly have the ten Prepclearing lists which give you the (0) and (1) questions. Meanwhile, treat every withhold you find in the above fashion for the sake of the preclear, for your sake as an auditor and for the sake of the good name of Scientology.

(Note: To practise with this system, take a withhold a pc has given several times to you or you and other auditors. Treat the question that originally got it as (1) and clean it as above in this system. You will be amazed.)

LRH:sf.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE

13 February 1962

\*\* 6202C13 SHSBC-110 Prep Clearing



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 FEBRUARY 1962

Sthil

**3D CRISS CROSS ITEMS**

All items found by 3D Criss Cross must be checked out for consistent read by an Instructor before being placed on a pc's Line Plot.

The item must be checked out by the pc's auditor first as usual before being checked out by an Instructor.

An Instructor is only to see if Item reads consistently on meter and to instruct student appropriately if it does not. The Instructor is not to find the correct item but direct that it be found.

Completeness of list is not to be otherwise checked or checked separately.

LRH:sf.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 FEBRUARY 1962

CenOCon  
Franchise  
Co-audit Centres

**CO-AUDIT & MISSED WITHHOLDS**

It could be that Co-Audit falls off because of missed withholds.

Drop at once any general O/W on the Co-Audit or *any* effort to pull withholds except by an Instructor.

This should improve Co-Audit attendance.

Use the old Comm process or responsibility process or any other Co-Audit instead.

LRH:sf.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6202C14	SHSBC-117	Directing Attention
** 6202C15	SHSBC-118	Prepchecking
** 6202C20	SHSBC-113	What Is a Withhold?
** 6202C21	SHSBC-114	Use of Prepchecking

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 FEBRUARY 1962

Franchise  
CenOCon

## WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL

I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge.

I don't appeal to reason. Only to faith at the moment. When you have a reality on this, nothing will shake it and you'll no longer fail cases or fail in life. But, at the moment, it may not seem reasonable. So just try it, do it well and day will dawn at last.

What are these natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, lost PE members, ineffective motions? *They are restimulated but missed or partially missed withholds.* If I could just teach you that and get you to get a good reality on that in your own auditing, your activities would become smooth beyond belief.

-----

It is true that ARC breaks, present time problems and withholds all keep a session from occurring. And we must watch them and clear them.

But behind all these is another button, applicable to each, which resolves each one. And that button is the restimulated but missed or partially missed withhold.

-----

Life itself has imposed this button on us. It did not come into being with security checking.

If you know about people or are supposed to know about people, *then* these people expect, unreasonably, that you know *them* through and through.

Real knowledge to the average person is only this: a knowledge of his or her withholds! That, horribly enough, is the high tide of knowledge for the man in the street. If you know his withholds, if you know his crimes and acts, then you are *smart*. If you know his future you are moderately wise. And so we are persuaded towards mind reading and fortune telling.

All wisdom has this trap for those who would be wise.

Egocentric man believes all wisdom is wound up in knowing his misdemeanors.

IF any wise man represents himself as wise and fails to discover what a person has done, that person goes into an antagonism or other misemotion toward the wise man. So they hang those who restimulate and yet who do not find out about their withholds.

This is an incredible piece of craziness. But it is observably true.

This is the WILD ANIMAL REACTION that makes Man a cousin to the beasts.

A good auditor can understand this. A bad one will stay afraid of it and won't use it.

-----

The end rudiment for withholds for any session should be worded, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

-----

Any ARC broke pc should be asked, "What withhold have I missed on you?" Or, "What have I failed to find out about you?" Or, "What should I have known about you?"

-----

An auditor who sec checks but cannot read a meter is dangerous because he or she will miss withholds and the pc may become very upset.

-----

Use this as a stable datum: If the person is upset, somebody failed to find out what that person was sure they would find out.

-----

A missed withhold is a should have known.

-----

The only reason anyone has ever left Scientology is because people failed to find out about them.

-----

This is valuable data. Get a reality on it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :sf.cden  
Copyright ©1962  
L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
22—27 February 1962

** 6202C22	SHSBC-119	Prepclearing and Rudiments
** 6202C27	SHSBC-115	Prepchecking
** 6202C27	SHSBC-116	Auditor's Code

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 MARCH 1962

Franchise

## PREPCHECKING

(A Class II Skill)

A new way of cleaning up a case in order to run Routine 3D Criss Cross has suddenly emerged as more powerful in obtaining case gains than any previous process in Scientology.

I developed Prepchecking in order to get around an auditor's difficulty in "varying the question" in pulling withholds. Auditors had a hard time doing this, hence Prepchecking.

But Prepchecking became quickly more important than a "rote procedure for Sec Checking". The potentiality in really cleaning up a case's withholds is Mest Clear! If, of course, done by Prepchecking.

Any goal Freud ever had is *easily* achieved by Prepchecking in a relatively few hours if done by a thoroughly trained Class IV auditor. Goals Freud never dreamed of rise beyond that point.

In Prepchecking one uses the Withhold System, HCO Bulletin of February 12, 1962. But Prepchecking has *exact* targets and exact procedure.

In Prepchecking one uses the rudiment questions one at a time as the body of Model Session. Havingness, however, is taken up last as a Prepcheck question.

-----

The target of a Prepcheck question is a chain of withholds.

A withhold chain behaves exactly like any chain. The bottom of the chain is the *basic*. The withholds on the chain will stay partially alive, even when covered, until the basic (first) withhold on the chain is fully recovered. Then the entire chain goes nul.

The definition of a Chain is: A series of incidents of similar nature or similar subject matter. (See *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*.)

The first incident of any chain is fully or partially unknown to the person.

-----

## THE MECHANICS OF PREPCHECKING

One uses the whole subject to be cleared as the *zero* question. Sub zero questions are marked 0A.

Each 0A has a Number One question which is taken from a withhold given on asking the 0A question.

The Number One question is worked with the When All Who of the Withhold question until it either disappears or obviously won't clear easily. Many withholds may be given relating to Number One. If it doesn't clear, one steers earlier by asking Number 1A, text taken from the withholds given in Number One. If 1A's *What* question doesn't clear on the meter after several withholds and When All Who is used liberally on each, one asks Question Number 1B.

Continuing What questions are asked and worked with the Withhold System, until the earliest incident of the chain is found and cleaned up. This should clear the whole chain.

One then reworks all the previous What questions on the Zero A Chain and leaves Zero A when all the previous Whats are clear.

One can clean some of the What questions, find a new branch and ask more What questions.

---

## ADMINISTRATION

The auditor writes down only what the auditor says (the Zero and What questions) plus any cognitions of the pc he cares to write.

He doesn't do a steno record of what the pc says, only the Zeros and Whats the auditor asks.

---

## THE MAGIC PHRASE

The magic question is "Is there any incident like that earlier?" Or any version of it.

The pc's attention tends to stick near present time.

The auditor must press the pc gradually back down the Chain to basic, cleaning up what he can as he goes, realizing, if the Chain is long and hot, that it won't clean until basic is reached.

The pc, on a charged chain, cannot go earlier until charge is moved off it by using the withhold system on each withhold the pc gives, (When All Who, test What. If What still charged on meter, another When All Who).

Basic is sometimes wholly unknown to pc, sometimes known only as a picture.

Unknown parts exist throughout the chain.

---

Sample:

0. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

0A. Have you ever done anything to an organization? (Zero A found by Dynamic Assessment.)

1. What about being jealous of a leader?

(1. Question found from a withhold given by pc in response to the Zero A being asked, "I was jealous of my lodge president." This is enlarged at once by auditor to be more general.)

Several withholds come off, all about leaders, each withhold well worked by the When All Who of the withhold system.

Then the 1 is still alive but pc gives a withhold about stealing money from an organization. This is a new *type* of withhold, but is *similar* on the chain as it's still about organizations.

1A. What about stealing money from an organization? (Question 1A derived by pc's given withhold.)

This 1A is worked by the Withhold System until pc gives a withhold still on organizations but having to do with wrecking a car belonging to a company.

1B. What about damaging organization property? Etc. Etc.

When the first overt is found and fully revealed by the When All Who of the Withhold System (maybe 1F) then 1F will clear fully as a *What* question. One then reworks the 1E, 1D, 1C, 1B, 1A and one. The auditor may clean 1E, 1D and find a new

series on the same chain, giving him a new 1E and 1D after which all Whats including the Number One will go clean if worked a bit more. This up and down may happen more than once. This ends the chain labelled in Zero A as Organizations, providing Zero A is now nul.

-----

### CONTROL PC'S ATTENTION

Work only one subject at a time. Keep pc on the subject of the chain.

Try not to start new chains when old Zero A's exist uncleared.

Start new Zero A's only when an old Zero A is cleared fully.

-----

The pc is doing well only when you have TA action. Complete chains started always but choose those that will give TA action during Prepchecking.

-----

### DON'T USE O/W

Use no version of withholds to clean up rudiments for a Prepcheck session. You'll find yourself steered off yesterday's Zero A. Use only old non O/W processes to clean rudiments in a Prepcheck session. For withhold rud, add "Since last session".

-----

### HOW TO DERIVE ZEROS

The modern Model Session Rudiments are the Zeros in all cases.

-----

### HOW TO DERIVE ZERO A's

Derive Zero A's as follows:

For "Are you willing, etc" do a Dynamic Assessment on pc and use its results. When this is cleared, do another Dynamic Assessment. Etc. Finally pc will talk to auditor about anything.

-----

For Withhold rudiment, use the Joburg and (on a Scientologist) Form 6A as 0A questions.

-----

For Present Time Problem use the whole of the Problems Intensive HCO Bulletin of November 9, 1961.

-----

For Half Truth use "Have you ever told a half truth?"

For Untruth, use "Have you ever told a lie?"

For Impress Anyone use "Have you ever tried to impress anyone?"

For Damage use "Have you ever damaged anyone?"

-----

For Meter, use itself.

For Withholds, use "What withhold have you only partially revealed?"

-----

For Goals use "Have you ever set impossible goals for anyone?"

For Gains, use "Have you ever propitiated anyone?"

For Orders and Commands, use "Have you ever made anyone obey?"

-----

The purpose of Prepchecking is to set up a pc's rudiments so they will stay in during further clearing of the bank.

-----

If a pc goes back track and out of this lifetime, let him or her go back track using the same system. Don't persuade pc to go back track.

-----

Asking the *What* question is the most skilled action of Prepcheck. The rule is as follows:

The *What* question must ask about the part of the withhold most dangerous to the pc's survival, and must not be too broad to miss the chain or too narrow to get only that one withhold. The supposition is that the pc has done similar things; the *What* question must also be capable of getting these.

There is only one exception to converting the pc's withhold to a *What* question directly.

If the pc does one of four things, the auditor asks a *What* question directly relating to the subject mentioned by the pc.

These four things are:

Pc gives Somebody else's withhold, gives a *MOTIVATOR*, gives a *CRITICISM* of someone or an *EXPLANATION*, then Auditor gives a *What* question, in each case, as follows: "What have you done to (subject mentioned by pc)?"

-----

Learning to Prepcheck is like learning to ride a bicycle. All of a sudden you can ride it.

Prepchecking gives high pc gains when done well, higher than any previous process.

-----

The auditor expects the pc to talk to him. The auditor does not prevent the pc from giving up withholds. Pcs, unlike in Sec Checking, talk glibly and easily while being Prepchecked.

-----

The only middle ruds you use are (frequently) "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and the half truth, etc, end rud question.

Use "Have I missed a withhold on you?" in the end rudiments rather than "Are you withholding anything?" while Prepchecking.

-----

There are some tapes extant on Prepcheck Sessions I have given.

Good hunting.

LRH:sf cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L RON HUBBARD

[This HCO B is corrected by HCO B 24 June 1962, *Prepchecking*, page 88.]

\*\* 6203C01 SHSBC- 120 Model Session I

\*\* 6203C01 SHSBC-121 Model Session II.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 MARCH 1962

Franchise  
Sthil  
CenOCon

**THE BAD “AUDITOR”**

It is time we spent time on improving auditing skill.

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

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

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

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

1. The natural auditor.
2. The dangerous auditor.

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

The *dangerous* auditor is not afraid to be found out (for who is questioning him or her while he or she is auditing?). The *dangerous* auditor is the auditor who is afraid to find out, afraid to be startled, afraid to discover something, afraid of what they will discover. This phobia prevents the “auditor” from flattening anything. This makes missed withholds a certainty. And only missed withholds create ARC breaks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Class I—Repetitive Process, run in sequence*

REVELATION PROCESS X1

What could you confront?

What would you permit another to reveal?

What might another confront?

What might another permit you to reveal?

What would you rather not confront?

What would you rather not have another reveal?

What might another hate to confront?

What might another object to your revealing?

What should be confronted?

What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?

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

*Class II—Prepchecking Zero Question*

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

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

*Class III—Routine 3D Criss Cross*

Find Line Items as follows:

Who or What would be afraid to find out? (then get oppterm of resulting item)

Who or What would prevent a discovery? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would startle someone? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would be unsafe for you to reveal? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would be dangerous for another to reveal? (then oppterm it)

Note: We'll run CCHs, run according to the very earliest data on them, given again on two Saint Hill Briefing Course Tapes (R-10/6106C22SH/Spec 18, "Running CCHs" and R-12/6106C27SH/Spec 21, "CCHs—Circuits"), benefit any case and are not relegated to the psychotic by a long ways. The CCHs do a remarkable job in making a good auditor for various reasons. The first CCH (Op Pro by Dup) was invented exclusively to make good auditors. The CCHs 1 to 4 are run each one in turn,

only so long as they produce change and no longer, before going on to the next. When is a CCH flat so that one can go on to the next CCH? When three complete cycles of the CCH have a uniform comm lag it can be left. My advice in straightening out or improving any auditor is to first flatten the CCHs 1 to 4, and then flattening all in one run Op Pro by Dup. This would be regardless of the length of time the auditor had been auditing in Dianetics and Scientology. Then I would do the Class II and Class III processes above, preferably doing the Class III items first, then the Class II so it could go whole track, or doing the Class II, then the Class III and then the Class II again.

-----

## SUMMARY

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is added to by HCO B 15 March 1962, *Suppressors*, which is on the following page.]

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 19—20 March 1962

** 6203C19	SHSBC-122	The Bad "Auditor"
** 6203C19	SHSBC-123	Mechanics of Suppression
** 6203C20	SH TVD-1	3DXX Assessment
** 6203C20	SH TVD-2	3DXX Assessment (cont.)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 MARCH AD 12

Franchise  
Sthil  
CenOCon

*ADD HCO BULLETIN 8 March 1962  
THE BAD "AUDITOR "*

### **SUPPRESSORS**

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

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

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

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

### **THE ROUGH PC**

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

The first observation of this must be credited to John Sanborn, Phoenix, 1954, who remarked to me in an auditor's conference, "Well, I don't know. I don't think this pc is getting on (the one he was staff auditing). I keep waiting for him to say, 'Well, what do you know!' or 'Gosh!' or something like that and he just grinds on and on. I guess you'd call it 'No cognition' or something." John, with his slow, funny drawl, had put his finger on something hard.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

-----

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

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

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

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

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

Also add (t) who is a Black Five.

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

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

Some auditors suppress only one type of person or case and audit others passably. Husbands as auditors tend more to fear what their wives may reveal to them and wives as auditors tend to suppress more what their husbands may reveal to them. Thus husband-wife teams would be more unlucky than other types of auditing teams as

a general rule, but this is not invariable and is now curable if they exclusively run on each other only suppression type processes.

*Add Class I*  
REVELATION PROCESS X2

What wouldn't you want another to present?  
What wouldn't another want you to present?  
What have you presented?  
What has another presented?

*Class II—Added Zero Question:*

Have you ever suppressed anything?

*Class III—Add Lines:*

Who or What would suppress an identity? (oppterm it)  
Who or What would make knowledge scarce? (oppterm it)  
Who or What would not want a past? (oppterm it)  
Who or What would be unconfontable? (oppterm it)  
Who or What would prevent others (another) from winning? (oppterm it)  
Who or What should be disregarded when you're getting something done?  
(oppterm it)  
Who or What would make another realize he or she hadn't won?  
(oppterm it)

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MARCH 1962

Franchise

## **PREPCHECKING DATA**

### **WHEN TO DO A WHAT**

Prepchecking can be defeated by failing to ask a *What* question at the proper time.

If you ask the *What* question when a pc gives you a vague generality, you will find yourself doing a “shallow draft” Prepcheck that never gets any meat.

When you obtain a generality early on after the Zero question, you make it a Zero A.

You never ask a *What* question until you have managed to get a single specific overt.

Only when the pc has been steered into stating an actual overt, do you ask the *What* question and write it down.

And when the pc gives you a specific overt, you frame the *What* question so as to take in the whole possible chain of similar overts. A chain is a repetition of similar acts.

Example:

Wrong: Pc says, “I used to disconcert my mother.” Auditor says and writes down, “What about disconcerting your mother?” as his *What* question. Of course the prepchecking goes lightly nowhere.

Right: Pc says he used to disconcert his mother. Auditor steers pc into a specific time. Pc finally says, “I jumped out on her and startled her one time and she dropped a tray of glasses.”

Now the auditor has a specific overt. The chain will be startling his mother. The *What* question, then, which is written down and asked is, “What about startling your mother?” and the first incident the pc gave is worked over. If the needle doesn’t fall when this *What* is asked, then the auditor asks for an earlier time he startled his mother. This *What* question is worked on different startlings of mother and *only* on startlings of mother until the needle is cleaned on that *What* question.

Then one asks the Zero A, “Have you ever disconcerted your mother?” The needle reacts. The auditor fishes around for a specific other incident. Finally gets, “I used to lie to her.” Now it would be an awful goof to give the *What* question on this one, as the pc has given no specific incident. But the needle reacted, so the auditor writes a Zero B, “Have you ever lied to your mother?” and then nags away at the pc until a specific time is recovered: “I told her I was going out with boys when in actuality, I dated a girl she hated.” Now write the *What* question: “What about lying to your mother about dating girls?” and work over that one time the pc gave with the When A11 etc. If the needle reacts on the *What* question after a couple times over the When A11 etc, ask for an earlier time. Get another specific incident, work it over.

Test the *What* question, work over exact withholds and find more incidents earlier until that *What* question is clean on the needle. Then ask the Zero B. If it’s clean write nul after it. If not find a new *What* on that subject as above.

When the Zero B is clean, ask the Zero A. If that’s clean, write nul after it. If not, find a new chain. And that’s the way it goes.

Working only generalities and never specific incidents wrecks all value of prepchecking and upsets the pc with missed withhold.

If the pc does come up with a withhold *not* on the chain (example: while doing above *What*, pc says, “I also lied to my father”) write notation (“Lied to father”) on margin for later reference and leave it alone. Don’t pursue it. Work only one chain at a time.

Q and A is a serious thing in Prepchecking.

---

### **Moving Tone Arm**

If you fail to get tone arm action while working a chain of overts on a pc (less than .25 division per 20 minutes) you are working a profitless chain. Clean it up a bit and leave it. Your Zero A is probably quite wrong. Be sure and ask, “Have I missed a withhold on you?” and clean *it* before so abandoning a chain.

You want TA motion in Prepchecking. Find Zero and Zero A questions that do move the TA.

It is a violation of the Auditor’s Code to continue to audit processes that do not produce change. Or to stop processes that do produce change. This applies to chains and subjects selected for Prepchecking.

---

### **Social Mores**

The criteria of what is a *hot* withhold depends utterly on the pc’s idea of What Is An Overt. It does not depend on what the auditor thinks an overt is.

The pc is stuck in various valences in the Goals Problems Mass. Each has its own *Social Mores*. They may m t agree with or apply to current life morality at all. This can cause trouble in Prepchecking.

Example: Pc is stuck in the valence of a Temple Priestess. Auditor is a bit fuddy on being a school principal. Auditor keeps looking for sexual misconduct with small boys. It isn’t on pc’s case. Result, no TA action. Finally almost by accident, knowing nothing about the pc’s GPM yet, the auditor disgustedly asks, “Have you ever failed to seduce anybody?” and bang! *That’s* a Zero A to end all Zero A’s and the pc gives up “overt” after “overt”, failed to seduce her husband’s friend, her sister’s boyfriend, her kindergarten teacher, etc, etc, etc, with two divisions of TA motion.

“Have you ever tried to cure anyone?” is a fine Zero question for all killer types.

Prepchecking is at its best *after* one knows some GPM items from doing 3D Criss Cross.

What *are* the mores of a Temple Priestess and how has the pc violated them in this life?

Prepchecking is wonderful at any time but it really soars when one knows some of the pc’s terminals.

This lifetime hasn’t added anything to the GPM. It’s just keyed it in. We live in quiet times.

---

### **Don’t Forget “Guilty”**

A fine Zero question is “making others guilty”.

“Have you ever tried to make anyone guilty?” Pc says Policemen, he guesses. Needle reacts. Auditor writes Zero A, “Have you ever tried to make a policeman



guilty?” He fishes for an actual incident, finds the pc bawled out a traffic officer, writes the *What*, “What about bawling out cops?” and we’re away.

-----

### **Add Appear**

In the Withhold System, add “Appear, Not Appear” after All.

The question sequence becomes for any one incident:

When?  
All?  
Appear?  
Who?

The next time around use “Not Appear”

When?  
All?  
Not Appear?  
Who?

The phrasing of this is, “What appeared there?” or some such wording. And “What failed to appear?” for the next round.

This injects “Afraid to find out” into Prepchecking with great profit and knocks the Not-Is off the withhold.

This will run a whole track incident.

-----

### **Whole Track**

If the pc goes back of this lifetime, let him or her go back. Now that Appear is part of the Withhold System, it’s unlikely the pc will hang up and get stuck. *But* the golden rule of Prepchecking is to always work specific incidents, work them one at a time, and go to an earlier incident if an incident doesn’t clear easily on the needle.

Two times through When, All, Appear, Who should free locks, ten times through should clean any engram.

If the chain you’re working isn’t moving the TA, you’re up to your neck in red herrings. Clean “Have I missed a withhold on you?” and abandon it.

-----

### **Unknown Pins Chains**

There is always an unknown-to-the-pc incident or piece of incident at the bottom of every chain. Only an unknown incident can make a chain of incidents react on the needle.

You will always find that a chain will be sticky until the unknown incident or piece of incident at the bottom of it is revealed. When you’ve got it fully revealed, the chain will go nul. The chain will not go nul until its basic is reached. It can be this lifetime or a former life. But it sure is unknown to the pc. That’s “Basic on a Chain”.

-----

### **Recurring Withholds**

The pc that gives the same withhold over and over to the same or different auditors, has an unknown incident underlying it. All is not revealed on that Chain.

## Missed Withholds

If you ask a pc if another auditor has missed a withhold on him or her and find one, you have a profitable chain to work in many cases.

-----

## Rudiments in Prepchecking

When you are running a chain and in the next session you find rudiments out and use any form of withhold question, the pc throws the session into a new chain and you will find yourself unable to get back to yesterday's session.

This utterly defeats Prepchecking. Do not let it happen. In a Prepcheck session, when getting rudiments in, avoid any suggestion of withhold questions. Use only processes that avoid O/W entirely. See early Model Sessions.

Example: Pc has Present Time Problem. It won't resolve with two-way comm. *Don't* ask for withholds about it or you'll ruin your control of what's to be Prepchecked. Use Responsibility or Unknown on the problem. For Room use Havingness. For Auditor use "Who would I have to be to audit you?."

Exception: In a Prepcheck Session Ruds ask for Withholds since last session. Ask this pointedly. "Since the *last session*, have you done anything you are withholding from me?" If you get a needle reaction, ask the same question again, very stressed. Buy only an exact answer to that question.

If you use any version of O/W in the rudiments in a Prepcheck session you open the door to a new chain and you'll spend the whole session on new chains without completing yesterday's session. This results in a scrambled case. You have lost control of the session.

-----

Prepchecking is a precious tool.

This bulletin covers errors being made or material evidently needed for successful Prepchecking.

I can tell you that if Prepchecking doesn't make a case fly for you, you need training on meters and auditing. This is one process that's a doll and if you can make it work you can do more for a case per session than any being in history.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:phjh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

21 March—3 April 1962

** 6203C21	SHSBC-124	Prepchecking
** 6203C21	SHSBC-125	Prepchecking
** 6203C27	SHSBC-130	Prepchecking Data
** 6203C29	SHSBC-126	CCHs
** 6203C29	SHSBC-127	Q-and-A Period
** 6204C03	SHSBC-131	The Overt-Motivator Sequence

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 MARCH 1962

Franchise

## **CCHs AGAIN**

### **WHEN TO USE THE CCHs**

We have today three major processes (and are about to get the bit of Class IV).

These processes are:

1. The CCHs
2. Prepchecking
3. 3D Criss Cross
4. Running 3D Criss Cross Items

Into this scheme of things the CCHs loom largely. They are our foremost “familiarization” processes that permit the pc to confront control and duplication.

In actual fact 3D Criss Cross goes “further south” than Prepchecking. And the CCHs go, of course, much further south than 3D Criss Cross.

The whole criteria is *tone arm motion*. If you do not get more than a quarter of a division of tone arm motion in 20 minutes of Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross, the pc probably should be run on the CCHs.

Here is a matter of no matter why there is no tone arm action, just put the pc on CCHs. As Mary Sue has said, this is a boon to any D of P. The D of P simply sees that the pc is getting only slight tone arm action after a session or two and then puts the pc on CCHs with no further reasoning or figure-figure on the case.

It does not matter *why* the pc gets slight tone arm action. It could be that the auditor is running the wrong Zero questions. It could be the way the auditor *or* the pc is doing or not doing. Don’t try extensively to figure out *why* no Tone Arm Action, just transfer the pc to the CCHs.

For how long? Until all CCHs (1 to 4) are runnable without somatics and reasonably flat.

This way you’ll get more wins, better gains.

Here is a typical case in point. A case was audited on Routine 3D, 3D XX, Sec Checking and Prepchecking for 260 hours. In all that time one half a tone arm division was all the change except during one series of 4 sessions when she got one tone arm division on one particular Zero question. At the end of this time the pc had made some small gains but was still incapable of recognizing her own overts. It would have been *far* better to have run a hundred hours of the CCHs first.

On this case, and others, the only significant tone arm action was achieved by tactile havingness (touching things), which always brought the tone arm down one division. Tactile havingness, as you will see, is a CCH type of process.

Thus one concludes that the CCHs (even though pcs are not metered of course while doing CCHs) produced tone arm action while the higher level processes did not.

Therefore, a helpful (but not final) test. If you get no real tone arm action on Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross listing and nulling, and you do get tone arm action asking the pc to touch things (laying down and picking up the cans often to check the TA position) you have a CCH pc. But this test is not needful if you just follow the rule, “No TA action on 3D Criss Cross or Prepchecking more than a quarter of a division every 20 minutes, transfer the pc to CCHs.”

Here is another test, which has sense but again is not vital to make. If the pc gets tone arm motion just discussing being audited, and relatively little in Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross, it's timesaving to transfer the case to the CCHs.

If you notice lots of TA action on Havingness and little tone arm action on Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross, you have a clear indication that CCHs will be all that will move the case.

If you notice lots of TA action on trying to clear the auditor in the rudiments it's probably best to use the CCHs. Now if only rudiments type Zero questions (beginning and end rudiments) move the TA in Prepchecking, but other things don't, it's a CCH case.

If the pc, for whatever reason, doesn't get tone arm action from any verbal process, old-time, or current, don't investigate the reason. It may lie with the auditor or pc. Just change over to the CCHs.

If you like, you can use a meter to handle beginning and end rudiments on a pc you're running on the CCHs. It would probably help and make things run faster. This is not mandatory, but knowing what we do about withholds, it might be safer.

Remember, the CCHs must be run right. The two bulletins best covering them are:

HCO Bulletin of November 2, 1961, "Training CCHs" HCO Bulletin of June 23, 1961, "Running CCHs"

Even if you think you know all about the CCHs, read these two bulletins again before you attempt them.

The CCHs expired in value after 1957 because the original method of running them was altered. There's only one way to run the CCHs and you have both the above bulletins to tell you how. They're the original CCHs and the original method of running them.

This then is the third bulletin in this sequence. It tells you *when* to run the CCHs. HCO Bulletin of November 2, 1961, tells you how each one is run. HCO Bulletin of June 23, 1961, tells you how they're run as a series on a pc. And now we can state here *When*.

A lot of stuff about CCHs being only for psychos has not helped their use. We now find that cases a long way from psycho won't move easily unless the CCHs are used first.

"A lot of Tone Arm Motion" is defined as at least three-quarters of a division motion on the Tone Arm dial in any 20 minutes of auditing.

"Not much Tone Arm Motion" is defined as one-quarter of a division of Tone Arm Motion in 20 minutes of auditing.

Judgment must be used in this, of course. You can have a pc who usually gets good Tone Arm Motion but, for a session, gets little. That doesn't mean jump to the CCHs. If the pc is routinely subject to Not Much Tone Arm Motion, you must switch to the CCHs.

Ds of P, Staff Auditors, and Field Auditors, watch the auditor's reports and look back through the pc's file. You'll find a lot of enlightenment on why the pc was "tough". No Tone Arm Motion.

I hope this sorts it out for you. It has for me.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[HCO B 2 Nov. 61, *Training CCHs*, was not by LRH and is not in these volumes. See page 310 for the revision of HCO B 2 Nov. 61.]

**CCHs**  
**AUDITING ATTITUDE**

This is an important bulletin. If you understand it you will get results on hitherto unmoving cases and faster results (1 hour as effective as a former 25) with the CCHs.

Here is what happened to the CCHs and which will continue to happen to them to damage their value:

The CCHs in their most workable form were *finalized* in London by me in April 1957. That was their high tide of workability for the next five years. After that date, difficulties discovered in *teaching them to auditors* added extraordinary solutions to the CCHs (not by me) which cut them to about one twenty-fifth of their original auditing value. Pcs thereafter had increasing difficulty in doing them and the gain lessened.

How far were the CCHs removed from original CCH auditing? Well, the other night on TV I gave a demonstration of the proper original CCHs which produce the gains on pcs. And more than twelve old-time auditors (the lowest graded ones out of 36) thought they were watching a demonstration of entirely foreign processes.

Although these auditors had been “well trained” on the CCHs (but not by me) they did not see *any* similarity between how they did them and how they saw me do them. Two or three students and two instructors thought they were being done *wrong*. Even the higher ranking students were startled. They had never seen CCHs like this.

*Yet*, the pc was very happy, came way up tone, lost a bad before-session somatic and within 48 hours had a complete change in a chronic physical problem, *all in 11/2 hours* of proper original CCHs.

The students and instructors “knew they weren’t watching the correct CCHs” because there was no antagonism to the pc, because the Tone 40 was not shouted, because there was no endurance marathon in progress. There was just quiet, positive auditing with the pc in good, happy 2-way communication with the auditor and the auditor letting the pc win.

In the student auditing of the next two days, some shadow of the demonstration’s attitude was used *and the cases audited gained much faster* than before. Yet at least two or three still feel that this is far too easy to be the CCHs.

In five years, the CCHs, not closely supervised by me, but altered in training, had become completely unrecognizable (and almost resultless).

Why?

Because the CCHs were confused with Op Pro by Dup which was for auditors. Because the CCHs became an arduous *ritual*, not a way to audit the pc in front of you. The CCHs became a method of auditing without communicating, of running off strings of drills without being there. And the CCHs are so good that even when done wrong or even viciously they produced some slight gain. The CCHs shade from bright white to dark grey in results, never to black.

Having been perverted in training to a system to make auditors audit them, they became something that had nothing to do with the pc.

What these students saw demonstrated (and which upset them terribly) was this:

The auditor sat down, chatted a bit about the coming session with the pc, explained in general what he was about to do. The session was started. The auditor explained the CCH 1 drill in particular and then began on it. The pc had a bit of embarrassment come off. The auditor took the physical reaction as an origination by the pc and queried it. The routine CCH 1 drill went on and was shortly proved flat by three equal responses. The auditor went to CCH 2. He explained the drill and started it. This proved to be flat. The pc did the drill three times without comm change. The auditor explained and went to CCH 3. This also proved flat and after a three times test, the auditor came off it, explained CCH 4, and went to CCH 4. This proved unflat and was gradually flattened to three equally timed correct responses by the pc on a motion the pc could not at first do. About 50 minutes had elapsed so the auditor gave a ten minute break. After the break the auditor went back to CCH 1, found it flat, went to CCH 2 and found the pc jumping the command and, by putting short waits of different lengths before giving commands, knocked out the automaticity. The auditor went on to CCH 3, found it flat, and then to CCH 4 which was found unflat and was accordingly flattened. The auditor then discussed end ruds in a general way, got a summary of gains and ended the session.

All commands and actions were Tone 40 (which is *not* “antagonism” or “challenge”). *But* the pc was kept in two-way comm between full cycles of the drill by the auditor. Taking up *each new physical* change manifested *as though it were an origin* by the pc and querying it and getting the pc to give the pc’s reaction to it, this two-way comm was *not* Tone 40. Auditor and pc were serious about the drills. There was no relaxation of precision. But both auditor and pc were relaxed and happy about the whole thing. And the pc wound up walking on air.

These were the CCHs properly done. With high gain results.

The viewers saw no watchdog snarling, no grim, grim PURPOSE, no antagonistic suspicion, no pc going out of session, no mauling, no drill-sergeant bawling and KNEW these couldn’t be the CCHs. There was good auditor-pc relationship (better than in formal sessions) and good two-way comm throughout, so the viewers KNEW these weren’t proper CCHs.

Well, I don’t know what these gruelling blood baths are they’re calling “the CCHs”. I did them the way they were done in April 1957 and got April 1957 fast results. And the processes aren’t even recognized !

So somewhere in each year from April 1957 to April 1962 and somewhere in each place they’re done, additives and injunctions and “now I’m supposed to’s” have grown up around these precise but easy, pleasant processes that have created an unworkable monster that is called “the CCHs” but which definitely isn’t.

Not seeing the weird perversions but seeing the slow graph responses, the vast hours being burned up, I began to abandon recommending the CCHs after 1959 as too long in others’ hands. I didn’t realize how complicated and how grim it had all become.

Well, the *real* CCHs *done right*, done the way they’re described here, are a fast gain route, easy on auditor and pc, that goes all the way south.

Take a reread of the June and November bulletins of last year (forget the 20 minute test, 3 times equally done are enough to see a CCH is flat) and, not forgetting your Tone 40 and precision, laying aside the grim withdrawn militant auditor attitude, try to do them as pleasantly as you find them described in the above outlined session, and be amazed at the progress the pc will make.

The CCHs easy on auditor and pc? Ah, they’d observed a lot of CCHs and never any that were *easy* on auditor or pc. Everybody came to know it was a bullying, smashing, arduous mess, a fight in fact. The only trouble was, the gains vanished when the ARC ran out.

Today, put *any* pc on the *original* CCHs done as above until they’re flat, then go to 3D Criss Cross and the pc will fly.

Surely you don't have to look and sound so hungry, disinterested and mean when you audit the CCHs. You want to *clear* this pc, not make him or her into a shaking wreck. The CCHs are easily done (when they're done right).

They'll get lost again, too, unless you remember they can get lost.

I believe Upper Indoc should be canceled in Academies and extra time put on just the CCHs as it is the Upper Indoc attitude carried over that makes the CCHs grim.

## SUMMARY

The PURPOSE of the CCHs is to bring the pc through incidents and into present time. It is the reverse of "mental" auditing in that it gets the pc's attention exterior from the bank and on present time. By using Communication, Control and Havingness this is done. If you make present time a snarling hostility to the pc, he of course does not want to come into present time and it takes just that much longer to make the CCHs work.

You do the CCHs with the Auditor's Code firmly in mind. Don't run a process that is not producing change. Run a process as long as it produces change. Don't go out of 2-way comm with the pc.

Complete every cycle of the process. Don't interject 2-way comm into the middle of a cycle, use it only after a cycle is acknowledged and complete.

Don't end a process before it is flat. Don't continue a process after it is flat.

Use Tone 40 Commands. Don't confuse antagonistic screaming at the pc with Tone 40. If you *have* to manhandle a pc, do so, but only to help him get the process flat. If you have to manhandle the pc you've already accumulated ARC breaks and given him losses and driven him out of session.

Improve the ability of a pc by gradient scale, give the pc lots of wins on CCH 3 and CCH 4 and amongst them flatten off what he hasn't been able to do.

The CCH drills must be done precisely by the auditor. But the criteria is whether the pc gets gains, not whether the auditor is a perfect ritualist.

Exact Ritual is something in which you should take pride. But it exists only to accomplish auditing. When it exists for itself alone, watch out.

Audit the pc in front of you. Not some other pc or a generalized object.

Use the CCHs to coax the pc out of the bank and into present time.

Take up the pc's physical changes as though they were originations. Each time a new one occurs, take it up with 2-way comm as though the pc had spoken. If the same "origination" happens again and again only take it up again occasionally, not every time it happens.

Know what's going on. Keep the pc at it. Keep the pc informed. Keep the pc winning. Keep the pc exteriorizing from the past and coming into present time.

Understand the CCHs and what you're doing. If it all deteriorates to mere ritual you'll take 25 to 50 times the time necessary to produce the same result as I would.

The auditing is for the pc. The CCHs are for the pc. In auditing you win in the CCHs only when the pc wins.

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 APRIL 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN**

Here is some good news for you. Recently I completed surveys on pcs establishing the general workability of processes. From there I found there was a simple way of establishing what should be run on a given pc.

The entire test is by tone arm action.

The table follows:

Considerable tone arm action during rudiments—do CCHs.

No tone arm action during rudiments and no decent tone arm action on prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross—do CCHs.

Considerable tone arm action during havingness processes—do CCHs.

Minimal tone arm action during 3D Criss Cross—do CCHs.

Minimal tone arm action during prepchecking—do CCHs.

Good tone arm action during listing in 3D Criss Cross—do 3D Criss Cross.

Good tone arm action during prepchecking—do prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross.

There is a phenomenon known as the “Drift Down” which is not actual tone arm action. The pc starts in on prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross with the tone arm high, and as listing goes on the arm gradually drifts down and lingers on and on at the lower read. This is not really tone arm action. The pc is just drifting toward the read of an item. In this the tone arm does not go up or down, back and forth. It just drifts slowly and evenly down over the first half hour period of listing and stays there.

Similarly, there is the “Drift Up” of the tone arm during prepchecking or listing. The constantly rising needle gradually raises the tone arm up to a high read which finally just stays there. This “Drift Up” is not actually tone arm motion. It is just the pc’s refusal to confront.

By “considerable”, “good” or “adequate” tone arm action, we mean about three-quarters of a division change in twenty minutes of auditing. Judgement has to be used in establishing this action, as for many minutes a tone arm may hang up even on an easy case before it begins to move again.

By minimal tone arm action we mean a quarter of a division change in twenty minutes of auditing, or less.

The secret is this. When the tone arm moves it is because mass is changing. When a pc is *being* the mass and no other mass or thing he cannot view it, as there is nothing there to view the mass but the mass. Thus we get cases that cannot as-is. These cases are just being the one valence or the mass or the somatic without being or seeing anything else.

The pc can be a mass or a valence however and still view another mass or valence.



When the pc can do this we get reaction between two masses and therefore tone arm change. Also a pc who is being himself and is capable of viewing a mass will get tone arm change.

It requires two locations to get a tone arm change—the location of the pc and the location of the mass. If two such points of reference do not exist the pc cannot view anything outside of what he is being, and thus there is no as-iness of mass. When the pc *is* what the pc needs to have audited and cannot view it, then we get no as-ising and therefore no change of mass, since it is a one point situation as opposed to a two point situation.

When we have a pc who is being a mass and cannot see anything or be anything but that mass, then we get no tone arm action on any subjective process. Everything we ask the pc to think we get little or no action on the tone arm because there is no shift of mass—and there is no change of case either and won't be. *But* when we have this same pc looking at the auditor we do get the viewing of an outside mass and so we do get tone arm action. Hence when rudiments produce tone arm action it is obvious that the pc gets his change by viewing things in the room and the CCHs are indicated. When this same pc does not get tone arm motion on a thinkingness process, that clinches the matter for the CCHs.

Also, in doing the CCHs, we have to take a somatic or a twitch or any pc reaction as an origin by the pc and call the pc's attention to it by asking him quietly about it. This makes the pc view it and when the pc does the pc gets exterior to it and so the mass changes. Thus two way comm of this type is *vital* to the pc's progress and lack of it multiplies the time in processing tremendously.

-----

Any Director of Processing *must* follow these rules in studying daily case reports. By looking over the pc's tone arm action, providing the auditor has recorded it frequently in prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross, the Director of Processing can tell at once what progress is being made.

It goes further than that. You just mustn't run a pc on prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross where the pc is getting minimal tone arm action session after session. Only the CCHs can be run. Do not let an auditor audit 3D Criss Cross if the auditor takes two weeks to find an item routinely. And don't let a pc be run on prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross unless good tone arm action routinely results. To do otherwise than follow these indications is to flagrantly waste auditing.

The only exception to this is that every pc must be regularly checked out for missed withholds. Only if this is done will the pc stay in session or be happy about his auditing.

-----

This will greatly lessen your worries as an auditor and as one supervising other auditing. Use it.

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6204C17	SHSBC-132	Auditing
** 6204C17	SHSBC-133	How and Why Auditing Works
** 6204C19	SHSBC-134	Gross Auditing Errors
** 6204C19	SHSBC-135	Determining What to Run
** 6204C24	SHSBC-136	Rundown on 3DXX, Part I
** 6204C24	SHSBC-137	Rundown on 3DXX, Part II.
** 6204C25	SH TVD-3	Checking Line Plots

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 APRIL 1962

Franchise

**CCHs**  
**PURPOSE**

A long time ago—in 1949—while doing research in Dianetics, I experienced considerable trouble in getting some pcs “up to present time”.

As you know, a pc can get “stuck in the past”, and if you can get a pc *out* of his engrams and reactive mind (his perpetuated past) he becomes aware of the present. He or she is unaware of the present to the degree that shock or injury has caused an arrest in time.

After running an engram, we used to tell the pc to “Come to present time” and the pc would, ordinarily, but sometimes no.

By telling the pc to examine the room, the return to present time could be accomplished on many.

I observed that a common denominator of all aberration was interiorization into the past and unawareness of the present time environment.

Over the years, I developed what became the CCHs.

Control, In-Communication-With, and Havingness of Present Time became feasible through certain drills of Control, Communication and Havingness, using the present time environment.

This is the purpose of the CCH drills—getting the pc out of the past and into present time. Any drill which did this would be a CCH drill, even “Come Up to Present Time!” as a single command.

The pc is stuck not just in engrams but in past identities. In fact the pc out of present time *is being* the past.

The pc can be made to see he is being the past and that there is a present.

Thus when the pc “has a somatic” and you ask the pc what it was, you get him or her to differentiate between self and past by looking. A being who *is* something, cannot observe it. A being who looks at something, ceases to be it. A pc can even *be a* somatic!

Hence the CCHs must be run with a non-forbidding present time, with queries about somatics and changes.

It’s all as simple as that, basically. That’s why they work—they get the pc to Present Time. But only if they are run right. Only if they invite the pc to progress.

Run wrong, the CCHs can actually drive a pc *out* of present time or park him or her in the session.

Do you see, now?

LRH:jw.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6204C26	SHSBC-138	Rundown on Prepchecking (Professional Attitude)
** 6204C26	SHSBC-139	Rundown on Routine 3: Routine 3DXX

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 APRIL 1962

Franchise

**RECOMMENDED PROCESSES HGC**

After considerable study of various results I have come to the conclusion, which may be refined later, that the best shotgun for all cases is a combination of the CCHs, Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross used in a certain specific and definite way with certain and specific indicators as to when and how they are employed.

At this time there are no better processes than these three. Properly processed on these three there are no cases which cannot be moved. Whereas many old-time repetitive processes achieved wonderful results on this or that special case, no such process ever achieved results on all cases. Therefore it could be said that we have only this combination of processes which give us remarkable results on all cases—the CCHs, Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross.

The only liability which these three types of processing have is that they require very well trained auditors and very precise application. But training skills are now such that certainly at Saint Hill all difficulties in teaching these processes have been overcome. Given some six months a student can be taught to use these with such skill as to cause a preclear to gape in wonder at the rapidity of his advance. The beauty of these processes is that they are susceptible to precision training and are precision actions. If a preclear has peculiar and special things wrong with him or if the preclear is very difficult these three processes properly administered will achieve success without special understanding of the case by the auditor.

But make no error about the precise nature of administration. There are very few maybe's in the administration of these three processes. There are definite answers to every problem or difference in preclears that may be encountered. Therefore if we are to attain high level sweeping clearing in Scientology we cannot compromise with the level of auditor training. I do not say that all auditors need to be trained at Saint Hill, but I do say that all auditors so far arrived as students at Saint Hill were far, far below any required level of skill to make these processes broadly work. But we can and are overcoming this skill factor, not only at Saint Hill but in Central Orgs which have Saint Hill graduates in their technical divisions. The only real technical trouble I have seen lately occurred in Orgs where no graduate of Saint Hill was yet posted.

**METHOD OF USE**

The CCHs, according to my latest finding, should be used in company with Prepchecking. The CCHs use the extroversion factor of present time. Prepchecking gives us the introversion factor.

The system is to prepcheck the pc to a win, in one, two or three sessions, and then CCH the pc to a win in one, two or three sessions. Use one then the other, then the first again then the second. Alternate these two skills, each time to a win. Use neither more than four sessions consecutively. Don't use them both in one two-hour session. Devote the whole of any session to either one or the other. Use a meter and rudiments only in the Prepcheck sessions. Use no meter or rudiments in the CCHs sessions.

In doing Prepchecking use the precise system developed to date, but use only rudiments questions as the zero questions. The end product of Prepchecking used this way is to achieve better tone arm action and rudiments that will stay in when we come to 3D Criss Cross.

If the pc, while being given his preclear assessment, shows excellent tone arm action on the think type of assessment question (which is most of it), then the pc could be put directly onto 3D Criss Cross, and the CCHs and Prepchecking by-passed. But if after a while or at any time the pc's tone arm action became poor and rudiments became very hard to keep in, the pc would be returned to or started on again CCHs and Prepchecking until a session was more possible on 3D Criss Cross.

If minimal tone arm action was present during the preclear assessment then the pc would be put at once on CCHs and Prepchecking as above.

This is how these three activities, CCHs, Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross, should be used. Use the CCHs against Prepchecking until rudiments go in very easily or stay in and the tone arm has excellent action. Then go into 3D Criss Cross. But if rudiments on 3D Criss Cross become consistently difficult and tone arm action drops, the auditor should return the pc to CCHs and Prepchecking until tone arm action is regained and 3D Criss Cross can be continued.

Thus we see that the CCHs and Prepchecking are used to get the pc into session and keep him easily in session, and the 3D Criss Cross is used for longrange permanent case gain. One does not try for real case gain with CCHs and Prepchecking even though real gain exists in the use of these processes. One tries for real gain with 3D Criss Cross.

### LIMITATIONS OF USE

Oddly enough it has been found that 3D Criss Cross is easier to learn than Prepchecking, and any auditor who can prepcheck can rapidly learn 3D Criss Cross. But it is also interesting that Prepchecking is necessary to know before one does 3D Criss Cross, due to meter experience and rudiments. It is easier to read a meter under Prepchecking than under 3D Criss Cross. But one has to be more skilled as an auditor in pressing home to do Prepchecking than to do 3D Criss Cross.

If an auditor can do skilled Prepchecking and get results his battle with auditing is three-quarters over. The rest is very easy.

### A FINAL WORD

There is nothing less than complete precision required of today's auditor. That precision can be learned and is being learned. It is marvellous to be audited by an Auditor who knows his Model Session and TRs, who doesn't Q and A and who just goes on and gets the job done, who stays in two-way comm with his pc during the CCHs, and who doesn't flinch at asking embarrassing questions in Prepchecking. It is *NOT* difficult to obtain this perfection. Its attainment guarantees the success of sessions and the future of Scientology.

In an Academy teach the fundamentals of Scientology, Axioms, Codes, Scales, TRs, Meter and Model Session, etc. Teach such a student to do the CCHs, old repetitive processes such as ARC Straight Wire, and Prepchecking and let him get his results on graduation with CCHs and Prepchecking as used herein. And graduate him with those skills well learned. Then later teach him a Class II Course bringing his TRs, Model Session and Metering to perfection and teach 3D Criss Cross. Then we'll have *good* auditors.

Don't compromise with auditing skill. And the combination of processes given herein will make every pc you audit thrilled with the results you will obtain.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 29 APRIL 1962

All Saint Hill  
Graduates  
All Saint Hill  
Students  
General to Orgs  
Franchise  
Additional Mailing

**ROUTINE 3G (EXPERIMENTAL)**

(A preview of a Clearing Process)

We are engaged in piloting through fast clearing.

Using the data and experience of 3D Criss Cross (which remains valid and all mistakes of which can be cleaned up as per this Info Letter) we should get faster results and, more important, obtain a continuing gain on the pc until the pc is clear.

The best locator of the Goals Problem Mass is from goals. On any pc (whose rudiments can be kept in), even pcs being run on 3D Criss Cross, the fastest road to clear is probably as follows:

**ROUTINE 3G STEPS IN BRIEF**

1. Do a goals assessment.
2. List and nul for an item obtained from the goal found, by *complete* listing.
3. Oppterm the item found by listing, nulling and finding the oppterm by complete listing.
4. Repeat 1, 2 and 3 many times.

-----

New data which makes this possible is as follows:

1. *Listing is auditing.*
2. Goals locate more deeply in the Goals Problem Mass than any other line.
3. Other types of line are less accurate and can give the pc more discomfort than goals items.
4. Finding a goal was blocked by out-rudiments, invalidations and missed withholds.
5. What a *complete* list is has been discovered and tests developed conditionally.
6. Pcs can become upset (given heavy somatics) by incomplete lines and by oppterming wrong items.

-----

In theory if an Item list is handled as a process, it must be completed.

All charge probably does not bleed off a goals list and these tests do not apply to a goals list as (in goals) a pc is facing no mass, only ideas. In items he faces up to mass. Items are charged, not goals. The following conditional tests are applied to Lists of Items (not a goals list) to establish if a list is complete.

- (a) All tone arm action has ceased by list end, but was present and adequate at list beginning, just as in any repetitive *process*.

- (b) By reading the first 12 items of the list back to the pc, as differentiation, no Tone Arm Action is produced. (Use the second 12 for next test.) (No thorough differentiation is done on the list.)
- (c) The first 12 items of the list produce no great needle action in nulling and all but one or two go out on reading them the first time. (Use the second 12 for next test, third 12 for third test, etc.)
- (d) Almost all the list vanishes on the first nulling of it. No items grind out.
- (e) The meter does not respond to a question: "Are there any more terminals?"

Coax the pc into completing the list by these tests. Keep off ARC break reactions by asking for missed withholds and invalidations.

In theory, when the terminal is attained by a goals assessment and a resulting list of items, and when the opposing item is obtained, if *both* lists were *complete*, the two items should "blow" and the goal cease to react. This then would make repetitive auditing unnecessary.

-----

The safest action on any case that has been run on 3D Criss Cross is to take any goal ever found on the case and check it out. If it checks out, ignore the former terminal and complete the goals terminal list as per the above five tests and then opterm it.

3D Criss Cross is a good training ground.

Any new auditor on Routine 3 processes should be put on 3D Criss Cross with Pre-Hav Levels as a source and be made to *complete* his list, find an item and do a *complete* opterm list.

Incomplete listing, invalidations and out-rudiments are the main faults of Routine 3 processes. A new auditor should be cured of them before messing with a goals assessment, which is the touchiest to do and hardest on a case.

Values gained in receiving or giving 3D Criss Cross are great. Values from Routine 3G are probably much greater and much more comfortable.

-----

In doing 3D Criss Cross or Routine 3G omit Differentiation as a step except to stir up the pc for more items or to test the completeness of a list.

-----

A goal is checked (whether new or old) by:

1. Nulling down to one goal.
2. Getting rudiments carefully in.
3. Taking off any invalidations (invalidations when present read the same as the goal or item while the goal or item does not read).
4. Reading the goal, then a goal that went out only after a second nulling of the list, then the goal found, then a nul goal, etc. The goal should continue to read.

A goal or item reads constantly, each time it is said. It reads tick, tick, tick, always the same and every time, providing invalidations are off and rudiments are in.

An item is checked out the same way as a goal.

No item on a complete list should have more than one or two nulling marks after it. If an auditor has to cover a list 25 times to get it nul, it's laughably incomplete. An auditing supervisor can simply look at a list's nul marks and tell if it's complete or not. Too many nul marks equals an incomplete list always.

A complete list, in theory, just fades away and leaves an item.

Perhaps an oppterm list will just fade out and the original item and goal will vanish.

-----

Routine 3G is an effort to exploit the assess to clear phenomena without auditing any items and to keep the pc continually gaining without slumps.

-----

Routine 3 failed only because of out-rudiments, poor meter handling, bad TRs and Model Session. It never failed because of its theory or technology.

-----

It is recommended that, when an auditor is skilled, the pc be placed on Routine 3G regardless of anything found by 3D Criss Cross.

Ignore all previously found or run items. Take up only a goal found (that still checks out as above) or a new goals list.

If a goals list has been lost, reconstruct it by taking invalidations off the subject of goals and having the pc list newly.

-----

Goals lists run from 100 to 1000, sometimes more.

Item lists seldom run less than 300, usually more.

-----

Use the same goals list for Step 4 of Routine 3G. Add to it. Nul the whole thing again. Don't try to get all TA action and charge off a goals list.

Always get all action and charge off an items list.

-----

The steps of Routine 3D Criss Cross now are:

1. Get a Pre-Hav Level by usual Pre-Hav Assessment.
2. List for the item.
3. Test for completeness with above Completeness tests.
4. Complete if not complete.
5. Nul list to one item.
6. Check out item (as above).
7. Oppterm the item at once.
8. Test oppterm list for completeness.

9. Nul oppterm list.

10. Check out item.

Put anything found on a Line Plot.

-----

The steps of Routine 3G are:

1. Do or recover a goals list.
2. Nul the list to one goal.
3. Check out the goal.
4. List for an item from the goal. (Use the wording: “Who or what would want to [goal] ?”)
5. Test for completeness (as above).
6. Complete list if not complete. (Do 5 and 6 until the list *is* complete.)
7. Nul the list to one item.
8. Check out the item.
9. Oppterm list the item. (Use: “Who or what would oppose [item] ?”)
10. Test for completeness of list.
11. Complete list. (Do 10 and 11 until list *is* complete.)
12. Nul list.
13. Check out item.
14. Assess for a new goal as above and do each of these steps in order.

Keep an accurate Line Plot record of all goals and items found.

-----

Repairing a case that has had bad or erroneous assessment or running of items on Routine 3 or 3A or 3D or 3D Criss Cross is done by the Routine 3G steps above. The errors should vanish.

-----

Note that the word “want” is used to get an item list from a goal. “Who or What would *want* to .....(goal) .....?” (Not “Who or What would [goal] ?”)

-----

A pc can be coaxed into completing a list by differentiation, which consists of asking him “Would a (item) want to (goal)?” for each item he or she has listed. But only differentiate a few until pc is going again.

-----

Don’t Tone 40 ack items or goals a pc gives you. It stops the pc by completing the cycle. Just murmur at him or her when you get a goal or item. Ask the question that is getting items only as a prompt when pc runs down. Not while a pc is talking goals or items. Try to get several goals or items for one question. Coax the pc. Keep the missed withholds picked up.



If the pc gets a “dirty needle” in listing 3D Criss Cross, an earlier item is wrong. (This is a pc “needle pattern”.) A wrong item found constitutes a missed withhold. Backtrack to earlier items. A wrong goal found can cause a “dirty needle”. Otherwise a “dirty needle” is caused by missed withholds. If you can’t clean up a “dirty needle” with missed withhold questions, a goal or item was wrong and you had better backtrack to it at once, no matter what else you were doing.

The way to do it is re-check all items on the Line Plot and correct the earliest item that won’t now check out (unless it and its oppterm blew, of course).

-----  
You will receive more data on Routine 3G as it is found.

-----  
The *Modifier* is part, it seems, of the oppterm so its use is dropped. It is not found now.

-----  
CAUTIONS

DO NOT LET ROUTINE 3G BE RUN AS THE FIRST ROUTINE 3 PROCESS BY ANY INEXPERIENCED AUDITOR. LET AUDITORS BECOME PERFECT USING ROUTINE 3D CRISS CROSS AS CONTAINED HEREIN. A goals assessment is tougher than 3D Criss Cross and goals are more easily invalidated than items. Further Routine 3G should clear off any errors run into a case by 3D Criss Cross. Therefore don’t train with the only cure. 3D Criss Cross does well with cases too! Train Auditors to do Routine 3 processes with Routine 3D Criss Cross from Pre-Hav Levels. Only when they’re perfect, let them go to more advanced routines. Routine 3D Criss Cross can be run on staffs and HGC pcs with great advantage to the pc and no unremediable risk to the pc.

Requisite to run Routine 3D Criss Cross is good gains with Prepchecking and the CCHs.

We have developed a good process to graduate the auditor to clearing without fouling up pcs too badly in Routine 3D Criss Cross. And the pcs will win too if it is well and thoroughly done.

-----  
All this should be good news to people whose goals have been found.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

** 6205C01	SHSBC-140	Missed Withholds
** 6205C01	SHSBC-141	Routine 3G, Experimental Preview of a Clearing Process
** 6205C02	SH TVD-4A	Prepchecking (Aud: LRH), Part I
** 6205C02	SH TVD-4B	Prepchecking, Part 11
** 6205C03	SHSBC-142	Craftsmanship—Fundamentals
** 6205C03	SHSBC-143	Prepchecking

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 MAY 1962

Franchise

**ARC BREAKS**  
**MISSED WITHHOLDS**

*(HOW TO USE THIS BULLETIN.*

WHEN AN AUDITOR OR STUDENT HAS TROUBLE WITH AN “ARC BREAKY PC” OR NO GAIN, OR WHEN AN AUDITOR IS FOUND TO BE USING FREAK CONTROL METHODS OR PROCESSES TO “KEEP A PC IN SESSION”, THE HCO SEC, D OF T OR D OF P SHOULD JUST HAND A COPY OF THIS BULLETIN TO THE AUDITOR AND MAKE HIM OR HER STUDY IT AND TAKE AN HCO EXAM ON IT.)

After some months of careful observation and tests, I can state conclusively that:

ALL ARC BREAKS STEM FROM MISSED WITHHOLDS.

This is vital technology, vital to the auditor and to anyone who wants to live.

Conversely:

THERE ARE NO ARC BREAKS WHEN MISSED WITHHOLDS HAVE BEEN CLEANED UP.

By WITHHOLD is meant AN UNDISCLOSED CONTRA-SURVIVAL ACT.

By MISSED WITHHOLD is meant AN UNDISCLOSED CONTRA-SURVIVAL

ACT WHICH HAS BEEN RESTIMULATED BY ANOTHER BUT NOT DISCLOSED.

This is FAR more important in an auditing session than most auditors have yet realized. Even when some auditors are told about this and shown it they still seem to miss its importance and fail to use it. Instead they continue to use strange methods of controlling the pc and oddball processes on ARC Breaks.

This is so bad that one auditor let a pc die rather than pick up the missed withholds! So allergy to picking up missed withholds can be so great that an auditor has been known to fail utterly rather than do so. Only constant hammering can drive this point home. When it is driven home, only then can auditing begin to happen across the world; the datum is that important.

An auditing session is 50% technology and 50% application. I am responsible for the technology. The auditor is wholly responsible for the application. Only when an auditor realizes this can he or she begin to obtain uniformly marvellous results everywhere.

No auditor now needs “something else”, some odd mechanism to keep pcs in session.

PICKING UP MISSED WITHHOLDS KEEPS PCS IN SESSION.

There is *no* need for a rough, angry ARC Breaky session. If there is one it is *not* the fault of the pc. It is the fault of the auditor. The auditor has failed to pick up missed withholds.

As of now it is not the pc that sets the tone of the session. It is the auditor. And the auditor who has a difficult session (providing he or she has used standard

technology, model session, and can run an E-Meter), has one only because he or she failed to ask for missed withholds.

What is called a “dirty needle” (a pc’s needle pattern) is caused by missed withholds, not withholds.

Technology today is so powerful that it must be flawlessly applied. One does his CCHs in excellent 2 way comm with the pc. One has his TRs, Model Session and E-Meter operation completely perfect. And one follows exact technology. And one keeps the missed withholds picked up.

There is an exact and precise auditor action and response for every auditing situation, and for every case. We are not today beset by variable approaches. The less variable the auditor’s actions and responses, the greater gain in the pc. It is terribly precise. There is no room for flubs.

Further, every pc action has an exact auditor response. And each of these has its own drill by which it can be learned.

Auditing today is not an art, either in technology or procedure. It is an exact science. This removes Scientology from every one of the past practices of the mind.

Medicine advanced only to the degree that its responses by the practitioner were standardized and the practitioner had a professional attitude toward the public.

Scientology is far ahead of that today.

What a joy it is to a preclear to receive a completely standard session. To receive a text book session. And what gains the pc makes! And how easy it is on the auditor!

It isn’t how interesting or clever the auditor is that makes the session. It’s how standard the auditor is. Therein lies pc confidence.

Part of that standard technology is asking for missed withholds *any* time the pc starts to give any trouble. This is, to a pc, a totally acceptable control factor. And it totally smooths the session.

You have *no* need for and must not use any ARC Break process. Just ask for missed withholds.

Here are some of the manifestations cured by asking for missed withholds.

1. Pc failing to make progress.
2. Pc critical of or angry at auditor.
3. Pc refusing to talk to auditor.
4. Pc attempting to leave session.
5. Pc not desirous of being audited (or anybody not desirous of being audited).
6. Pc boiling off.
7. Pc exhausted.
8. Pc feeling foggy at session end.
9. Dropped havingness.
10. Pc telling others the auditor is no good.
11. Pc demanding redress of wrongs.
12. Pc critical of organizations or people of Scientology.
13. People critical of Scientology.
14. Lack of auditing results.
15. Dissemination failures.

Now I think you will agree that in the above list we have every ill we suffer from in the activities of auditing.

Now PLEASE believe me when I tell you there is ONE CURE for the lot and ONLY that one. There are no other cures.

The cure is contained in the simple question or its variations “*Have I missed a withhold on you ?* “

### THE COMMANDS

In case of any of the conditions 1. to 15. above ask the pc one of the following commands and CLEAN THE NEEDLE OF ALL INSTANT READ. Ask the exact question you asked the first time as a final test. The needle must be clean of all instant reaction before you can go on to anything else. It helps the pc if each time the needle twitches, the auditor says, “That” or “There” quietly but only to help the pc see what is twitching. One doesn’t interrupt the pc if he or she is already giving it. This prompting is the *only* use of latent reads in Scientology—to *help* the pc spot what reacted in the first place.

The commonest questions:

“In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?”

“In this session have I failed to find out something?”

“In this session is there something I don’t know about you?”

The best beginning rudiments withhold question:

“Since the last session is there something you have done that I don’t know about?”

Prepcheck Zero Questions follow:

“Has somebody failed to find out about you who should have?”

“Has anyone ever failed to find out something about you?”

“Is there something I failed to find out about you?”

“Have you ever successfully hidden something from an auditor?”

“Have you ever done something somebody failed to discover?”

“Have you ever evaded discovery in this lifetime?”

“Have you ever hidden successfully?”

“Has anyone ever failed to locate you?”

(These Zeroes do not produce “What” questions until the auditor has located a specific overt.)

When Prepchecking, when running any process but the CCHs, if any one of the auditing circumstances in 1 to 15 above occurs, ask for missed withholds. Before leaving any chain of overts in Prepchecking, or during Prepchecking, ask frequently for missed withholds, “Have I missed any withhold on you?” or as above.

Do not conclude intensives on any process without cleaning up missed withholds.

Asking for missed withholds does not upset the dictum of using no O/W processes in rudiments.

Most missed withholds clean up at once on two way comm *providing* the auditor doesn’t ask leading questions about what the pc is saying. Two way comm consists of asking for what the meter showed, acknowledging what the pc said and checking the meter again with the missed withhold question. If pc says, “I was mad at my wife,” as an answer, just ack and check the meter with the missed withhold question. Don’t say, “What was she doing?”

In cleaning missed withholds do not use the Prepcheck system unless you are Prepchecking. And even in Prepchecking, if the zero is not a missed withhold question and you are only checking for missed withholds amid other activities, do it simply as above, by two way comm, not by the Prepcheck system.

To get auditing into a state of perfection, to get clearing general, all we have to do is:

1. Know our basics (Axioms, Scales, Codes, the fundamental theory about the thetan and the mind);
2. Know our practical (TRs, Model Session, E-Meter, CCHs, Prepchecking and clearing routines).

In actual fact this is not much to ask. For the return is smooth results and a far, far better world. An HPA/HCA can learn the data in 1 above and all but clearing routines in the material in 2. An HPA/HCA should know these things to perfection. They are not hard to learn. Additives and interpretations are hard to get around. Not the actual data and performance.

Knowing these things, one also needs to know that all one has to do is clean the E-Meter of missed withholds to make any pc sit up and get audited smoothly, and all is as happy as a summer dream.

We are making all our own trouble. Our trouble is lack of precise application of Scientology. We fail to apply it in our lives or sessions and try something bizarre and then we fail too. And with our TRs, Model Session and meters we are most of all failing to pick up and clean up MISSED WITHHOLDS.

We don't have to clean up all the withholds if we keep the Missed Withholds cleaned up.

Give a new auditor the order to clean up "Missed Withholds" and he or she invariably will start asking the pc for withholds. *That's* a mistake. You ask the pc for *Missed Withholds*. Why stir up new ones to be missed when you haven't cleaned up those *already missed*? Instead of putting out the fire we pour on gunpowder. Why find more you can *then* miss when you haven't found those that *have been* missed.

Don't be so confounded *reasonable* about the pc's complaints. Sure, they may all be true BUT he's complaining only because *withholds* have been *missed*. Only then does the pc complain bitterly.

Whatever else you learn, learn and understand this please. Your auditing future hangs on it. The fate of Scientology hangs on it. Ask for missed withholds when sessions go wrong. Get the missed withholds when life goes wrong. Pick up the missed withholds when staffs go wrong. Only then can we win and grow. We're waiting for you to become technically perfect with TRs, Model Session and the E-Meter, to be able to do CCHs and Prepchecking and clearing techniques, *and* to learn to spot and pick up missed withholds.

If pcs, organizations and even Scientology vanish from Man's view it will be because you did not learn and use these things.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is changed by HCO B 4 July 1962, *Bulletin Changes*, page 101.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 MAY 1962

Franchise

**PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING**

How do you use Form 3 (the Joburg), Form 6A and other forms with Prepchecking?

These forms have great value in improving a case, they dig up things. They get off the overts against Scientology that hold up many a case.

Now that Prepchecking is here, with all its vast ability to clean up this life, you still need these forms. For the most general auditor fault in Prepchecking is going too shallow. By using these forms this is to a large measure remedied by the use of all our Sec Check forms as released on HCO Policy Letters or even in Information Letters.

An old auditor, for instance, will make much faster case progress (or even make case progress) if given the Saint Hill Special "last 2 pages of the Joburg and a Form 6A".

Prepchecking and Sec Checking come together with a simple formula:

IF A SEC CHECK QUESTION DOESN'T AT ONCE CLEAR ON THE METER BY SIMPLE REVELATION, THE AUDITOR PREPCHECKS IT.

The smoothest way to clean a Sec Check question is to ask the pc to consider it carefully, then clean the needle of any response to it and go on. There is no varying the question.

If a question doesn't clear on one or two revelations, you then swing straight into a formal Prepcheck of the question.

This specific drill, shortly to become a TR, should be precisely followed.

Auditor (watching meter) (using Sec Check Form question): "Have you ever stolen anything?"

(Auditor may tell pc if needle reacted and steer pc's attention.)

Pc: "I stole a watch once." (Or whatever response.)

Auditor: "Thank you. I will now check the question: 'Have you ever stolen anything?' "

IF NEEDLE DOESN'T REACT:

Auditor: "That seems clear at the moment." (Asks next Sec Check question.)

IF NEEDLE STILL REACTS:

Auditor: "There's still something on this."

(Auditor writes down the question on his report as a Zero A question. Auditor probes for a specific single overt, finds one, forms the *What* question for use in a chain, writes it on his report and goes straight into routine Prepchecking. When the *What* question is null, the auditor returns to the same Sec Check question as above, tests it for now being clean. If not, more Prepchecking on it is indicated. If clean now he goes to next question on Form.)

If the auditor knows this drill his progress down a form will be relatively rapid.

The theory of this is that if a question doesn't promptly clear on the needle then it is part of a chain and must be Prepchecked to get all of it.

The phrasing of the *What* question for Prepchecking is *not* the Sec Check question. The *What* question is derived only from the overt discovered.

Any Sec Check question Prepchecked is tested before leaving it just as though it were found reacting in the first place (same drill as above).

## USE OF RUDIMENTS IN PREPCHECKING

Do not continually ask the pc, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" while doing *any* Prepchecking. In Prepchecking one asks for missed withholds only after cleaning a What question and in End Rudiments.

Prepchecking sends the pc down the track. If an auditor says during Prepchecking a chain, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" it yanks the pc back to present time and out of whatever incident he or she is in.

In doing a Routine 3 Process one asks for missed withholds often and at any time, but not in a Prepcheck session.

If you do five or so Sec Check questions without a single one having to be Prepchecked, it is, however, good policy to ask for missed withholds. Ask for missed withholds in Prepchecking only after a What question is nul, but always ask and clean it then.

In Routine 3 processes ask for missed withholds at any time.

### HELP THE PC

In general, when getting rudiments in or getting off missed withholds or invalidations, help the pc by guiding his attention against the needle.

This is quite simple. The auditor asks the question, the needle instantly reacts, the pc (as he or she usually does) looks puzzled if the auditor says "It reacts." The pc thinks it over. As he or she is thinking, the auditor will see the same reaction on the needle. Softly the auditor says "That" or "There" or "What's that you're looking at?" As the pc knows what he or she is looking at at that instant, the thing can be dug up.

This is auditor co-operation, not triumph.

Most often the pc does not know what it is that reacts as only unknowns react. Therefore an auditor's "There" when the needle twitches again, before the pc has answered, co-ordinates with whatever the pc is looking at and thus it can be spotted and revealed by the pc. This is only done when the pc comm lags for a few seconds.

Remember, the pc is always willing to reveal. He or she doesn't know What to reveal. Therein lies the difficulty. Pcs get driven out of session when asked to reveal something yet do not know *what* to reveal.

By the auditor's saying "There" or "What's that?" quietly each time the needle reacts newly, the pc is led to discover what should be revealed.

Auditors and pcs get into a games condition in Prepchecking and rudiments only when the auditor refuses this help to the pc.

New auditors routinely believe that in Prepchecking the pc *knows* the answer and won't give it. This is an error. If the pc knew all the answer, it wouldn't react on the meter.

Old-timers have found out that only if they steer by repeated meter reaction, giving the pc "There" or "What's that?" *can* the pc answer up on most rudiments questions, missed withholds and so on.

This is the only use of reads other than instant reads on the E-Meter.

Help the pc. He *doesn't* know. Otherwise the needle would never react.

Even if doing a Sec Check form still call it Prepchecking when done this way. This is "Prepchecking on Forms." The Zero for the whole lot of course is "Are you withholding anything?" Thus Sec Check form questions, when they do not nul at one crack become Zero A questions, and the What formed from the overt found becomes the No. 1 question.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 10 MAY 1962

Students,  
sthil  
Franchise  
Central Orgs

**ROUTINE 3GA (EXPERIMENTAL)**

(A Clearing Procedure  
Intended to Handle the GPM  
Accurately without Liability)

As the commonest difficulties auditors are having and the greatest errors that can be made on a Routine 3 process are the same, I have been working to get around these and may have done so in Routine 3GA.

The difficulties are:

1. Getting a pc to complete a list.
2. Getting the right item.

The greatest liabilities in a Routine 3 process are:

1. Incomplete list.
2. Wrong item.

As you can see (aside from getting the correct goal), the greatest dangers in the processes are unfortunately the most difficult for an auditor to do correctly by recent experience.

Therefore in Routine 3GA we have the same end product as in Routine 3G (as per HCO Information Letter of 29 April 1962) but, if it works smoothly, without the liabilities.

As listing can be considered processing, I have made it follow the rules of processing in Routine 3GA, to wit, plus and minus and possible stuck flows should be regarded. The principle of the four basic flows is therefore used in Routine 3GA (HCO Bulletin of 25 January 1962).

**ROUTINE 3GA**

This has four steps only:

1. Find a goal (done as in Routine 3 and Routine 3G).
2. List four lists simultaneously to no TA action on any list.
3. Nul each list once in rotation, then twice in rotation, then three times, etc, to try to locate items.
4. Find a new goal and repeat 2 and 3.

**STEP ONE**

This is the most difficult and is done exactly as in Routine 3 or 3G. The goal *must* check out to a constant *instant* tick.

If the goal has an instant "Dirty needle" get the missed W/Hs off it before checking. It will probably vanish as a goal and another goal is the correct one.

Goal finding is made easier by keeping the subject of listing, auditing, the session and the goal free of missed withholds, including the overt of missing withholds on others.



A good, clean instant ticking, constantly reacting each time it is said goal is what we want in Step One.

Once it is checked out as THE GOAL we don't check it again until Step 3 is complete.

## STEP TWO

This is the innovation. We do not optterm an item. We optterm the goal itself. Thus we never really have to find an item in order to optterm. And even if we found a wrong item, it would not further upset the case.

Further, we use FOUR versions of the goal for our lists. And we do Four lists at the *same time*.

We take items down on one list until the pc seems draggy. Then we pick up any missed withhold and go to the next list. And so on through four lists, around and around until each list shows no TA action on a few items being read to the pc.

The words "Who or What would WANT ...." inserted before the original goal for the first list, the words "Who or What would oppose ...." for the second list. The words "Who or What would not oppose ...." for the third list. And the words "Who or What would not want ...." for the fourth list.

Example:

Goal: To Catch Catfish.

List One: Who or What would want to catch catfish? (Outflow.)

List Two: Who or What would oppose catching catfish? (Inflow.)

List Three: Who or What would not oppose catching catfish? (Restrained Inflow.)

List Four: Who or What would not want to catch catfish? (Restrained Outflow.)

Use four sheets of paper or four double sheets, legal (foolscap) length, ruled or not. Put the page number and the list question, the date and pc's name at the top of the first sheet, and the page number and list question on subsequent pages. Don't tangle up on labelling and numbering as it will be a trick keeping four lists going anyway. And if you fail to label them right or list on wrong sheets, you'll confuse the session horribly. So be neat and try to shift paper quietly in the session to reduce pc's getting attention on auditor. When a sheet is full drop it on a common pile on the floor, do a new sheet for that list. Separate the floored lists afterwards.

List a list as long as the pc does it easily. Whether this is 3 items or 30 on one list. Then check for missed withholds: "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" Clean it as necessary and go on to the next list.

Give the pc the list question only often enough to keep the pc going, not for every item he or she gives.

Put anything on the list the pc wants on it. Don't let pc mutter and claw around for "the exact item", just keep the pc naming items.

Try to keep the lists vaguely equal in length.

If the "winds of space" turn on (if pc is getting his or her face pushed in) go a little stronger on Lists 1 and 3. That takes the pressure off.

If pc thinks they're all complete, pull any session missed withhold, test one or two lists for TA action by reading a few items to pc, and if TA action is present or if the list question reacts (or other tests including finding if the pc still has somatics or pressures), continue listing.

When lists do not produce TA action, etc, the listing can be considered complete.

Do NOT test goal for complete list as a test.

Lists may go to several hundred items each.

Learn to list rapidly. Don't upset the pc by calling for repeats of earlier items you missed. The pc probably will have forgotten them and get confused.

Don't pretend you've heard an item when you haven't. Get it correct from pc. He or she will only feel more acknowledged.

Pcs go groggy, lose interest and refuse to list only when session withholds are missed. Running too long on one flow, however, is conducive to withholds developing.

### STEP THREE

Nul each list with three repeats of the item. Mark it with a slant for "In", use an X for "Out". Tell the pc it's in or out and go on.

If a list is at all live, listing is incomplete. This is not likely to happen in Routine 3GA unless the auditor has made very short lists.

Nul all lists. Try to isolate an item on each.

Be fully prepared to find, with all rudiments well in, no items and to have the goal vanish. You will have made a long step toward clear if all goes out.

If all doesn't go out and items and goal hang, lists are incomplete.

The goal may also fail to react on only partially completed lists using Routine 3GA, so make sure the TA action is out of the lists before nulling is begun.

Nul List One once down, List Two once down, List Three once down, List Four once down. Then nul List One through any items still reacting, List Two similarly, etc.

It may be found on further data that nulling one page of each list at a time in sequence, List 1, 2, 3, 4, is easier on the pc than nulling a whole list. This is permissible.

### STEP FOUR

Find a new goal as in Step One. You may have to add more goals. You may only need to get missed withholds and invalidations off goals lists and various goals to have a new one pop up.

Repeat Steps 2, 3 and 4.

-----

If the pc has been run extensively on 3D Criss Cross, Routine 3GA should push off all such charge without further attention according to preliminary findings.

-----

A good auditing maxim applies hard to 3GA. When the auditor is faced with the unusual, do the usual.

Use Routine 3GA in preference to any other Routine 3 activity.

-----

Lengthy as this may seem, it is *far* shorter than finding and auditing items on processes.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 MAY 1962

CenOCon  
Franchise  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Graduates

### **CASE REPAIR**

We, for some time now, have been moving in spheres of higher level auditing which reached deeper into a case than old processes could repair. The definition of a master process would be one which ran out all other processes *and* processing. We now have such processes.

As there have been several Routines run on various cases, and as there is a new way of Sec Checking called Prepchecking, it is time I issued data on case repair in case any of these routines were done wrong by auditors or left unflat.

### **Routine 1a**

The best remedy for any bracket process on problems is to flatten the exact process that was run and left unflat.

The auditor should explore this and get the exact version.

Only the exact problems process that was left unflat will flatten that problems process.

### **Sec Checking**

Unflat Sec Checking, where material was overlooked, is best remedied by a combination of CCHs and Prepchecking, using the exact Sec Check form originally left unflat and covering it completely again, but using HCO Bulletin of May 10, 1962 which combines Sec Checking and Prepchecking. This will get off all the rough edges that are left over from Sec Checking only. It is quite revealing how much auditors left untouched during the Sec Checking days. And how many missed withholds were generated.

### **CCH Blowy Pcs**

Pcs who give an appearance of blowing while being run on CCHs or who are nattery to their auditors are best run on the CCHs in complete Model Session form, with full beginning and end rudiments on the meter. The body of the session is, of course, run without a meter when Model Session is used on the CCHs.

Never ask the pc if you've missed a withhold on him or her with the pc off a meter. Don't ask it socially either. You can lose more friends that way!

### **Prepchecking Repair**

When a pc has been getting a lot of Prepchecking from one or several auditors and the pc has begun to look withdrawn or misemotional in life, a lot of What questions have been left unflat.

The best remedy, and the proper one, for this is to take *all* the pc's Prepcheck auditors' reports and, in session, test every What question from the earliest one ever asked for needle reaction.

If a What question reacts, no matter what it was, clean it up by the routine

Prechecking system until the original What question is nul, then ask for missed withholds in the session and go on to the next What question in the reports. Don't vary the What questions you find in the reports. Just work the chain until you get the chain fully blown.

This cleaning up of every What question left not nul can do wonders for a pc.

Some What questions will be found to be silly. Clean them up anyway.

If another auditor did it, ask, after a What question is nul, "In that session, did the auditor miss a withhold on you?" and clean it off the needle.

## **CCHs**

Where the CCHs have been done wrong or have been left unflat, just do more good CCHs with proper two way comm about *Physical* originations by the pc. The CCHs done right flatten CCHs done wrong.

## **SCS**

Where SCS has been done wrong or left unflat, just do it right with two way comm about physical originations by the pc and it should come right.

In one case SCS was never flattened on *Start* because the pc considered the body already *started* and thus the pc could never execute the command. The remedy was to flatten Stop much better.

## **Op Pro by Dup**

Old Opening Procedure By Duplication has been left unflat on a lot of Scientologists.

One way is to just flatten it.

Another way is to add it to the CCHs as a fifth CCH in sequence and run it only until it ceases to produce change and then go to CCH 1. However, I think it's best just to grind it flat, as it was and is a test of endurance in duplication unlike the CCHs.

## **Routine 2**

If left unflat just ignore. There are things you can do with it such as to add want, not want, oppose, not oppose to the level and list four lines with *You* or *Your* as the terminal.

Example: Original level found was "blame".

Who or what would want to blame you?  
Who or what would oppose blaming you?  
Who or what would not oppose blaming you?  
Who or what would not want to blame you?

Only if a worsening of case was directly traceable to having had a Pre-Hav level run would one recover that level and treat it as above.

The listing would have to be complete on every one of the four lists and it would be done as in Routine 3GA, Information Letter of May 10, 1962.

As the auditor might not have had the right level at the time, repairing Routine 2 should be done only after careful review and probably not even then.

### **Routines 3, 3A and 3D**

The original Routine 3 began with finding the pc's goal. This also applies to Routine 3A and 3D.

All these are repaired the same way.

You ignore everything but the goal. You skip the terminal or oppterm or the modifier or oppgoal. You use only the goal. Choose the First Goal Ever Found. The FIRST, FIRST, FIRST, no matter who found it or where.

All invalidations, suppressions and missed W/Hs on:

- (a) The routines,
- (b) The auditor or auditors who did any assessments on the pc,
- (c) Scientology,
- (d) Listing in general (goals, items),
- (e) Nulling any list (including Pre-Hav Scale),
- (f) The goal found,

are carefully picked up. The goal itself is worked over hardest. When the goal is clean, it is carefully checked against the rest of the goals list.

If the goal checks out, you then use the current goals routine on it (Routine 3GA at this time of writing) and go on from there.

If the goal does not check out even after the most careful cleaning up of its invalidations, suppressions or missed withholds, add to the goals list and start in to find the right goal and then use it in the current routine and continue with that routine.

This repair is highly specific, is very important, and will have to be done on every person on whom a goal was ever located.

**THIS INCLUDES ALL CLEARS.**

There is no other method of salvage.

If more than one goal was found, take the first and treat it as given here, then take the second goal ever found, clean it up and so forth.

### **Routine 3D Criss Cross**

Because auditors had so much trouble getting lists completed, Routine 3D Criss Cross is the most important to patch up.

In fact, many cases run on it will not progress on a current Goals Routine until 3D Criss Cross is cleaned up.

The process was powerful and only cleans itself up. But, cleaned up, it gives fantastic case resurgences.

Take all the items found and scrap them.

Take a list of the lines from which the items came, written in the sequence they were used. With the pc on a meter in Model Session, query the pc for his or her reactions on each line at the time it was done.

Take the earliest line source that was done on the pc that gave the pc sensation, pain, heat or cold. In other words, the earliest line source that produced somatics. It must be the earliest. In some cases a goal was the earliest thing from which a list was taken but the listing of a goal, if it was not productive of somatics, can be left, just as any other line source can be left alone on repair—no somatics, neglect the line.

Now comes the only tricky part. Convert the line source into four line sources by entering into its wording want, oppose, not oppose, not want, in that order. These four lines must include the original source line that was listed.

Now list the three hitherto unlisted lines up until they are in even length with the original line done and then, as in Routine 3GA, keep the four abreast of each other. List all TA action out of all lines. Use 3GA tests to find this out.

When no charge of any kind is left, skip the lot. No need, so far as I know at this writing, to nul them as this is just a repair job. When all lines that were formerly active (had somatics during listing) are so repaired, get on with the current Routine 3 Process. (At this writing, Routine 3GA.)

The case gain you'll get on the pc from this alone will be startling—providing the four lines you list from any single 3DXX source formerly used are now complete.

Note: If pc confused as to which was it, the lines probably aren't complete. Pull missed withholds on assessments, listing, items and get pc to list further.

Note: Unless you do this repair well, the case may bog when you try to get a goal.

Note: In case you missed it, you throw away all items ever found before doing anything else and you oppterm no items.

On Pre-Hav levels used for 3DXX see Routine 2 above. For flow lines do the expansion with want, oppose, not oppose, and not want as contained herein.

### **General Repair**

Repair of earlier auditing than those processes specifically mentioned here is best done by Prepchecking combined with CCHs. The best Zero question for such repair is any one of those calculated to unearth missed withholds.

A general process on missed withholds, repetitive, will be the subject of another HCO Bulletin and it is permissible to use this to repair all earlier sessions in which the above-mentioned routines were not run.

In general repair you can get nice gains by Prepchecking all rudiments, beginning and end, in a general way. You will be amazed how many have been out on old pcs. I found one who had not answered even one havingness command although auditors had given the pc thousands. That's thousands of failures to answer the auditing command—and no havingness worked on this pc until I'd discovered and remedied this.

Case repair is a task for a skilled auditor. No case will repair if it continues to be audited badly.

If you want to be sure you can repair cases—and audit them—take an Academy retread or apply for Saint Hill—or both.

LRH:jw.aa .rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MAY 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**MISSED WITHHOLDS,  
ASKING ABOUT**

Since a pc can give a motivator response to the question, “Have I missed a withhold on you?” and since a pc’s case can be worsened by permitting the pc to get off motivators rather than overts, the following becomes a must in asking for Missed Withholds:

“What have you done that I haven’t found out about?”

Use “*done*”, not “missed a withhold” in all missed w/h questions.

The prior confusion aspect will be found to operate also if this is followed and the missed withhold will blow.

In short use *done* not “missed withhold” in rudiments and middle rudiments questions and stress doingness rather than withholdingness.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.cden  
Copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
15—22 May 1962

** 6205C15	SHSBC-144	New Training Sections
** 6205C15	SHSBC-145	New TRs
** 6205C16	SH TVD-5A	Patching Up 3DXX Cases, Part I (LRH MTS-3)
** 6205C16	SH TVD-5B	Patching Up 3DXX Cases, Part II.
** 6205C17	SHSBC-146	Auditing Errors
** 6205C17	SHSBC-147	Prepchecking
** 6205C22	SHSBC-150	Administration of Courses
** 6205C22	SHSBC-151	Missed Withholds

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 MAY 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**MODEL SESSION CHANGE**

In Beginning Rudiments the withhold question should be worded “Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding?”

This must be answered exactly as asked. It cannot be answered with a “They did to me” or your end command rud will go out.

In the first session the auditor gives the pc the line is omitted.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.bh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
23 May 1962

** 6205C23	SH TVD-6	Check on “What” Questions and Havingness Probe (LRH MTS-4)
** 6205C23	SH TVD-7	Fish and Fumble—Checking Dirty Needles (LRH MTS-5)



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!

LRH:gl.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 MAY 1962

Franchise

### Q and A

A great deal has been said about “Q and A-ing” but few auditors know exactly what it is and *all* auditors have done it without exception up to now.

I have just completed some work that analyses this and some drills which educate an auditor out of it. With a better understanding of it, we can eradicate it. Q and A means ASKING A QUESTION ABOUT A PC’S ANSWER.

A SESSION IN WHICH THE AUDITOR Qs and As IS A SESSION FULL OF ARC BREAKS.

A SESSION WITHOUT Q and A IS A SMOOTH SESSION.

It is vital for all auditors to understand and use this material. The gain for the pc is reduced enormously by Q and A and clearing is not just stopped. It is prevented.

The term “Q and A” means that the exact answer to a question is the question, a factual principle. However, it came to mean that the auditor did what the pc did. An auditor who is “Q and A-ing” is giving session control over to the pc. The pc does something, so the auditor also does something in agreement with the pc. The auditor following only the pc’s lead is giving no auditing and the pc is left on “self audit”.

As nearly all auditors do this, no auditing is the rule of the day. Therefore I studied and observed and finally developed a precision analysis of it, for lack of which auditors, although they understood Q and A, nevertheless “Q’d and A’d”.

### THE Qs AND As

There are 3 Qs and As. They are:

1. Double questioning.
2. Changing because the pc changes.
3. Following the pc’s instructions.

### The Double Question

This occurs on Rudiment Type questions and is wrong.

This is the chief auditor fault and *must* be cured.

The auditor asks a question. The pc answers. The auditor asks a question about the answer.

This is not just wrong. It is the primary source of ARC Breaks and out rudiments. It is quite a discovery to get this revealed so simply to an auditor as I know that if it is understood, auditors will do it right.

The commonest example occurs in social concourse. We ask Joe, “How are you?” Joe says, “I’ve been ill.” We say, “What with?” This may go in society but *not* in an auditing session. To follow this pattern is fatal and can wipe out all gains.

Here is a *wrong* example: Auditor: “How are you?” PC: “Awful.” Auditor: “What’s wrong?” In auditing you just must never, never, *never* do this. All auditors have been doing it. And it’s awful in its effect on the pc.

Here is a *right* example: Auditor: “How are you?” PC: “Awful.” Auditor: “Thank you.” Honest, as strange as this may seem and as much of a strain on your social machinery as you’ll find it, there is *no* other way to handle it.

And here is how the whole drill must go. Auditor: "Do you have a present time problem?" PC: "Yes" (or *anything* the pc says). Auditor: "Thank you, I will check that on the meter. (Looks at meter.) Do you have a present time problem? It's clean." or ".....It still reacts. Do you have a present time problem? That .....That." PC: "I had a fight with my wife last night." Auditor: "Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That's clean."

The way auditors have been handling this is this way, very wrong. Auditor: "Do you have a present time problem?" PC: "I had a fight with my wife last night." Auditor: "What about?" Flunk! Flunk! Flunk!

The rule is NEVER ASK A QUESTION ABOUT AN ANSWER IN CLEANING ANY RUDIMENT.

If the pc gives you an answer, acknowledge it and check it on the meter. Don't *ever* ask a question about the answer the pc gave, no matter *what* the answer was.

Bluntly you *cannot* clean rudiments easily so long as you ask a question about a pc's answer. You cannot expect the pc to feel acknowledged and therefore you invite ARC Breaks. Further, you slow a session down and can wipe out all gain. You can even make the pc worse.

If you want gains in a session never Q and A on rudiments type questions or Form type sec check questions.

Take what the pc said. Ack it. Check it on the meter. If clean, go on. If still reacting, ask another question of a rudiments type.

Apply this rule severely. *Never* deviate from it.

Many new TR drills are based on this. But you can do it now.

Handle all beginning, middle and end rudiments exactly in this way. You'll be *amazed* how rapidly the pc gains if you do and how easily the rudiments go in and stay in.

In Prepchecking you can get deeper into a pc's bank by using his answer to get him to amplify. But never while using a Rudiment or sec check type question.

### **Changing because the Pc changes**

This is a less common auditor fault but it exists even so.

Changing a process because the pc is changing is a breach of the Auditor's Code. It is a flagrant Q and A.

Getting change on the pc often invites the auditor to change the process.

Some auditors change the process every time the pc changes.

This is very cruel. It leaves the pc hung in every process run.

It is the mark of the frantic, obsessive alteris auditor. The auditor's impatience is such that he or she cannot wait to flatten anything but must go on.

The rule of auditing by the tone arm was the method of preventing this.

SO LONG AS YOU HAVE TONE ARM MOTION, CONTINUE THE PROCESS.

CHANGE THE PROCESS ONLY WHEN YOU HAVE RUN OUT ALL TONE ARM MOTION.

Rudiments repair processes are not processes in the full sense of the word. But even here the rule applies if to a limited extent. The rule applies this far: If a pc gets too much tone arm motion in the rudiments, and especially if he or she gets little tone arm motion in the session, you must run Prepchecking on the rudiments questions and do CCHs on the pc. Ordinarily, if you run a rudiments process in getting the rudiments in, you ignore the Tone Arm Motion. Otherwise you'll never get to the body of the session and will have Q'd and A'd with the pc after all. For you will have let the pc

“throw” the session by having out rudiments and will have let the pc avoid the body of the session. So, ignore TA action in handling rudiments unless you are Prepchecking, using each rudiment in turn in the body of the session. When a rudiment is used as a rudiment, ignore TA action. When a rudiment is used in the session body for Prepchecking, pay some attention to TA action to be sure something is happening.

Don’t hang a pc up in a thousand unflat processes. Flatten a process before you change.

### **Following the Pc’s Instructions**

There are “auditors” who look to the pc for all their directions on how to handle their cases.

As aberration is composited of unknowns this results in the pc’s case never being touched. If the pc only is saying what to do, then only the known areas of the pc’s case will get audited.

A pc can be asked for data on what’s been done by other auditors and for data in general on his reactions to processes. To this degree one uses the pc’s data *when* it is also checked on the meter and from other sources.

I myself have had it bad in this. Auditors have now and then demanded of me as a pc instructions and directions as to how to do certain steps in auditing.

Of course, snapping attention to the auditor is bad enough. But asking a pc what to do, or following the pc’s directions as to what to do is to discard in its entirety session control. And the pc will get worse in that session.

Don’t consider the pc a boob to be ignored, either. It’s the pc’s session. But be competent enough at your craft to *know* what to do. And don’t hate the pc so much that you take his or her directions as to what to do next. It’s fatal to any session.

### **SUMMARY**

“Q and A” is slanguage. But the whole of auditing results depends upon auditing right and not “Q and A-ing”.

Of all the data above only the first section contains a new discovery. It is an important discovery. The other two sections are old but must be discovered sooner or later by any auditor who wants results.

If you Q and A your pc will not achieve gains from auditing. If you really hate the pc, by all means Q and A, and get the full recoil of it.

A session without ARC Breaks is a marvellous thing to give and to receive. Today we don’t have to use ARC Break processes if we handle our rudiments well and never Q and A.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### **SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

24—30 May 1962

** 6205C24	SHSBC-148	E-Meter Data—Instant Reads, Part I
** 6205C24	SHSBC-149	E-Meter Data—Instant Reads, Part II.
** 6205C29	SHSBC-152	Question-and-Answer Period
* * 6205C29	SHSBC-153	Security Check Prepchecking
** 6205C30	SH TVD-8A	Getting Rudiments In (LRH auditing demo), Part I
** 6205C30	SH TVD-8B	Getting Rudiments In, Part II.

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 inexperienced 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.)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 MAY 1962

Franchise  
Central Orgs  
Tech Depts  
Post Conspicuously  
in Training Office  
and on Student Board

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  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 JUNE 1962

Sthil Form  
All Academies  
All HGCs

**AUDITING**  
**RUDIMENTS CHECK SHEET**

(This is the only Rudiments Check Sheet  
to be used in straightening up HGC pcs  
or cancelling sessions on Students.)

The following check sheet should be used by Ds of P, supervisors and instructors seeking to establish whether or not the HGC or student auditor got the rudiments in during a session.

This check is not done in Model Session. Only the R factor is put in and "End of Check" is given at end.

Only a British Mark IV Meter is used. Sensitivity is at 16 throughout check.

Note:

During the first two sessions of a pc by that auditor randomness can be expected and the auditor should not be rebuked, as it sometimes takes two or three sessions for the rudiments to be put in solidly for an auditor and for a pc's needle to get smooth enough to be read by a checker.

Note:

See HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962 on needle reading.

The checker should carefully repeat at least once any rudiment on which he or she gets a read, stressing "By the end of your last session". And at first even ask the pc when that was.

As auditing continues for several sessions, if the auditor *is* putting rudiments in every session, the needle will smooth out and checks become highly accurate. If this does not take place, then the rudiments are *not* ever being put in by the auditor.

**RUDIMENTS CHECK**

(Repeat the leading line before each numbered item.  
Mark those that give an instant read [HCO B May 25, 1962] .)

By the end of your last session had your auditor failed to find and clear

1. A half truth?
2. An untruth?
3. An effort by you to impress him (her)?
4. An effort by you to influence the E-Meter?
5. Something you were withholding?
6. An unanswered question?
7. An unanswered command?
8. An unwillingness to talk to him (her)?
9. A problem?
10. An unwillingness to be audited in that room?

LRH :dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

\*\* 6205C31 SHSBC-154 Value of Rudiments  
\*\* 6205C31 SHSBC-155 Middle Rudiments

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs  
Tech Depts

## RUDIMENTS CHECKING

It will be found that checking a pc's rudiments leads to occasional arguments.

Rudiments checking is done after the session by another auditor, more usually a leading auditor or instructor, using HCO Policy Letter of June 1, 1962 to find if the rudiments were in during a session just past.

The rudiments check, especially early in a pc's auditing when the needle is rougher, or after very poor auditing, often discloses that certain rudiments were not in during the session just past.

Two protests sometimes occur when rudiments have been found to have been "out" on the session just past.

The first is a possible protest from the auditor who did the auditing. The auditor sometimes claims loudly that the rudiments were *in* but that the checker mysteriously threw them out and that the checker is in error. The auditor has been known to get the pc back on the meter before friends and show one and all that the rudiments check was in fact nul—and it *has* been nul. But this does not mean the rudiments were in fact *in* in the session or that the checker erred. It means only this: the auditor's TR 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 are very weak and there was no impingement on the pc by that auditor. Exception: a pc early in auditing or who has been badly audited doesn't get the rudiments check question—cure: ask the check question again if you get a read.

The second is a possible protest by the pc whose rudiments have been found out by the checker. The pc seeks to "protect" the auditor and claims the rudiments were "in" in session even if found "out" by the checker. This pc is seeking to validate the stupidity of the auditor. The pc actually has something he consciously or unconsciously wishes to hide from the auditor and so wants the auditor to find the rudiments *in*, regardless of all evidence.

Pcs have even been known to gradually raise the fingers off one can to attempt to get a rising needle and obscure rudiments reads!

A rudiments checker is more concerned with a pc's needle getting smoother early on in auditing than in rudiments check results. But after a few days of sessions on a pc a rudiments checker must believe his rudiments check, not the protests.

Students who fight instructors are, anyway, in sufficiently low tone to be able to fight only their friends. As they come up they can have friends and fight an actual enemy, not us.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs  
Tech Depts

**PREPCHECKING THE MIDDLE RUDIMENTS**

The Routine Three Auditor (not the Prepcheck Auditor), as the first action in finding a goal and before listing (or before the auditor adds to list), is to prepcheck the following Zero questions in a regular prepcheck session.

Thereafter this same prepcheck is run on the pc about every fifth R3 session.

On goals have you ever suggested anything?  
On goals have you ever had anything suggested?  
On goals have you ever suppressed?  
On goals have you ever had anything suppressed?  
On goals have you ever invalidated?  
On goals have you ever had anything invalidated?  
On goals have you ever failed to reveal anything?  
On goals have you ever been careful of anything?  
On goals have you ever told any half truths?  
On goals have you ever told any untruths?  
On goals have you ever influenced a meter?  
On goals have you ever tried not to influence a meter?

Now the same list endings with:

On listing ditto above.  
On items ditto above.

The word “goal” and the word “listing” are also cleared.

The whole thing *can* be preceded with the whole list above after “on Auditing”.

This whole scheme is known as “Prepchecking the Middle Ruds”.

The reason for this care and the use of Middle Ruds every time you check a goal or the pc stops listing, is because a goal can stay in with a tick when only invalidated, but would go out if the invalidation is listed. A goal then will go nul if the Middle Ruds are out, or a wrong goal will get active if the Middle Ruds are out.

I have seen so many bum findings on goals that I have finally worked out the above as a solution to being double sure.

I have seen no valid goals where the list was less than 850 goals. I think it takes 850 goals in most cases to get goals as a subject enough discharged to reveal a right one even though it appeared in the first hundred and fifty.

When a wrong goal is used for further auditing the pc gets dizzy and quite uncomfortable. When a right goal is listed it's all very easy. So you can easily tell if you are listing a wrong one.

LRH:dr.cden  
Copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6206C12SHSBC-160	How to Do Goals Assessment
** 6206C12SHSBC-161	Middle Rudiments
** 6206C13SH TVD-9	Checking Out a Goal, Part I
** 6206C13SH TVD-10	Checking Out a Goal—Fish and Fumble—Part II.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs  
Tech Depts

**CHECKING NEEDLE IN RUDIMENTS CHECKS**

The following types of needle characteristic are defined and published here as a guide to all rudiments checkers.

*CLEAN NEEDLE.*

Responsive to instant reads only.

*MEDIUM CLEAN:*

Offers many prior and latent reads, but reads instantly when a question is asked.

*MEDIUM DIRTY:*

Agitated throughout check but with periods of no agitation when a read can be obtained easily. Reacts to checker's voice.

*DIRTY NEEDLE.*

Agitated throughout check, making reading difficult. Pc's attention obviously dispersed.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

14—21 June 1962

** 6206C14	SHSBC-156	Future Technology
** 6206C14	SHSBC-157	Listing
** 6206C19	SHSBC-158	Do's and Don'ts of R3GA
** 6206C19	SHSBC-159	Question-and-Answer Period
** 6206C21	SHSBC-162	Model Session Revised
** 6206C21	SHSBC-163	Question-and-Answer Period

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 JUNE 1962

Sthil Students  
Franchise  
CenOCon

**MODEL SESSION REVISED**

(Amplified in Sthil Lecture June 21, 1962)  
(Cancels all previous Model Session Scripts)

A new, far better Model Session has been under development for some months and now that it is stabilized it is released as the official Model Session.

This version has the benefit of requiring no other Rudiments process (except in the Havingness Questions) than the question itself. There are, therefore, no additional processes except Havingness.

Beware of *any* Q and A in using this script (HCO B May 24, 1962 [ 1 ] ).

Ask a question only until it is clear on the needle. Don't say it is clear when it isn't. Don't ask it again if it is clear. If you couldn't read it and don't know if it was clear or reading, say, "The read was equivocal" and say the same question again. Use HCO B May 25, 1962 in reading the needle.

Don't stray off Model Session into unusual questions or processes to "get in rudiments".

If you don't get an instant read, say, "That's clear" and leave it. If you *do* get an instant read, say, "That reads" and ask the second half of the Rudiments line. Omit the second half ("What was it?") if you don't get an instant read.

Continue to ask the rudiments same question until the read is clear. Don't ask anything else. If a pc has a badly behaving needle, do a perfect Model Session on pc for 2 or 3 sessions using Havingness or, better, Prepchecking in the body of the session, and you will see the needle smooth out. Don't expect the needle to become smooth all on one question or even in one session. Just do an excellent Model Session and clean up whatever instant reads and the pc will get better and better. Be careless and unusual in cleaning ruds and the pc will feel worse.

**START OF SESSION**

"Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"

"START OF SESSION."

"Has this session started for you?" (If pc says, "No", say again, "START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No", say, "We will cover it in the rudiments.")

**BEGINNING RUDIMENTS:**

*GLL:* "What goals would you like to set for this session?"  
"Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?"

*Env:* "Tell me if it is all right to audit in this room?" (If not, run hav.)

*Aud:* "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"  
"What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?"

*W/h:* “Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?” “What was it?”

*Ptp:* “Do you have a present time problem?” “What is the problem?”

***START OF PROCESS:***

“Now I would like to run this process on you (name it).”

“What would you say to that?”

***MIDDLE RUDIMENTS:***

“In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal, or been careful of?” “What was it?”

***END RUDIMENTS:***

*1/2-unT:* “In this session, have you told me any half-truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me, or tried to damage anyone?” “What was it?”

*E-M:* “In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?” “How did you try to influence the E-Meter?”

*? or C:* “In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command?” “What question or command did you fail to answer?”

*Dec:* “In this session, is there anything you have decided?” “What was it?”

*W/h:* “In this session, have you thought or done anything I have failed to find out about?” “What was it?”

*Aud:* “In this session, have you been critical of me?” “What have you done?”

*Env:* “In this session, was the room all right?” (If question reacts or can squeeze denotes down havingness, run hav.)

*G/g:* “Have you made any part of your goals for this session?” “Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?”

***END OF SESSION:***

“Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?”

“Is it all right with you if I end this session now?”

“Here it is. END OF SESSION. Has this session ended for you?” (If pc says, “NO”, repeat, “END OF SESSION.” If session still not ended, say, “You will be getting more auditing. END OF SESSION.”)

***END OF PROCESS NON-CYCLICAL:***

“If it is all right with you, I will give this command two more times and then end this process.” (gives command two more times)

“Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?”

“End of process.”

## ***END OF PROCESS CYCLICAL:***

“Where are you now on the time track?”

“If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process.” (After each command ask, “When?”)

“That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?”

“End of process.”

Most flagrant errors that can be made:

1. Not being expert on Meter.
2. Fumbling with script, not knowing Model Session.
3. Asking a question a second time when it was clear the first time.
4. Not asking the question a second time when it read on the Meter.
5. Not saying you could not tell what the read was when you couldn't. (If you couldn't you say it again.)
6. Failing to get in the R factor by telling pc what you are going to do at each new step.
7. Doing what the pc suggests.
8. Adding unusual questions or remarks or making sudden irrelevant statements.

## **PATTER ON RUDIMENTS**

(Question) “That reads. What was it. There, that (steering pc by needle).”

(Question) “That's clean.” (Go to next question without adding “What was it?”)

After a question gets an instant read:

Whatever pc says in answer, then say, “I'll check that on the Meter,” and ask the same question again.

If question is clean and then pc answers, do not check it on Meter. Just ack and go to next question.

**L. RON HUBBARD**

LRH:dr.bh  
Copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 JUNE 1962

Franchise  
Sthil

**PREPCHECKING**

(Correction of HCO Bulletin 1 Mar 1962  
and to be included as a change in all  
Theory Checking of that HCO Bulletin)

The Withhold System of When, All, Appear, Who must not be applied to the overt found for the formulation of the What Question. This System is only applied to the earliest overt one can discover on the chain opened by the What Question.

The exact Prepcheck procedure becomes as follows:

1. Ask the Zero Question. (See HCO Policy Letters and Information Letters for Sec Check Forms. These are "Zero Questions".)
2. If the Meter gives an Instant Read (see HCO Bulletin May 25, 1962 for Instant Read) then the auditor says, "That reads. What have you done?"
3. The pc gives the overt. (If the pc doesn't, the auditor can coax or demand until an overt is given, saying such as, "But you must have done something because the Meter reads—What have you done?" until the pc does give the overt on the subject of the Zero Question. A pc well in session will give it. (Note: A severe ARC Break can cause a Meter to react on a Zero Question. Just ask if there's an ARC Break if you suspect it and ask the Zero again.)
4. The auditor says, "I will check that on the Meter" and reads the Zero Question again. If the Zero Question still gives an instant read the auditor says, "I will formulate a broader question."
5. The auditor forms and tests What Questions until one gives an instant read the same as the Zero Question did.
6. Addressing the pc directly, the auditor asks the What Question he has composed and verified by Meter test.
7. The pc is permitted to answer the What Question, giving as many incidents in a general way as he cares to. He is never cut off short. Let him talk as long as the pc can give overts.
8. The auditor asks if there are any earlier incidents. The auditor, without a Meter, gets the pc down the track until the pc says that's the earliest.
9. The auditor now applies the Withhold System, When, All, Appear, Who, to this earliest incident, going through When, All, Appear, Who several times.
10. The auditor now says, "I will check the What Question on the Meter," and does so, asking it and watching for a read.
11. If there is an instant read, the auditor repeats steps 8, 9 and 10 above until there is no instant read on the What Question.
12. When the What Question reads nul the auditor says, "That is clean. I will now do the Middle Rudiments." Note: Various end rudiments can be added to Middle Ruds in extreme cases of pc ARC Breaks.



13. The auditor checks the Middle Rudiments and gets them clean.
14. The What Question is tested again. If clean, the auditor says, "It is clean." And then reads the Zero Question. If it is clean (gives no instant read), the auditor goes on to the next *Zero* Question. If it is not clean the auditor repeats steps 4 onward to 14 until the Zero Question is clean, at which time he goes to the next Zero Question on the list.

-----

All What Questions are asked to expose and clean a chain of Overts. If the Zero didn't clean at once originally, there is a Chain of such overts. Therefore the What Question must be asked so that it can be answered with a number of overts if they exist.

It is fatal not to permit the pc to fully answer the What Question to his complete satisfaction before shoving at him with demands for earlier material. To cut off his effort to give several incidents is to leave him with missed withholds and a probable ARC Break.

Don't ask the Withhold System of When, All, Appear, Who, on *any* late incidents. Use this system only to blow the earliest incident the pc can easily recall. This opens Up earlier track if any exists. And if none exists it blows the whole chain.

The pc can experience the effect of collapsing track if the auditor applies the Withhold System, When, All, Appear, Who, to an incident late (closer to pt) on the chain. Or if the auditor won't let the pc fully answer the What Question when found.

### THE WHAT QUESTION

The formulation of the What Question is done as follows:

The pc gives an overt in response to the Zero which does not clean the needle of the Instant Read on the Zero.

The auditor uses that overt to formulate his What Question.

Let us say the Zero was "Have you ever stolen anything?" The pc says, "I have stolen a car." Testing the Zero on the Meter, the auditor says, "I will check that on the Meter. Have you ever stolen anything?" (He mentions nothing about cars, Heaven forbid!) If he still gets a read, the auditor says (as in 4 above), "I will formulate a broader question." And, as in 5 above, says, to the Meter, "What about stealing cars? What about stealing vehicles? What about stealing other people's property?" The auditor gets the same Zero Question read on "What about stealing other people's property?" so he writes this down on his report. All of 5 above is done with no expectancy of the pc saying a thing.

The auditor does it all in a testing tone of voice with a testing attitude.

Now in 6 above, as he has his question, the auditor sits up, looks at the pc and says, meaning it to be answered (but without accusation), "What about stealing other people's property?"

Now, as in 7 above the pc will probably mention the car, the auditor gives a half acknowledgment (encouraging mutter), the pc then recalls an umbrella and then a dressing gown and seems to think that's it. The auditor now fully acknowledges all of these with an "All right!" or a "Thank you, that's fine." The auditor does this only when the pc appears to be sure that's it.

And then the auditor goes into 8 above with, "Now are there any earlier incidents of stealing other people's property?" and 7 and 8 are played out until the pc finally says something like, "Well, I stole a mirror from a little girl who lived in our block, and that really is the first time." The auditor now does 9. The pc with track opened by the

When, All, Appear, Who Questions, is again asked, as in 10, “I will check that on the Meter. What about stealing other people’s property? That still reads. Is there an earlier incident (as in 8)?” The pc recalls one, saying, “I almost forgot. In fact I had forgotten it. I used to steal my father’s car keys when I was three!” The auditor says (as in 9), “When was that?” “Is there any more to that?” “What might have appeared there?” “Who failed to find out about it?” asking these four questions in order and getting an answer each time, asking them again and perhaps again. The auditor then says, “I will check this on the Meter (as in 10). What about stealing other people’s property? That’s clean.” And goes on into 12.

The auditor says, “I will now do the Middle Rudiments” (HCO Bulletin June 23, 1962), cleans them and again says, “I will check the What Question. What about stealing other people’s property? That’s clean. “ And immediately does the Zero Question asking, “Have you ever stolen anything? That’s clean. Thank you.” And then asks the next Zero Question on the list.

Note: The pc can go back track as far as he likes without auditor interference.

-----

### TESTING WHATS

To test any auditor’s auditing, and to be sure all is well with a field or HGC pc, the *What* Questions should be checked out on the pc by another auditor and the pc turned back to the auditor to get them flat. Don’t test Zeros for flatness. Increasing responsibility will unflatten Zeros. Only What Questions become forever nul if done right. So only test What Questions for nul reads. A What Question left alive can really raise mischief, as it constitutes a *series* of missed withholds.

So test all What Questions formulated for that pc after an intensive or close to its end to be sure. And be sure every What Question used is written legibly on the auditor’s report.

-----

This improvement in Prepchecking will increase speed, save ARC Breaks and make an easier and more thorough job of it.

Use this version of Prepchecking for all Theory and Practical tests and drills and on all pcs.

Prepchecking still combines with the CCHs more or less session for session.

Form 3 and Form 6A are the most productive Zero Question Lists. For auditors, “The last two pages of the Joburg (Form 3) and Form 6A” is a required prerequisite for higher classes.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 JUNE 1962

Franchise  
CenOCon

**E-METER STANDARDS**

The Mark IV E-Meter is just sensitive enough at sensitivity 16 to get a pc's rudiments in *so the pc knows it* and to check out a goal.

No earlier British or American meter is this sensitive.

The use of a meter which does not so register will not detect out rudiments and will not find a goal.

A pc audited on a meter even slightly less sensitive than this will have answers to rudiments questions although the meter says they are clean. Therefore the pc is nerved up with missed withholds and you get an ARC breaky or unsatisfactory session.

This is the most fruitful source of "dissatisfied" or "difficult" pcs. They are being audited with rudiments out when an insensitive meter indicates the rudiments "clean".

The needle gets dirtier. It becomes hard to read the meter. And, due to lack of sensitivity alone, the meter will find no goals. And as the needle is wilder, goals are even less likely.

Model Session and havingness sessions which are properly run by the auditor will result in an even, clean needle. But if the meter is bad, even when auditing is good, the needle will get wilder as the ruds are actually out even when they seem to be in.

You are doing earlier auditing and Prepchecking to clean up the wildness of a needle so Routine 3GA can be run. If auditing is good and the needle is getting worse, there's something wrong with the meter or the operator's meter reading.

Only the Mark IV shows if a rudiment is clean. All others ruin sessions and needles and give you ARC breaky pcs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.bh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

26 June 1962

** 6206C26	SHSBC-164	E-Meter Quality
** 6206C26	SHSBC-165	Prepchecking

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**RUNDOWN ON ROUTINE 3GA**

3GA has cleared or is clearing everyone on whom it has been run. It's a clean sweep. These include several famous rough cases so this one is really there.

Procedure is to get a goal and then make awful sure it is the goal. A goals list is at least 850 long and shows, if complete, no TA action when nulling (aside from a slight drift of the TA normal in any session). Thirty or forty goals that persisted in and didn't go out are then separately listed and done at sensitivity 16. You have to catch this point in the session.

Then the goal found is checked. This is done by giving the pc a full prepcheck on the Middle Rudiments. Then the Mid Ruds are also done against the goal itself with great care. If the goal remains in solidly ticking every time except when read against a swooping needle, that's it. It's best for another auditor to do the checkout.

Then the lines are phrased up as per HCO Information Letter of May 10, 1962. A negative goal can be phrased "Not want the goal quote, etc", for example, "Who or what would not want the goal quote not to be detected", "Would oppose the goal quote not to be detected", etc.

Now here's an important datum. As many as twenty-five hundred items per line, or ten thousand items in all, have been listed before a needle went free on every line. This was Halpern. Others are of similar length. It won't do any good to stop short and in fact would lose everything; you have to list to free needle on the first goal found.

The goal doesn't vanish utterly during listing. The tick read of it transfers off to one or another of the lines in turn.

Ten thousand items means about 200 hours of auditing at the slowpoke rate of 100 items found per two hour session.

So you see there's considerable listing to be done, and also it's fatal to list a bum goal.

The cure for listing a bum goal is just to find the right goal and list it.

Listing a bum goal results in a pc's getting sick and dizzy. The bank goes solid after a dozen hours of listing and the pc has motion sensations or the winds of space.

So we really got it. What we need is accurate auditing to find the pc's goal in the first place and accurate checkout to make sure that is the goal, and then you've got easier clearing than we have ever had and you've got 100 per cent clearing.

More and more pcs are getting into listing here and it's all going by the book.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise

## **DIRTY NEEDLES**

### **How to Smooth Out Needles**

Quite often a pc is found whose needle is jerky, random, gives many prior and latent reads and goes into small scratchy patterns or wild, continuing rock slams.

Such a needle is hard to read—and such a pc is a long way out of session a lot of the time.

An auditor, seeing such a needle, and faced with the task of reading the instant read through all these prior and latents and scratchy patterns, tends to think in terms of heroic measures. It is “obvious” that this pc has W/Hs, Missed W/Hs, overts and secrets to end all reactive banks and that the thing one ought to do is pick each one of these random needle reactions up as soon as possible. BUT when you try to do this you find the needle gets even *more* confused. It reads something all the time!

An extreme case of a dirty, random needle is not solved by any “fish and fumble” or heroic measures.

The pc’s needle reacts that way because of *no-confidence*, which induces a sort of auto-control in session which induces a dirty needle. *Ability to predict equals confidence*.

The thing to do is give this pc about 3 sessions of rudiments and havingness just Model Session severely with no Q and A or added chit-chat. The sessions should be each one about one hour long.

All one does is do Model Session, getting the rudiments in carefully exactly by the textbook. Use Model Session, HCO Bulletin 23 June 1962. Use instant reads only as per HCO Bulletin 25th May 1962. And avoid *any* Q and A as per HCO Bulletin 24 May 1962, “Double Questioning”.

Use Middle Rudiments somewhere during the havingness session.

By doing this perfect, predictable textbook auditing session three times on the pc, most of these prior and latent reads will drop out and the needle will look much cleaner. Why? Because the pc is off auto or in session.

You can *make* a pc’s needle get dirty and react to many odd thoughts by the pc by doing the following:

1. Try to clean off prior reads and avoid instant reads in getting ruds in (going against HCO Bulletin 25 May 1962).
2. Use a scruffy and ragged session pattern (going against HCO Bulletin 23 June 1962).
3. Double question any rudiments question (as per HCO Bulletin 24 May 1962).

The pc’s needle, even if very clean at the start and loose, will tighten up, develop patterns and dirt if an auditor fails to use a textbook session. This includes raw meat

that never heard of a textbook session. Raw meat particularly requires a severely textbook session. Don't think because they're new they won't know. And too much coffee shop type auditing can rough a needle.

A pc who has become unwilling to be audited is best cured by three textbook flawless sessions of havingness as above. Don't plunge for what is *wrong*. Just establish a standard of excellence the pc can predict. And up will come the pc's confidence.

After the three sessions you can prepcheck or fish and fumble and get things really clean. And providing you *continue* to use a textbook session, the pc will get better and better.

If a pc still has a dirty needle with many prior reads after an auditor has audited that pc three sessions, then we can conclude that that auditor

1. Is not using HCO Bulletin 25 May 1962 in reading a meter.
2. Is not handling questions as per HCO Bulletin 24 May 1962, and
3. Is not using Model Session HCO Bulletin 23 June 1962.

There *are* no difficult pcs now. There are only auditors who do not give textbook sessions.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

28 June 1962

- |            |           |                            |
|------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| ** 6206C28 | SHSBC-166 | Rudiments                  |
| ** 6206C28 | SHSBC-167 | Question-and-Answer-Period |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs  
Tech Depts

**ARC PROCESS**

The ARC Straight wire process now used in training is the old  
Recall a time.....

This is hereby changed for the following reason:

Students and co-audit pcs go out of session when permitted to answer only “yes” to the command, as two-way comm is deleted and the definition of “In Session” is violated.

With the advent of Repetitive Rudiments the student should be otherwise (and better) trained on a repetitive process.

A second question is thereby added to the ARC process and any co-audit process that can be answered merely “yes”.

The new process:

RECALL A COMMUNICATION. WHAT WAS IT?

RECALL SOMETHING REAL. WHAT WAS IT?

RECALL AN EMOTION. WHAT WAS IT?

Do not use the older versions or any process that can be answered only with “yes” without adding the second question.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd.bh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 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  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JULY AD 12

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING**

As the Prepchecking we have been doing is a complicated skill and as recent rudiments developments open the door to simplified handling of overts, you may lay aside all versions of previous Prepchecking and Security Checking and substitute the following.

This is in the interests of improvement of auditing and keeping pcs from being enturbulated by unskilled auditing. The version herein is far easier to train students into as it uses the same actions as Repetitive Rudiments.

**REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING**

We will still use the term “Prepchecking” and do all Prepchecking by repetitive command.

We will refer to the older version as “Prepchecking by the Withhold System” and abandon it as of this date as too complicated and too susceptible to restimulation of pcs in semi-skilled hands.

**THE AUDITING PROCEDURE**

We handle any Zero question exactly as in repetitive rudiments, (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962).

The session is started exactly as per Model Session, HCO Bulletin June 23, 1962, (or as may be amended). A Mark IV Meter is used (using earlier meters on Prepchecking can mean disaster as they miss withholds).

The auditor then announces for the body of the session, that a Prepcheck will be done on such and such a subject or Form.

The auditor then takes an already prepared Form (such as Form 3, 6A, Prepcheck Mid Ruds, Goals Prepcheck Form [not yet released] ).

**STEP ONE**

Without now looking at the Meter, the auditor asks the Form question repetitively until the preclear says that’s all, there are no more answers.

**STEP TWO**

The auditor then says, “I will check that on the meter” and does so, watching for the Instant Read (HCO Bulletin May 25, 1962).

If it reads, the auditor says, “That reads. What was it?” (and steers the pc’s attention by calling each identical read that then occurs). “There... That... That . . .” until the pc spots it in his bank and gives the datum.

**STEP THREE**

The auditor then ignores the meter and repeats Step One above. Then goes to Step Two, etc.

**STEP FOUR**

When there is no read on Step Two above, the auditor says, “Do you agree that that is nul?” The auditor watches for an Instant Read on this and if there is an Instant Read on it, does Step Two above, then Step Three. This gives a double check on the flatness of a question.

This is *all* there is to Repetitive Prepchecking as a system. Anything added in the way of more auditor questions is destructive to the session. Be sure not to Q and A (HCO Bulletin of May 24, 1962).

Be sure your TR4 is *excellent* in that you *understand* (really, no fake) what the pc is saying and acknowledge it (really, so the pc gets it) and return the pc to session. Nothing is quite as destructive to this type of auditing as bad TR4.

### THE ZERO QUESTIONS TIME LIMITER

There must be a time limit on all Zero questions. Although it says, "Have you ever stolen anything?" the auditor must preface this with a TIME LIMITER such as "In this lifetime . . ." "In auditing. . ." or whatever applies. Form 3 (the Joburg) has to be prefaced with "In this lifetime . . ." on every question. Form 6A, as it speaks of preclears, etc, is already limited in Time.

In Prepchecking the Middle Ruds, use "In auditing . . ." before each question or other appropriate limitations.

The Zero *must not* swing the pc down the whole track as Middle Rudiments then become unanswerable and a fruitful source of missed withholds.

### MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

In Repetitive Prepchecking the Middle Rudiments can be Fast Checked (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962), (using the package question "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" If one of the four reads, use it singly to clean it in the same worded question and do the remainder of the Middle Ruds singly: "In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal?").

Use the Middle Rudiments Fast Checked every time you clean a Zero Question, whether the pc had answers for it or not.

### PREPCHECKING THE MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

To begin or end a series of sessions (such as an intensive), Prepcheck also the Middle Rudiments.

In such Prepchecking the Middle Ruds, for havingness sessions, the Zeros are as follows:

"Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have suppressed?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have invalidated?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have failed to reveal?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have been careful of?"

To these standards add, in the same question form, "suggested" "failed to suggest" "revealed" "told any half truths" "told any untruths" "damaged anyone" "influenced the E-Meter" "failed to answer a question" "failed to answer a command" and "Since I have been auditing you have you shifted your attention?" Flatten off with O/W as below.

### O/W ASSISTS

As a Prepcheck by form and even beginning rudiments are not calculated to handle a pc who is *very* distraught before the start of session by reason of upsets in life (howling PTPs accompanied by misemotion) or who is too ill physically to settle into auditing, an earlier rudiment immediately after start of session can be used. This is general O/W (Overt-Withhold):

"What have you done?" "What have you withheld?"

These are run alternately. This is *never* run on a terminal (i.e. What have you done to George? etc). Only the general type command is now used.

When the pc is much better, go into the usual rudiments.

(Note: This is, by the way, the best repetitive process for an assist.)

This is run to a nul needle on both questions. If either gives an Instant Read, continue to run both until both are nul, much as in steps One, Two, Three and Four of Repetitive Prepchecking.

When used to flatten off a Prepcheck on the Middle Rudiments, whether for Prepchecking or for goals type or ordinary Repetitive Prepchecking, the O/W command wording is as follows:

“Since I have been auditing you, what have you done?” “Since I have been auditing you, what have you withheld?”

Both must be nul to conclude the process. If either is found alive on the needle, run both.

When used to begin a session, or when used to Prepcheck the Middle Ruds, O/W must be followed by a Fast Check of the Mid Ruds.

### SUMMARY

This type of Prepchecking—Repetitive Prepchecking—is more easily done and more thorough than Prepchecking by the Withhold System and its earlier forefather Security Checking. It replaces both of these.

In view of the fact that the same system is used for Repetitive Rudiments (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962), by learning one, the student also learns the other, thus saving a lot of time in study and training.

Repetitive Prepchecking replaces former auditing requirements for Class IIa and *is* the Class II skill.

It should be thoroughly instilled in the auditor that extra doingness by the auditor is detractive from the system and that every additive is a liability, not required in the system and liable to upset the pc. It is a *must* that the auditor be very capable with TR4 and that the auditor makes no attempt to shut off routine pc originations as the intensity of “In Sessionness” generated by modern Model Session used with Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking is such as to make the ARC breaks quite shattering to the pc if TR4 is bad.

If Repetitive Prepchecking is run right, with good metering, the only remaining source of missed withholds is the inadvertent withhold caused by bad TR4. (The pc said it but the auditor didn’t *understand* it.)

This bulletin culminates three years of exhaustive research into the formation of Model Session, Rudiments and the handling of overts, and overcoming the limitations of the auditor and student in handling sessions. This, coming with the broad success of Routine 3GA, rounds out auditing from raw meat to clear for all cases capable of speech. These techniques represent a data span of 13 years and a general research of 32 years.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 JULY 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**BULLETIN CHANGES**

(Changes in Model Session  
HCO Bulletin June 23, 1962, HCO Bulletin May 3, 1962  
and HCO Bulletin July 3, 1962)

(Note: Make changes on your copies of HCO Bulletin May 3, 1962, HCO Bulletin June 23, 1962 and HCO Bulletin July 3, 1962 so that students passing these bulletins do not have to give the outdated data in their Theory Examination of HCO Bulletins May 3, 1962, June 23, 1962 and July 3, 1962. This HCO Bulletin July 4, 1962 is to be passed also in Theory as it gives Why.)

**HAVINGNESS RUD**

The Room Rudiment is dropped from Model Session in the Beginning Rudiments but remains in the End Rudiments.

Abolish its use in Beginning Rudiments. Retain its use in End Rudiments in all HGCs, Academies, staff auditing and the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

The Room Rudiment spoils the evenness of Repetitive Rudiments and as often as not takes the pc's attention out of session.

**MISSED WITHHOLDS**

The question: "In this Session have you thought, said or done anything I have failed to find out?" is to be used in all Model Sessions as a Random Rudiment to be used in strict accordance with HCO Bulletin May 3, 1962, "ARC Breaks—Missed Withholds". It remains also as part of End Rudiments.

The word "about" is deleted from the end rudiment question as it is unnecessary.

Change your copy of HCO Bulletin May 3, 1962 to give the above as the standard command.

This is used whenever the pc starts to get tense or tries to explain urgently. Don't let the pc get into a full ARC Break. See it coming. But if pc does get into a heavy ARC Break it is of course used. It means the auditor was slow observing.

Its use is always repetitive as in any other Repetitive Rudiment.

The "said" is added to prevent upset from poor TR4.

**OVERT/WITHHOLD**

At the start of any session, after starting the session, General O/W may be used on any pc who is feeling ill or misemotional *before* session beginning by reason of heavy restimulation or acute PTPs. This is run only until the pc feels better and has cycled to present time. It is not run until both questions are nul (as given in HCO Bulletin July 3, 1962).

Use the cyclic type ending on the process.

Follow this action by Repetitive asking of the Missed Withhold Rudiment above to prevent a missed withhold from occurring.

### END WORDS

The E-Meter has two holes in it. It does not operate on an ARC broken pc and it *can* operate on the last word (thought minor) only of a question. Whereas the question (thought major) is actually nul.

A pc can be checked on the END WORDS OF RUDIMENTS QUESTIONS and the charge on those single words can be made known and the question turned around to avoid the last word's charge.

Example: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

The word "difficulties", said to the pc by itself gives an Instant Read. Remedy: Test "Difficulties". If it reads as itself then change the question to: "Concerning your difficulties, are you willing to talk to me?" This will only react when the pc is unwilling to do so.

Caution: This trouble of END WORDS reading by themselves occurs mainly in the presence of weak TR1 and failure to groove in the question to a "thought major". With good TR1, the END WORDS read only when the question is asked.

IN PRACTICE you only investigate this when the pc insists strongly that the question is nul. Then test the end word for lone reaction and turn the question about to make it end with another end word (question not to have words changed, only shifted in order). Then groove it in and test it for Instant Read. If it still reacts as a question (thought major) then of course, it is not nul and should be answered.

### CLEAN

Change HCO Bulletin July 3, 1962 to read: Do not pay attention to any reaction consequent to asking "Do you agree that that is clean?"

Trying to handle a reaction to this second question is too involved for ordinary handling. If the main question reads nul, ignore a read on "Do you agree that is clean?"

### DOUBLE CLEANING

"Cleaning" a rudiment that has already registered nul gives the pc a Missed Withhold of nothingness. His nothingness was not accepted. The pc has no answer. A missed no-answer then occurs. This is quite serious. Once you see a Rudiment is clean, let it go. To ask again something already nul is to leave the pc baffled—he has a missed withhold which is a nothingness.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.aap.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 JULY 1962

Central Orgs  
Tech Depts

**COACHLESS TRAINING  
USE OF A DOLL**

As it is better in the absence of *good* coaches to do many drills (but not TR0, 1, 2, 3, 4) with the student solo, mocking up the session as he goes, we are using this at Saint Hill.

A student, many of whom feel the emptiness of the empty chair he or she is facing, should make or buy and use a doll.

The doll need not be elaborate but should be at least a foot tall, preferably two feet.

The drills of spitting out rapidly Model Session Repetitive Rudiments, Fast Rudiments, Listing, Nulling, etc, are at this time being done Coachless and great progress is being made.

But the empty chair “gets” some auditors. Therefore the doll. Dolls were used in training first in 1957.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

10 - 12 July 1962

** 6207C10	SHSBC-168	Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking, Part I
** 6207C10	SHSBC-169	Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking, Part II
** 6207C12	SHSBC-174	Meter Reading
** 6207C12	SHSBC-175	Meter Training

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  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



You have suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

You have failed to suppress\_\_\_\_\_

You have protested\_\_\_\_\_

Another has invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

You have invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

You have failed to reveal\_\_\_\_\_

You have been careful of\_\_\_\_\_

F. On the goal\_\_\_\_\_is there anything:

Another has suggested\_\_\_\_\_

You have failed to suggest\_\_\_\_\_

You have suggested\_\_\_\_\_

You have suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

You have failed to suppress\_\_\_\_\_

You have protested\_\_\_\_\_

Another has invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

You have invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

You have failed to reveal\_\_\_\_\_

You have been careful of\_\_\_\_\_

-----

G. READ GOAL TO PC: Reacts\_\_\_\_\_ Reacts\_\_\_\_\_

Reacts\_\_\_\_\_

(If goal does not react when read in Section G, do Section H.)

H. Do you get a reaction when you ask pc—Has this goal been:

Suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

Invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

If no reaction do I.

If reaction, clean with Rep. Prepcheck.

I. Read goal to pc: Reacts\_\_\_\_\_ Reacts\_\_\_\_\_

Reacts\_\_\_\_\_

J. If reaction is a multiple reaction and not a clean single tick (if needle reacts as a dirty needle on the Instant Read) ask Repetitive “Are you withholding the goal from anyone?” Clean off any read.

K. Read goal to pc:            Reacts\_\_\_\_\_ Reacts\_\_\_\_\_  
   Reacts\_\_\_\_\_

L. Do Mid Ruds Repetitive.

M. Read goal to pc:            Reacts\_\_\_\_\_ Reacts\_\_\_\_\_  
   Reacts\_\_\_\_\_

(Note: Do any goal found up to this point, if it got past D above. If the goal does not give a clean single tick every time it is read except against a fast rise, abandon it. If goal reads in Section L use it for listing as it is *the* goal.)

N. Compose list wording: (Do not change pronouns. If “Myself” or some such word invites you to do so, use the goal just as it is. If goal is negative use just as it is.)

1. Who or what would want to  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Who or what would not want to  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Who or what would oppose  
\_\_\_\_\_ (Change verb in goal to “ing” form.)
4. Who or what would not oppose  
\_\_\_\_\_ (Change verb in goal to “ing” form.)

Lines formed all reacted like the goal\_\_\_\_\_

If not do a repetitive check on Mid Ruds and test again. Get pc to agree to lines or find out why not.

When all lines react as an instant read, it is safe to list goal.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Auditor

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JULY AD12

CenOCon  
Sthil Students

**ROUTINE 3GA**  
**HCO WW R-3GA Form 1**  
**LISTING PREPCHECK**

Before and during listing of goals, and before beginning to list items for any goal from the four lines, and during listing, the following Prepcheck must be completed as a form for the pc. It must thereafter be done every fifth session. The form must be made out for the pc and included in his or her folder.

The Prepcheck is done Repetitive (HCO Bulletin of 3 July AD12) in Model Session with a Mark IV Meter.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pc's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Location of Org \_\_\_\_\_

Mark when clean:

A: In auditing is there anything you have

Suggested_____	Protested_____
Failed to suggest_____	Done to anyone_____
Suppressed_____	Tried to make anyone guilty of_____
Invalidated_____	Altered_____
Revealed_____	Decided_____
Failed to reveal_____	Blamed_____
	Regretted_____

B: Since you have begun auditing is there anything another has failed to find out about you?\_\_\_\_\_

Since your arrival at (location) is there anything you have done to another that we have failed to find out?\_\_\_\_\_

C: In this lifetime, on listing is there anything you have

Suggested_____	Protested_____
Failed to suggest_____	Done to anyone_____
Suppressed_____	Tried to make anyone guilty of_____
Invalidated_____	Altered_____
Revealed_____	Decided_____
Failed to reveal_____	Blamed_____
	Regretted_____

D: Since you have started Scientology listing has anything shifted your attention?

Since you have started Scientology listing is there anything you have

Suggested\_\_\_\_\_

Protested\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to suggest\_\_\_\_\_

Done to anyone\_\_\_\_\_

Suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

Tried to make anyone guilty of\_\_\_\_\_

Invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

Altered\_\_\_\_\_

Revealed\_\_\_\_\_

Decided\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to reveal\_\_\_\_\_

Blamed\_\_\_\_\_

Regretted\_\_\_\_\_

E: FOR LINE LISTING AFTER GOAL HAS BEEN FOUND.

1. On the line "Who or what would want to\_\_\_\_\_(goal)" is there anything you have

Suggested\_\_\_\_\_

Protested\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to suggest\_\_\_\_\_

Done to anyone\_\_\_\_\_

Suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

Tried to make anyone guilty of\_\_\_\_\_

Invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

Altered\_\_\_\_\_

Revealed\_\_\_\_\_

Decided\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to reveal\_\_\_\_\_

Blamed\_\_\_\_\_

Regretted\_\_\_\_\_

2. On the line "Who or what would not want to\_\_\_\_\_(goal)" is there anything you have

Suggested\_\_\_\_\_

Protested\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to suggest\_\_\_\_\_

Done to anyone\_\_\_\_\_

Suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

Tried to make anyone guilty of\_\_\_\_\_

Invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

Altered\_\_\_\_\_

Revealed\_\_\_\_\_

Decided\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to reveal\_\_\_\_\_

Blamed\_\_\_\_\_

Regretted\_\_\_\_\_

3. On the line "Who or what would oppose\_\_\_\_\_ing (goal)" is there anything you have

Suggested\_\_\_\_\_

Protested\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to suggest\_\_\_\_\_

Done to anyone\_\_\_\_\_

Suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

Tried to make anyone guilty of\_\_\_\_\_

Invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

Altered\_\_\_\_\_

Revealed\_\_\_\_\_

Decided\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to reveal\_\_\_\_\_

Blamed\_\_\_\_\_

Regretted\_\_\_\_\_

4. On the line "Who or what would not oppose\_\_\_\_\_ing (goal)" is there anything you have

Suggested\_\_\_\_\_

Protested\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to suggest\_\_\_\_\_

Done to anyone\_\_\_\_\_

Suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

Tried to make anyone guilty of\_\_\_\_\_

Invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

Altered\_\_\_\_\_

Revealed\_\_\_\_\_

Decided\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to reveal\_\_\_\_\_

Blamed\_\_\_\_\_

Regretted\_\_\_\_\_

F: USE ONLY AFTER GOAL HAS BEGUN TO BE LISTED:

On the goal\_\_\_\_\_ (goal) is there anything you have

Suggested\_\_\_\_\_

Protested\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to suggest\_\_\_\_\_

Done to anyone\_\_\_\_\_

Suppressed\_\_\_\_\_

Tried to make anyone guilty of\_\_\_\_\_

Invalidated\_\_\_\_\_

Altered\_\_\_\_\_

Revealed\_\_\_\_\_

Decided\_\_\_\_\_

Failed to reveal\_\_\_\_\_

Blamed\_\_\_\_\_

Regretted\_\_\_\_\_

Date completed\_\_\_\_\_

Auditor\_\_\_\_\_

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO PL is changed by HCO PL 22 July 1962, *Routine 3GA-Listing Wording.*]

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

17 July 1962

\*\* 6207C17 SHSBC-170 E-Meter Reads and ARC Breaks

\*\* 6207C17 SHSBC-17 1 Anatomy of ARC Breaks

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 JULY 1962

Sthil Students  
CenOCon

**CLEARING—FREE NEEDLES**

Any auditor running a Routine 3 process and obtaining a free needle on an E-Meter should, on the Saint Hill course, have an Instructor observe and verify that condition and in a Central Organization should have it observed by an HCO Area Secretary.

Any auditor obtaining a free needle on all lines continuously (the state of a first goal clear) should, on the Saint Hill course, demonstrate that condition to an Instructor and, in a Central Organization, to an HCO Area Secretary.

An Instructor or HCO Area Secretary should make a statement on the auditing report testifying to the fact and existence of the free needle.

In short, there are two stages of observation—the first free needle obtained on one line and the state of continuous free needle on all lines.

*No* verbal statement by an auditor, not otherwise confirmed as above is to be given credence or be used to establish the condition of a case.

The early observation on one line being difficult to maintain for observation is not mandatory, but if not verified as above may not be claimed.

The state of a “first goal clear” is established by:

1. A free needle on each line ]listed from the goal.
2. No reaction of the goal on the meter after a final prepcheck on that goal as per HCO Policy Letter 15 July 1962.
3. Tone Arm near Clear Read.

A free needle is not a stage 4 needle or an inverted stage 4. It is floating and free.

In Routine 3GA we have actual, lasting clearing. It is accomplished by expert and exact auditing. There is no reason to fake the condition or rumour that someone is clear when he or she is not, or to tell someone he or she is clear when they are not.

-----

We are on solid ground with technology and procedure. Let's keep it that way. The goal has been sought on Earth for 2,500 years. We have achieved 8 first goal clears on the Saint Hill course in the last two months. People, with reason, trust a clear. We have attained the state of clear in Man. We must not upset that Trust.

LRH :gl.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6207C19	SHSBC-172	The E-Meter
** 6207C19	SHSBC-173	Question-and-Answer Period



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JULY 1962

Franchise  
Sthil Students

*URGENT*

**INSTANT READS**

(Adds to HCO Bulletin of 25 May 1962)

On Rudiments, repetitive or fast, the instant read can occur anywhere within the last word of the question or when the thought major has been anticipated by the preclear, and must be taken up by the auditor. This is not a prior read. Preclears poorly in session, being handled by auditors with indifferent TR One, anticipate the instant read reactively as they are under their own control. Such a read occurs into the body of the last meaningful word in the question. It never occurs latent.

In other words all reads occurring when the major thought has been received by the preclear must be taken up and cleaned. This does not mean all needle reactions occurring while question is being asked must be cleaned, but it does mean that the instant read is often to be found before the last meaningful word is spoken fully, and it is catastrophic not to take it up and clean it.

Goals and items are however read only when the read occurs exactly at the end of the last word.

This will give you cleaner sessions and smoother needles.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.pm rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B was cabled to the Hubbard Communications Office in Washington, D.C., who issued it on the same date as above under the title of *Rudiments Repetitive or Fast.*]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 JULY 1962

Sthil Students  
CenOCon

**ROUTINE 3GA  
LISTING WORDING**

(Changes HCO Policy Letter 17 July 1962, "Listing Prepcheck"  
and HCO Policy Letter 15 July 1962, "Goals Prepcheck Form")

The wording of the four lines for listing out a goal should be as follows:

Line One: "Who or what would want to (goal)\_\_\_\_\_?"

Line Two: "Who or what would oppose (goal -ing form)\_\_\_\_\_?"

Line Three: "Who or what would pull back opposition to (goal -ing form)\_\_\_\_\_?"

Line Four: "Who or what would pull somebody or something back from (goal -ing  
form)\_\_\_\_\_?"

It will be noted that lines One and Two remain the same.

Also it should be noted that there is no alternate to "pull back" (restrain, retard,  
give different vectors).

It should be noted also that the goal changes in form on three lines to the "ing"  
form of the verb in the goal. Example: Goal—"to fish" changes to "fishing".

These changes are for all goals. If a goal is currently being listed, change the list  
wording to the above.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[See HCO B 21 August 1962, *3GA-Line Wording*, page 130, which changes earlier issues on 3GA  
lines.]

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
24 - 26 July 1962

** 6207C24	SHSBC-176	Routine 3GA, Part I
** 6207C24	SHSBC-177	Routine 3GA, Part II.
** 6207C26	SHSBC-178	Routine 3GA
** 6207C26	SHSBC- 179	Prepchecking

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 JULY 1962

Sthil Students  
CenOCon

**R3GA**  
**HCO WW FORM G3**  
**FAST GOALS CHECK**

*(Keep completed form in pc's folder)*

This is a rapid check out of a goal for use by Auditors and particularly Instructors and Auditing Supervisors. By an Auditor it is done in Model Session. By an Instructor or Supervisor it is done as a simple check out.

ALWAYS COMPLETE WHOLE CHECK.

Pc's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Org Location \_\_\_\_\_

Goal \_\_\_\_\_

A: Read goal rapidly to pc three times \_\_\_\_\_  
Note reaction and inform pc if in or out.

B: Repetitive Ruds. (Early reads are acceptable as instant reads on ruds, not on goal which *must* be instant only.)

On the goal \_\_\_\_\_  
has anything been  
Suppressed \_\_\_\_\_ Invalidated \_\_\_\_\_  
Suggested \_\_\_\_\_ Withheld \_\_\_\_\_

Only when each is clean, go to next and when all clean go to C.

C: Read goal rapidly to pc three times Note reaction and tell pc if in or out.

D: Do fast ruds: Is there anything you have suppressed, suggested, invalidated, failed to reveal. When all nul, go to E.

E: Do fast ruds plus goal with no pause between ruds and goal.

On the goal \_\_\_\_\_  
is there anything you have suppressed, suggested, invalidated or failed to reveal.  
(Goal) \_\_\_\_\_ (Goal) \_\_\_\_\_ (Goal) \_\_\_\_\_

If none of ruds read in this section and goal did read, providing the meter reading of the check was flawless it is the right goal.

This section must be read all in one sweep to be valid, with no read on any rud and a sharp downward tick each time exactly at end on the goal read. Don't add in the goal until all four ruds items read nul in one sweep. Then read the ruds line and the goal 3 times in one breath.

Goal checked out \_\_\_\_\_ Auditor \_\_\_\_\_

Goal didn't check out \_\_\_\_\_

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

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  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[The order of Prepcheck buttons is amended by HCO B 30 August 1962, *Order of Prepcheck Buttons*, page 133.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 AUGUST AD12

Sthil Students  
CenOCon

**ROUTINE 3GA**  
**GOALS**  
**NULLING BY MID RUDS**

Now that 3GA has been proven time and again to make clearing a certainty for all in the hands of a good auditor who knows his meter and drills, I have been spending much time smoothing out any rough spots in *finding* and *being certain of* the pc's goal. Only a wrong goal or opposition goal can get the pc in real trouble. Therefore goals listing and nulling and testing become of great importance.

**THE GOALS LIST**

The pc is asked to do a goals list. This can occur before or after a goals Prepcheck, HCO Policy Letter of July 15, 1962.

The list must be *at least* 850 goals long, one column per foolscap (legal size) page. (Folders of 4 pages, 1 sheet, of ruled 13 inch x 8 inch paper can be bought in most stationers.) The pc is asked to get that many (850) goals written *legibly* and numbered.

The pc must be warned not to read the list back to himself or herself to try to find the goal, and not to attempt any nulling on self. (Pcs can become quite ill doing this foolish reading or trying to nul on self. If a method is ever developed for this, I'll release it, but no such method exists and all attempts to find it on self have ended in failure. )

The auditor then does the goals Prepcheck form, HCO Policy Letter of July 15, 1962.

It is understood that the pc will have received at least a Problems Intensive well done and have a fairly smooth needle.

**TEST FOR CHARGE**

The auditor tests the list now for *needle* charge. TA action on reading half a page of goals to pc *does not matter* but will probably be absent.

What is important is the needle action. This *must not exceed* a quarter of an inch rapid fall, instant, for any goal read on test. (A sudden wild rock slam a half dial wide on a goal or two per page does not matter. It is not always seen on a pc but happens on some.) Further, at least five goals out of eight or ten have *no* instant read on them. In other words, the list *is flat* on the *needle*.

If the list is not flat at 850 goals, then do a four line goals list, one or four goals on each list, until the original goals list *does* react as above.

This special goals listing uses the lines as follows:

1. What goal might you have?
2. What goal would oppose your goal?
3. What goal would retard opposition to your goal?
4. What goal would pull back your goal?

About sixty items or so, at a guess, put down one to four in rotation, on each of these lists should discharge the goals list of superfluous needle reaction. Occasional bursts of goals on these lines will be encountered. Take them down. But try to keep the lines even in number, letting only line I run on over length.

Carefully note any pain or sensation the pc gets on any goal on any line. (Pn or Sen written after the goal.) This will help rule out opposition goals.

When the main goals list in its early part, on the test, acts as above, desist on the four lines of goal. Scrap (or at least put away) lines 2, 3 and 4. Do not use or nul them. But use line one as an added line to the pc's goals list. Now ask the pc if the list is complete in addition to the above test for needle action. Make sure pc seems happy that his goal is somewhere on the goals list.

This then is a complete goals list and can be nulled.

### NULLING BY MID RUDS

Nulling by repeater technique was the original method of nulling just as repeater technique was the earliest form of Dianetic Auditing. It has now been superseded by "Nulling by Mid Ruds".

If you did the Mid Ruds on *every* goal on the list you would be sure to have the goal when you came across it. But this is too tedious. I have worked out a much faster method using the Mid Ruds, faster even than repeater technique.

There are only a few things that can hide a goal or make one read falsely. These are:

"READ" throughout means "INSTANT READ".

SUPPRESSED—Can keep a goal or an invalidation, suggestion, mistake, assertion or missed withhold on the goal *from reading*.

INVALIDATED—Can make a wrong goal read or can steal the read from a right goal.

SUGGESTED—This is evaluation. It can do the same as "INVALIDATED"—make a wrong goal read or steal the read from a right goal.

FAILED TO REVEAL—This is the missed withhold on the goal. It reads as a minute rock slam and can absorb all other reads or make a wrong goal read with a minute rock slam. We call this a "dirty needle".

MISTAKE BEEN MADE—This is a combination of the auditor or the pc asserting and the other denying that it is or is not the goal. It is a conflict of positive negative opinion and forms a ridge impossible to dispel unless the auditor asks for "MISTAKE".

ASSERTED—Another name for suggested, used mainly in check out, to be sure, and occasionally in routine nulling when pc is declaring, "It is my goal."

The auditor should learn the above by rote and by sight and by experience.

These are the *only* things that can give a wrong goal or submerge a right one.

-----

In actual use on nulling, each has a priority over the rest. *Suppressed* is king, *Invalidated* is next, *Suggested* is third, *Failed to Reveal* is fourth and *Mistake been made* is fifth.

These are used in nulling only as needed.

Example: The auditor reads a goal from the list *once* (with good TR 1 and no flubs and pc in session). If the goal does *not* read, the auditor asks on the meter, “Has this goal been suppressed?” If no reaction of needle on either goal or “suppressed” the auditor says, “Thank you. That is out.” And marks the goal off the list.

Why? Because if it (1) was the goal it would have read. (2) If it was an invalidated goal it would have read. (3) If a failed to reveal was present it would have read a dirty needle. (4) If a mistake had been made it would have read. So that leaves only Suppressed as possible. And if Suppressed doesn’t read, then that isn’t the goal.

But if Suppressed reacted and was cleaned, the goal would have to be read again.

If the goal read (originally or after Suppressed was cleaned), then it may be not a goal read but an Invalidation, Suggestion, a Failed to reveal (if dirty) or a Mistake. So one asks for an Invalidation. If that reads, the auditor cleans it, and then asks the goal again, and if it now doesn’t read, the auditor asks Suppressed and if Suppressed doesn’t read, the auditor marks the goal off as “Out”.

However, if the goal still read, after Invalidated was cleaned, the auditor asks for Suggested. If that reads, the auditor cleans it and asks the goal again. If it does not now read, the auditor asks Suppressed and if it doesn’t read, then the auditor marks the goal “Out”.

If the last Suppressed read and was cleaned, the auditor reads the goal again and if it reads, then the auditor asks for a Failed to reveal. If that reads, the auditor cleans it and asks the goal again and if the goal reads, the auditor asks if a Mistake has been made and if that reads the auditor cleans it and asks the goal again, and if the goal does not read the auditor asks Suppressed. If Suppressed doesn’t read, the auditor marks the goal “Out”.

Also, this sequence applies, or any part of it. The auditor asks the goal. It reads. The auditor, after a goal *reads*, never asks Suppressed at once but the others. Suppressed is only asked after the goal is not reading and the goal is marked “Out” only when both goal and Suppressed are found clean one after the other without cleaning anything.

After a goal reads, ask Invalidated. If that doesn’t read, ask Suggested, if that doesn’t read ask “Failed to reveal”. If that doesn’t read, ask “Mistake been made”. If that doesn’t read ask Suppressed again to be sure and then read the goal three times to see if it kicks after each read. If it kicks only once or twice now, ask Suppressed and the rest and try to get it to read each time as that would be *the* goal if it did!

This is like running in a maze, with doors suddenly opening to the right and left and the auditor making a fast correct choice for the next question. The more exact is his choosing, the faster the nulling. A full bulletin of drills will be published on all this to give you the hang of it.

And every goal behind you is *not* the goal and won’t be examined again, and every goal ahead *may* be.

Drilling with this system does marvels to pick up an auditor’s speed on this nulling.

A keen meter reader and a fast handling of this system can dispose of a hundred goals in a couple of hours with no further re-nulling to do.

And the pc stays relaxed! No anxiety. That came from the built-up charge of invalidations, etc, and the fact that the pc had no certainty for 15 hours or more of nulling. At least the pc is now certain of the goals he or she *doesn’t* have. And the charge is gone from them.



Intricate at first glance, requiring drill; this is a very rewarding system. For you *may* find the pc's goal in the first 300 goals. And when you have by this system, that's it. You go no further.

If you find this too hard at first, just do the Mid Ruds complete on every goal until you can grasp this shortened system. It would be better than repeater nulling.

If you use Mid Ruds until you learn this system (don't use repeater technique any more on lists of goals, it's too long and too inaccurate) use this form: Read the goal once. Then use this Mid Rud form, "On this goal has anything been suppressed, invalidated, suggested, withheld, or mistaken?" Watch for *any* fall on these words and clean it off until whole question is clear. Then read the goal 3 times to see if it reacts. And mark it in or out accordingly. If it still reads well, clean it up further. If it finally reads with a sharp 1/16th of an inch more or less fall, *exactly* at the end every time, it's *the* goal. Go no further on list.

When you study this HCO Bulletin well and drill on the drills HCO Bulletin that goes with it, you will be able to make the goals fly.

Good hunting.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr jh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 AUGUST AD12  
Issue II

Sthil Students  
CenOCon

**ROUTINE 3GA**  
**NULLING DRILLS**  
**for**  
**NULLING BY MID RUDS**  
(Accompanies HCO Bulletin of 1 August AD12)

(Note: In an actual session, in addition to Model Session script, only the words below are used. No additive words or departures are necessary except to clean up a constant dirty needle with *session* Mid Ruds if that misfortune occurs. And use *session* Mid Ruds only when you *can't* go on otherwise.)

**Drill on New Nulling Procedure for Routine 3GA**

Position for this drill is the usual auditor-coach position. The coach only has the drill form and follows it exactly until the student auditor has each example down perfectly. When the student auditor and the coach have these drills down exactly, then the coach can give different reads and different goals for the student auditor to work on, the only caution being that the goals selected be those which would be most unlikely on anyone's goals list. The goal used in this drill is: TO BE A TIGER. On the drills below "A" is for auditor, "C" is for coach. Student and coach use only the words in the drill except when student errs at which coach says, "Flunk!" and "Start", at which student starts at the beginning.

*Drill 1:*

- A: To be a tiger.
- C: Null
- A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?
- C: Null
- A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 2.*

- A: To be a tiger.
- C: Read
- A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?
- C: Read
- A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been invalidated?
- C: Null
- A: To be a tiger.
- C: Null
- A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?
- C: Read
- A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?
- C: Null
- A: To be a tiger.
- C: Null
- A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 3:*

- A: To be a tiger.
- C: Null

A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger.  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 4:*

A: To be a tiger.  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Read  
 A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger.  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 5:*

A: To be a tiger.  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Read  
 A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. To be a tiger.  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 6:*

A: To be a tiger.  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: On the goal to be a tiger is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has any mistake been made?  
 C: Read  
 A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has any mistake been made?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 7.*

A: To be a tiger.  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
C: Null  
A: On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
C: Null  
A: On the goal to be a tiger has any mistake been made?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has any mistake been made?  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Null  
A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 8:*

A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
C: Null  
A: On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has any mistake been made?  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read (Note that this goal is now ready to be checked out.)

*Drill 9:*

A: To be a tiger.  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed.  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested.  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Null  
A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 10:*

A: To be a tiger.  
C: Null  
A: On this goal is there anything you have suppressed?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal is there anything you have suppressed?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Read  
A: On this goal is there anything you have invalidated?  
C: Null  
A: On this goal is there anything you have suggested?  
C: Read  
A: What was it? Thank you. On this goal is there anything you have suggested?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger.  
C: Null  
A: Thank you. That is out.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 2 AUGUST 1962

CenOCon

**CCH ANSWERS**

The following queries and my reply are useful in the CCHs.

Ron from Ray = 1/8 = 335L

Thanks for Telexes 233L2 and 334L2. That's fine.

Some queries have come up about CCHs. Could we have the latest stable data on

1. When is a physical origination picked up—after command is executed and before acknowledgement, or after acknowledgement?
2. Does one pick up by saying—"How are you doing?" "What happened then?" or "I noticed—so and so—happened. What's going on?"—or is there any other method that we don't have and which is better than any of these?

Love  
Ray

Ray from Ron = 15.30 = 2/8 = 335L2

1. When it happens.
2. Only by a two way comm query like "What's happening?"

Never designate the origin.

Don't make a system out of queries. Three commands nicely done is flat.

Don't take spoken data from PC about somatics as a reason to keep on.

Also the process that turns something on turns it off.

Love  
Ron.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 AUGUST 1962

Sthil Students  
Course  
Franchise

## **RUNNING CCHs**

CCHs being run terribly wrong.

Correct version follows: Run a CCH only so long as it produces change in the pc's general aspect.

If no change in aspect for three commands, with the pc actually doing the commands, go on to next CCH.

If CCH producing change do not go on but flatten that CCH.

Then when for three commands executed by the pc it produces no change go on to next CCH.

Run CCHs One Two Three Four, One Two Three Four, One etc.

Use only right hand on One.

The CCHs are run alternated with Prepchecking session by session depending upon whether or not the pc has had a win on either and whether the CCHs in the CCH Session were not left with the pc stuck in one CCH which was producing terrific change and thusly very unflat as a process.

CCHs are not run in Model Session, nor run on the E-Meter, nor are goals set. The reality factor is established before the first command is given.

It is code break clause thirteen to run a CCH that is producing no change or to not flatten in same or subsequent session a CCH that is producing change.

Some pcs get no reaction at first on any CCH; therefore run each one as above, CCH One Two Three Four, One etc, and with Prepchecking being given in alternate sessions, or as stated above in case one of the CCHs has to be flattened off in another session on the CCHs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

** 6208C07	SHSBC-180	Routine 3GA Data on Goals, Part I
** 6208C07	SHSBC-181	Routine 3GA Data on Goals, Part II.
** 6208C08	SH TVD-11	Routine 3GA Nulling Goals (LRH auditing demo)
** 6208C09	SHSBC-182	Clearing
** 6208C09	SHSBC-183	Goals Listing

Magazine  
Franchise

**HOW IT FEELS TO GO CLEAR**

Jean Kennedy of Bulawayo, Southern Rhodesia, wrote me a note after her first goal was cleared. She had been cleared once on Routine 3 and was cleared again on the same goal at Saint Hill with Routine 3GA. Her subjective reality on these two processes is of great value to all Scientologists.

These are in actual fact two notes. I give you both with her permission.

She has now had her second goal found and is listing on it and will soon be the first 3GA 2nd goal clear. She graduates this week from the Saint Hill course with honours.

“Dear Ron,

I feel tip top at the moment, and really couldn't have asked for more out of auditing, if this was as far as one could go it would be enough. I must say there are two big basic differences in the way I feel now and the way I felt after the 3rd S.A. ACC. (1 ) This time I have a bigger certainty, and a very 'comfortable' feeling, and while R3 processed you up to more confidence each session, I found on R3GA (just before the lines went free), that I had never felt so stripped bare, and at one stage I didn't know who I was or where I was going until I realized that 'I' had to do things not wait for something else to do them! So all in all listing on the goal was fun, pictures and track recall were very vivid and I sailed right back to the beginning of 'body moulding', but the biggest thrill of all was the basic cognition where I thought I was going to find the answer to why I decided to be that way—and guess what, there wasn't *any* reason !

Jean.”

-----

On receipt of the above I asked her for permission to issue and she wrote the following expansion:

“This is the basic difference between R3 and R3GA. Being run on R3 had a limiting effect inasmuch as you didn't run with enough depth and could never really get at the reason why you chose to be the way you are. It processed you towards greater confidence each session and finally left you feeling tip top, mass-less but still no real answer—and one was always a little vulnerable, if you knew the right button. Pictures and cognitions were also limited.

Now, R3GA was very different and had much more punch behind it, and you could 'get' at things you would never have got at on R3. At the start of listing everything seemed innocent enough and I couldn't see any difference between the two, and suddenly the track opened up and vivid pictures and recall in detail on the track came from all directions, cognitions shot off the body in little spark forms and one could feel the masses just exploding all around, at times making the rings so hot on my hands they had to be taken off. There was a steady feeling of cycling backwards (to the start of body moulding) and one's habit patterns, fixed ideas and attitudes just went flying by. The most fascinating part was the lines transferring over and viewpoints changing totally.

The worst part comes just before the end, two days before the needle went free I dug my heels in and refused to give another item—why, because I didn't know who I was, where I was and least of all why I made that postulate. I have never felt so stripped bare of everything and suddenly realized that nothing was automatically going to swing into place and do things for me, 'I' would have to do them.

My auditor gently coaxed me into more items, and then at the bottom I found the answer I have been looking for, for so long—'nothing'—how foolish can a thetan be! But what a certainty.

Jean Kennedy.”

L RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.bh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard



## ROCK SLAMS AND DIRTY NEEDLES

I have been lucky enough and you have been fortunate enough to trace the source of the persistent dirty needle and also the wide rock slam.

A criminal I had my hands on showed me clearly that the wide rock slam was an overt. The dirty needle is a small rock slam. And so we benefit.

The reason a rock slam is a rock slam is that I found it on many pcs in an effort to locate the rock.

It now turns out that it is also the sign of an overt. For instance all failed to reveals read with a small dirty needle which is in fact a smaller edition of the rock slam.

If you have a wide rock slam then the goal does not exist on the list and that list may be scrapped.

If you find this on a pc it means either that the pc has fantastic personal overts against you or that the pc's goal is such as to be an overt against Scientology.

Therefore on a pc whose needle is doing a large or a small rock slam all you have to do is ask for "What goal might you have that would be an overt against Scientology?" and you will be able to run the rock slam off by so listing, and when it is gone you will have the pc's goal on that list.

In the case of a small occasional dirty needle you have missed a withhold or the goal lies under your pencil while nulling or a few goals earlier.

When the dirty needle is persistent and is always recurring, the solution is to list goals with the question as stated above.

The actual formula for this is as follows, for a dress parade action on raw meat.

Do a Dynamic Assessment. Ask the question: "What goal might you have that would be an overt against (dynamic found)?"

It turns out amongst Scientologists that the roughest case is thereby now the shortest case to do, as the goal will lie on a specific list which, when nulled by Mid Ruds (Tiger Drill), will disclose the pc's goal.

These principles should be put into effect at once.

LRH:dr.cden  
Copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6208C14	SHSBC-184	Rock Slams and Dirty Needles
** 6208C14	SHSBC-185	World Clearing
** 6208C15	SH TVD-12A	3GA Dynamic Assessment—Listing Items for Dynamics, I
** 6208C15	SH TVD-12B	3GA Dynamic Assessment—Listing Items for Dynamics, II.
** 6208C16	SHSBC-186	3GA Dynamic Assessment

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 AUGUST AD12

Sthil Students  
Franchise Airmail

**3GA**

**LINE WORDING**

(Changes all earlier Policy Letters and HCO Bulletins on Lines, 3GA)

Lines must read after the goal is checked out and before listing.

The optimum line wording is probably as follows:

LINE ONE: WHO OR WHAT WOULD WANT ( goal ).

LINE TWO: WHO OR WHAT WOULD OPPOSE ( goal ing form for verb ).

LINE THREE: WHO OR WHAT WOULD OPPOSE OPPOSITION TO ( goal ing form ).

LINE FOUR: WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT WANT ( goal ).

The line must read on the pc, firing like the goal, each time.

**LISTING SESSION**

The goal must be made to fire at least at the beginning of every listing session.

The button "Suppress" can be too heavily charged to read at first on a goal unless it is repetitively used as opposed to fast checking. All other Mid Rud buttons can be fast checked.

**DURING LISTING**

Before listing any one line, the goal should be made to fire and the line made to fire, both by the Tiger Drill (HCO Bulletin 1 August 1962). The line is then listed. This may be found more time-consuming than timesaving in listing but is a good thing to do.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
21 August 1962

** 6208C21	SHSBC-187	Finding Goals by Dynamic Assessment
** 6208C21	SHSBC-188	Basics of Auditing

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 AUGUST 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**3GA**

**DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM**  
**DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT TIP**

To get a complete list for a Dynamic Assessment ask for “any additional parts of the dynamics”, after giving pc a broad list of them.

Then ask for “anything the pc can think of that should *not* be a part of existence” and carefully put down everything pc says isn’t or shouldn’t be a part of existence.

DATUM: THE ONLY REASON GOAL FINDING BY DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT FAILS IS BECAUSE THE ITEM IS NOT ON THE LIST. THIS IS TRUE OF THE LIST OF DYNAMICS AND THE LIST OF ITEMS. NO WIDE ROCK SLAM WILL DEVELOP IF THE LIST IS NOT COMPLETE. USE PC’S LIST OF DYNAMICS PLUS THINGS HE SAYS AREN’T. GET LOTS OF “DYNAMICS” FROM THE PC UNDER ANY DYNAMIC HE WANTS TO LEAVE OUT. “WHAT PARTICULARLY SHOULDN’T BE A PART OF THAT DYNAMIC?”

Assess by tiny Rock Slam, or wide Rock Slam, asking some version of this thought on each Dynamic, “Consider committing overt acts against (dynamic).” Read by Instant RS (dirty needle or wide slam).

Assess out the Dynamic that Rock Slams most.

Now list this Dynamic by asking the question, “What represents (dynamic found) to you?”

Bleed meter for any more items. If list complete meter will be quiet.

During this writing of items a wide Rock Slam will turn on, diminish to a dirty needle as you list and vanish when list is complete. Carefully note on Auditor’s Report if this happened as it will never happen again!

Assess list with the question, “Consider committing overt acts against (list item being tested).”

Keep in all instant Rock Slams or dirty needles. Assess down to one Item. This, like the Dynamics assessment is ordinary Assessment by Elimination.

Find Item.

Prepcheck Item. Be very careful to keep Suppress button clean.

Ask the pc for a list of goals with the following question: “What goal might you have that would be an overt against \_\_\_\_\_ (Item)?” As you list you will get a wide RS dwindling as you list to a dirty needle and vanish. List this first line out to a clean needle before listing goals on any of the remaining lists.

You want only a few goals on each of these lists except List One. On List One list off the Rock Slam. Note on report that this happened.

## GOALS FORMULAE

What Goal might you have—

1. that would be an overt against (item)? (Poor)
2. that (item) would consider impossible? (Check)
3. that (item) might consider was an overt?
4. that (item) would consider undesirable (also for itself or themselves)? (Good) (Check)
5. that (item) would prevent you from doing? (Good) (Check)
6. that would be impossible to realize if you were (item or part of item). (Best)
7. that would be impossible if (item) were you? (Check)
8. that couldn't be achieved because (item) acted as a barrier?
9. that (the item) would make too difficult?
10. Just list some more goals.

List all lists in order above until Rock Slam and all tendency to a dirty needle vanishes.

Pc will probably know his goal. Or his goal will recur on several of the lists.

Assess List Six above first, being very careful of Suppress, working it over hard.

If not on List Six use List Five. If not on Five, go over List Four. If not on List Four, nul remaining list.

If the pc has any dirty needle (minute Rock Slam) or lots of Fail to Reveal answers, lists above were not completed to clean needle and a bled meter.

If your pc's Dynamic was on the Dynamic List, if the pc's Item was on the Item List, and if your pc's goal was put down on the above lists, and if the Dwindling Wide Rock Slam was found on Listing Items and Listing Line One above on goals, you'll have pc's goal on list for sure.

If you turn on the above phenomena, write it on a report giving Dynamic and Item to HCO WW as it can never be turned on again.

The goal must be checked out by a Class IV auditor before it can be listed.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B incorporates HCO B 23 August 1962, *3GA-Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam*, the only text of which said to add the tenth line in the Goals Formulae above. This HCO B is added to by HCO B 31 August 1962, *3GA-Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam*, page 135, and modified by HCO B 3 September 1962, *3GA-Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam*, page 138. It is canceled by HCO PL 25 February 1963, *R2-R3-Routine 3-M-Goal Finding by Method B*, which has a limited distribution so is not in these volumes.]

- \*\* 6208C22      SH TVD-13A      Dynamic Assessment and Item Assessment, Part I  
\*\* 6208C22      SH TVD-13B      Dynamic Assessment and Item Assessment, Part II.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 AUGUST 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**ORDER OF PREPCHECK BUTTONS**

This is the following order of buttons for all Prepcheck forms, including those of July 15 and all Problems Intensives. All buttons must be cleaned before leaving any section even if they have to be gone over several times in sequence.

The first question to be asked is "What have you been careful of?"

The subsequent questions are: "What has been \_\_\_\_\_?"

The endings are now as follows and in the order:

Agreed upon.  
Suppressed.  
Asserted.  
Invalidated.  
Suggested.  
Protested.  
Revealed.  
Mistaken.  
Withheld.  
Done by you.  
Decided.

Finally: "What goals have been set?"

These buttons are done over and over until nothing is made to read and the suppressed button has been worked hard every time it is covered.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :dr.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 31 AUGUST 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**3GA**  
**EXPANDED LINE WORDING**

The following are expanded line wordings for listing on a found and checked goal in Routine 3GA:

GOAL: "To Sneeze", which is used as an example.

Line One: Who or what would want to sneeze?

Line Two: Who or what would oppose sneezing?

Line Three: Who or what would not oppose sneezing?

Line Four: Who or what would not want to sneeze?

Line Five: Who or what would sneeze?

Line Six: Who or what would not sneeze?

Line Seven: Who or what would oppose opposition to sneezing?

Line Eight: Who or what would pull back somebody or something from sneezing?

Line Nine: Who or what would want to be sneezed at?

Line Ten: Who or what would oppose being sneezed at?

Line Eleven: Who or what would not oppose being sneezed at?

Line Twelve: Who or what would not want to be sneezed at?

Line Thirteen: Who or what would be sneezed at?

Line Fourteen: Who or what would not be sneezed at?

Line Fifteen: Who or what would cause somebody or something to be sneezed at?

Line Sixteen: Who or what would help somebody or something not to be sneezed at?

Line Seventeen: Who or what would someone or something have to be in order to sneeze?

Line Eighteen: Who or what would someone or something have to be in order to oppose sneezing?

Line Nineteen: Who or what would someone or something have to be in order not to oppose sneezing?

Line Twenty: Who or what would someone or something dare not to be in order to sneeze?

Lines Seventeen through Twenty are not vital to list, and Lines Nine through Sixteen, which are the effect wording of the goal, may not be broadly workable.

Lines One through Eight are vital. By listing four items at a time on the first eight lines or the first sixteen lines, the case stays balanced, the goal can be kept firing, and clearing is speeded.

So use eight or sixteen lines on goal listing.

As regards pain, it can occur on any line in listing. The only dangerous indication is if no pain occurs on any line, only sensation, which indicates that rudiments are out or that the goal is wrong. Pain can even occur on Lines Two and Four and sensation on Lines One and Three, and all still be okay.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.-h  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 31 AUGUST 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**3GA**

**DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM**

(Second addition to HCO Bulletin of 22 August 1962, same title)

If a routine Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam fails, the preclear should be prechecked on "On Auditing is there anything you have suppressed?" etc.

Then the preclear can be listed on "What isn't a part of the Dynamics?" and "What part of life have you regretted?"

Completing and assessing these lists, will give you the Dynamic.

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
1812 19th Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 SEPTEMBER 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**3GA—DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM**

The following is a step list which modifies earlier HCO Bulletin.

List persons the preclear has considered opinionated and has detested. Assess by "Consider committing overt against\_\_\_\_\_."

List "What part of existence does (person found) represent?" Assess by "Consider committing overt against\_\_\_\_\_."

Take Dynamic found. List "What represents (Dynamic found) to you?" (dwindling Rock Slam). Assess by "Consider committing overt against\_\_\_\_\_."

Take item found. List "What goal have you had that would be an overt against (item found)?" (dwindling Rock Slam).

Do list 6 by listing "What goal might you have that would be impossible to achieve if you were\_\_\_\_\_or (part of\_\_\_\_\_)?"

If item not on first lists above, list all remaining lists in HCO Bulletin August 22, '62, and examine for goals in common to a majority of lists and Tiger Drill these.

LRH:rahjh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

## **CLEARING SUCCESS CONGRESS LECTURES**

Washington, D.C.  
1—3 September 1962

L. Ron Hubbard gave nine lectures at the Clearing Success Congress, which was held in Washington, D.C., at the Shoreham Hotel.

6209C01	CSC-1	Presentation of the GPM
** 6209C01	CSC-2	The Point Where the Pc Begins to Get Clear
6209C01	CSC-3	Basic Purpose
6209C02	CSC-4	The Healing Effect of Preparatory Auditing (Suppress Button)
6209C02	CSC-5	Staff Introduction—Demo: J. Fudge
** 6209C02	CSC-6	The Problems Intensive, Mechanics and Buttons
6209C03	CSC-7	World Clearing and You
6209C03	CSC-8	Slides Shown by Reg Sharpe
** 6209C03	CSC-9	Your Scientology Orgs and What They Do for You



Franchise

## ACCOUNT OF CONGRESS GOAL

It was offered at the Clearing Success Congress in Washington, September 1st to 3rd, that we would find a goal on someone at the Congress whose name would be drawn at random from a basket. We drew six names from a basket, and the subsequent interview demonstrated that four of these people had rock slams on asking for a short list of people they detested.

Jim Skelton did the interviewing and auditing and goal finding. Lieutenant Colonel Voight was selected as the most likely candidate.

Every available moment of auditing time from the first intermission to the beginning of the third day was thereafter utilized.

It was impossible to turn the rock slam back on after it had been demonstrated by the PC in the interview. Standard dynamic assessment steps were taken without avail.

A dynamic (group) was equivocally located as the dynamic the PC had overts on, and the item *Scientology* appeared on that list. Earlier than this, I requested Jim to ask the PC what would be the consequences of our clearing him. The PC's answers indicated that he would have to change his whole life. On the strength of this, we used the following two questions to list goals.

1. "What goal might you have that would be an overt against Scientology?"
2. "If you were part of Scientology, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve?"

Jim listed some 49 goals on the first question, and then happened to be looking at the meter, and out of the clean flowing meter suddenly appeared a rocket read. He asked the PC what the PC was thinking of, and the PC said, "Immortality, and things like that," and Jim said, "What goal might be associated with this?" And the PC said, "To live."

Jim wrote the goal down and Tiger Drilled it at once, ignoring the remaining goals. The goal read sporadically with ticks and one half dial drop, and seemed very alive. It was interesting that no TA action whatsoever occurred during the listing of the goals on the first question above, and that the second question was never asked. It could be speculated that the goal might have appeared on the second list, but this is of course speculation.

Jim came to my room to tell me about this, and I asked him where the pain and rock slam were. Jim said there had been none, and returned to the auditing room. Much to our relief on Jim's return to the auditing room, the preclear informed him that he had an excruciating pain in his arm which had made him weep, so great was the intensity of it. Jim put him back on the meter, and once more resuming Tiger Drill a wide rock slam turned on, on the goal.

In the check-out session, it was obvious to the auditor that the PC needed a great deal of prepchecking to smooth him out; when he did the end rudiments on the PC, the rock slam continued straight on through the end rudiments, or would have if the auditor had not said, "Floor, floor, floor," several times and gotten the rock slam off so that he could get the end rudiments in.

The PC's cognitions were extreme and numerous, and the behaviour of the needle was strong and persistent, and there is no slightest doubt but what this was the PC's goal.

This demonstration of dynamic assessment by rock slam and finding a PC's goal with this "slight" deadline was a very adventurous activity, and we held our breaths until it had been done. As a matter of fact, we began a second PC on the second day, in hopes of at least getting one on one of the persons offered, and on the second PC were able to get a complete dynamic list as per the standard steps. This PC, on listing on the detested persons' names, listed about a hundred and fifty items, dove straight into his bank, and had extreme manifestations of insanity, and excruciating pain. The dynamic was speculated to be the eighth, but this dynamic assessment was not complete. However, this PC's life changed remarkably just by doing the first bit of dynamic assessment.

LRH:rah.bh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 SEPTEMBER 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

### **3GA**

#### **DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM**

The following is a step which modifies the HCO Bulletin of 22 August 1962:

List persons the preclear has considered opinionated and has detested. Assess by "Consider committing overt against \_\_\_\_."

List "What part of existence does (person found) represent?" Assess by "Consider committing overt against \_\_\_\_."

Take Dynamic found. List "What represents (Dynamic found) to you?" (dwindling Rock Slam). Assess by "Consider committing overt against \_\_\_\_."

Take item found. List "What goal have you had that would be an overt against (item found)?" (dwindling Rock Slam).

Do list 6 by testing "What goal might you have that would be impossible to achieve if you were \_\_\_\_ or part of \_\_\_\_?"

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

CenOCon  
Franchise Airmail

### 3GA TO BE GOALS LINE LISTING

The following is a 24 line listing for a beingness type goal.

The method of running is to place the heading on 24 consecutive legal length pages so that one exists for each line.

The method of running is to clean up the goal so that it fires three times at the beginning of session and then simply list for the remainder of session, putting in Middle Rudiments only at such times as the pc has obviously gone out of session.

These lines are listed exactly four items on each line in rotation. After the four items have been written a short strike mark is put under the beginning of the last item written so that the auditor can easily see when he has listed the next four.

The above directions will apply to all types of lines listed, beingness, doingness and havingness goals, but different wordings have to be used for doingness and havingness goals. NOTE: These lines are not ordinarily prepchecked or made to fire before being used on a pc.

- Line One* Who or what would want to be a catfish?
- Line Two* Who or what would not want to be a catfish?
- Line Three* Who or what would oppose being a catfish?
- Line Four* Who or what would not oppose being a catfish?
- Line Five* Who or what would be a catfish?
- Line Six* Who or what would not be a catfish?
- Line Seven* Who or what would oppose opposition to being a catfish?
- Line Eight* Who or what would pull back somebody or something from being a catfish?
- Line Nine* Who or what would want a catfish?
- Line Ten* Who or what would not want a catfish?
- Line Eleven* Who or what would oppose wanting a catfish?
- Line Twelve* Who or what would not oppose wanting a catfish?
- Line Thirteen* Who or what would make a catfish?
- Line Fourteen* Who or what would not make a catfish?
- Line Fifteen* Who or what would oppose making a catfish?
- Line Sixteen* Who or what would not oppose making a catfish?
- Line Seventeen* Who or what would have to be a catfish?
- Line Eighteen* Who or what would not have to be a catfish?
- Line Nineteen* Who or what would have to oppose a catfish?
- Line Twenty* Who or what would not have to oppose a catfish?
- Line Twenty-One* Who or what would have to have a catfish?
- Line Twenty-Two* Who or what would not have to have a catfish?
- Line Twenty-Three* Who or what would oppose having to have a catfish?
- Line Twenty-Four* Who or what would not oppose having to have a catfish?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jb jh  
copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SECURITY CHECKS AGAIN

With the advent of Dynamic Assessment a new method of Security Checking, far better than any previous Security Checking, has emerged.

Nothing in this bulletin of course detracts in any way from the value of missed withholds, pulling missed withholds or handling missed withholds on preclears or other persons in the Organisation.

If the following questions are asked of a person on a meter it can be at once established whether or not this person will inadvertently, covertly, or unknowingly attempt to ruin, wreck, stop and otherwise interfere with an Organisation, Scientology, or an Auditor. The questions are as follows:

- Consider committing overt against Scientology.
- Consider committing overt against Ron.
- Consider committing overt against the Organisation.
- Consider committing overt against me. (the auditor)

It will be found that such a person has a goal which the person considers to be impossible to achieve so long as any one of the above four exist, therefore destructive actions will at all times be manifested no matter how “constructive” they appear.

The Rock Slam produced must be a wide Rock Slam to be decisive. By wide Rock Slam is meant a quarter of a dial Rock Slam to a full dial Rock Slam.

The action which should be taken if this condition is found to exist is to suspend the person or otherwise put the person away from communication lines until such time as the person’s Dynamic, Item, and Goal are found. Sometimes it is almost enough merely to find the Item, as the foolishness of the conclusion that Scientology stands immediately and directly in their road will appear to the preclear at that time.

By “A Goal which is an overt against Scientology” is meant something which the *pc* considers to be a goal which is an overt against. When you finally see such goals appear they will not be apparent to the auditor as overt. However, the *pc* so interprets them. For instance a *pc* may have a fixed idea against any spiritual activity, interpreting it as a harsh activity which forbids dancing, and the *pc* may have a goal to dance. However the person’s Item lying above the goal to dance will be found to be a spiritual group and this of course would make Scientology appear to the person to be highly antipathetic to the goal to dance.

I cannot too strongly urge the fact that when the above occurs no possible good will result until the Dynamic, Item, and Goal are found. Therefore this should be expedited. All care should be taken not to punish the person unduly, but to carry on because often the person is unaware of the destructiveness of his or her own actions.

In a marriage, if the husband were to place the wife on an E-Meter and ask the question “Consider committing overt against me” and find a wide Rock Slam immediately results, he will be then in total possession of what has been wrong with his marriage. Similarly, a wife finding this manifestation on a husband would also be informed.

The remedy in such a case is not to sack somebody, to shoot somebody, to divorce somebody or take some drastic final action, because we now have all the answer we need to resolve this and it will be found that as soon as the person's goal has been found the condition of hostility will cease.

The Rock Slam produced must be at sensitivity 16 on the meter. If a dirty needle occurs it is necessary to pull the person's missed withholds because these obviously exist. This should not be neglected. By Dirty Needle is meant a quarter of an inch agitation of the needle as an instant response to the asking of the above questions.

This is the new security programme. Any person responsible for maintaining security in an Organisation or a home should perform the above tests and take the remedial action.

I cannot too strongly urge that while this is absolute, or near as it can be, and positive in its diagnosis, it is not permanent because we can now clear, and clearing consists of doing away with the Rock Slam and not the offending person.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jb.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
1812 19th Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 SEPTEMBER AD 12  
Issue III

CenOCon

## **AUTHORIZED PROCESSES**

Only the following processes are authorized for use on Staff Members and on HGC Preclears:

Assists.  
Problems Intensives (Modern Version).  
Ordinary 3GA.  
3GA by Dynamic Assessment.

No other processes are to be used on Staff or HGC Preclears.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jb.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

** 6209C18	SHSBC-189	Directing Pc's Attention
** 6209C18	SHSBC-190	3GA Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**3GA**  
**TIPS ON DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT**  
**RULES OF THUMB**

1. If the system does not work, it is *invariable* that the item is not on the list.
2. If an item, dynamic, or person can be found that will RS broadly, only list “What represents” from it. Do not use another form of listing (goals being a “represents” also).
3. The pc’s interest follows the RS.
4. Carefully record the presence of a RS or any dwindling of the RS on any item, dynamic or, most important, during the course of listing.
5. If the pc has no cognitions the item is *not* on the list.
6. The dynamic and/or item will be accompanied by heavy pain or sensation if on the list.
7. A RS is a convulsion of the mind and can reflect as a convulsion of the body.
8. A pc’s needle may be dirty until the goal is on the list.
9. A goal sometimes cannot be checked out until the charge is listed off on various goals lists derived from the item.
10. The item is more valuable than the person found or dynamic found.
11. An item is proven by its overt goals list (No. 1 ) producing a dwindling slam.
12. The real item when listed itself on “What represents” gives no further slams on the new list.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gljh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
19—20 September 1962

- |            |            |                     |
|------------|------------|---------------------|
| ** 6209C19 | SH TVD-14A | Tiger Drill, Part 1 |
| ** 6209C19 | SH TVD-14B | Tiger Drill, Part 2 |
| ** 6209C20 | SHSBC-191  | Listing Lines       |
| ** 6209C20 | SHSBC-192  | Geriatrics          |

### **A 40 LINE LIST ON A DOINGNESS GOAL**

Using the create CDEI scale a system of writing lines for goals listing has been attempted.

This gives us Create, Interest, Desire, Enforce and Inhibit.

We have four flows for each word positive and four flows for each word at effect.  
The goal: To impress people. And the lines are:

Who or what would create an impression on people?  
Who or what would not create an impression on people?  
Who or what would create opposition to impressing people?  
Who or what would not create opposition to impressing people?

Who or what people would want an impression created?  
Who or what people would not want an impression created?  
Who or what people would oppose an impression being created?  
Who or what people would not oppose an impression being created?

Who or what would be interested in impressing people?  
Who or what would not be interested in impressing people?  
Who or what would oppose interest in impressing people?  
Who or what would not oppose interest in impressing people?

Who or what people would be interested in being impressed?  
Who or what people would not be interested in being impressed?  
Who or what people would oppose interest in being impressed?  
Who or what people would not oppose interest in being impressed?

Who or what would want to impress people?  
Who or what would not want to impress people?  
Who or what would oppose impressing people?  
Who or what would not oppose impressing people?

Who or what people would want to be impressed?  
Who or what people would not want to be impressed?  
Who or what people would oppose wanting to be impressed?  
Who or what people would not oppose wanting to be impressed?

Who or what would have to impress people?  
Who or what would not have to impress people?  
Who or what would have to oppose impressing people?  
Who or what would not have to oppose impressing people?

Who or what people would have to have an impression made on them?  
Who or what people would not have to have an impression made on them?  
Who or what people would have to oppose an impression being made on them?  
Who or what people would not have to oppose an impression being made on them?

Who or what would inhibit impressing people?  
Who or what would not inhibit impressing people?  
Who or what would inhibit opposition to impressing people?  
Who or what would not inhibit opposition to impressing people?

Who or what people would inhibit an impression being made on them?  
Who or what people would not inhibit an impression being made on them?  
Who or what people would inhibit opposition to an impression being made on them?  
Who or what people would not inhibit opposition to an impression being made on them?

Similar goals, all of a doingness type, can be patterned as above.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.Jh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
25—27 September 1962

** 6209C25	SHSBC-193	Current Trends
** 6209C25	SHSBC-194	3GA Assessment
** 6209C27	SHSBC-195	3GA Listing
** 6209C27	SHSBC-195A	3GA Listing



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 SEPTEMBER 1962

Franchise  
CenOCon

**VALID PROCESSES**

(Changes all earlier Issues)

The following processes should be used by all Scientologists and other earlier processes should be discarded except for research.

Class I: Assists.

Class I: CCHs, Op Pro by Dup and SCS.

Class I: ARC Straight Wire.

Class II: Problems Intensives (Modern).

Class II: Prepchecking Auditing, goals, etc.

Class II: Goals Listing.

Class III: 3GA Ordinary.

Class IV: 3GA by Dynamic Assessment.

Class II: Items Listing.

Classes II, III and IV: Tiger and Big Tiger Drills on goals, items, lines, single words, names, persons.

All except Assists, CCHs, Op Pro by Dup and SCS are done in Model Session.

If a process is not mentioned above, do not use it.

*NOTE:* Any of the above Processes, except 3GA ordinary goals finding and 3GA Dynamic Assessment may be done in Co-audits under direct supervision of classed auditors.

For the greatest gain achievable by an auditor in his class, use the above. An auditor attempting processes above his class will have failures and spoiled cases.

Use of processes above Classification can result in cancellation of certificates.

We can clear Earth. Why spoil cases in the process?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 SEPTEMBER AD 12

Franchise

**PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE**

The only fully valid lower level process today that achieves enormously effective results, is the Modern Problems Intensive.

It does the following:

Eradicates feelings of illness  
Adds years to life  
Subtracts years from appearance  
Increases IQ.

It is very easy to run as it can be done with errors and, so long as the Tone Arm moves, will achieve marvellous results.

It is the ideal HGC process for HCA/HPA staff auditors as it gives them countless wins.

It is a natural for the field auditor who knows his Model Session and the rundown.

It can be combined with the CCHs or used without.

Its rundown is simple.

One does a Case Assessment. Assesses for the Change, predates it by a month and runs the Prepcheck Buttons on it over and over, flattening each one so far as possible.

When one assessed change is run, another list of changes is made and assessed and it is all done again.

It can be interrupted by an end of intensive without consequences to the pc if something was left unflat.

The public may scream to get clear, but most of it could only be audited on a Problems Intensive anyway.

Unlike partially completed or badly done goals assessments, there is no liability to a Problems Intensive.

All the gains envisioned in Book I can be achieved with enough Problems Intensives, even a 1st Dynamic clear in many cases.

So don't risk your pc's health and good will if you're not a Saint Hill graduate. Get good, solid gains with the Modern Problems Intensive. Only if you fail to find and pull his or her Missed Withholds in the course of sessions could you estrange a pc.

You may have to clear the buttons for the pc who doesn't understand the words, but other than that it's all plain sailing.

People are suddenly losing all manner of things they thought were illnesses and were calling arthritis and ulcers and what not. They weren't sick. They were just suppressed.

Please realize what you've got here in a Modern Problems Intensive. I'll be giving you lots of data on how it's done.

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

Sthil Students  
Franchise Airmail

**3GA**

**LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS**

**114 NEW LINES FOR LISTING**

(Cancels all earlier HCO Bs on Listing)

(A student under Theory Examination is not supposed to know the lines by heart, only the directions, and how to put lines together sensibly.)

This is probably excellent as the later lines are the same buttons that make goals fire.

The first four lines are well tried. Remember that many have gone Clear on the 1st four with smooth auditing. The next four are also well tried. The next four are taken from the ACC that cleared 15 people.

The remaining lines are the buttons that make goals fire.

The first Twelve Lines *can* be gone through more often during the course of the next 102.

(NOTE: Before doing this listing, make sure the pc knows what his goal is and Tiger Drill nul any old goal found on pc or any goal wording pc thought was his. To get pc's goal to fire at each session beginning, use "In Auditing on the goal\_\_\_\_has anything been \_\_\_\_?" Goal also should be made to fire at session end just before room rud with same drill to clear up session.)

(NOTE: Any trouble with listing stems from (1) Rough Auditing, auditors challenging answers or mixing up questions, pc not in session and ruds out. (2) Wrong lines. (3) Goal not cleaned. (4) Consequences of being Clear feared by pc. (5) Wrong goal. (6) Pc protesting about Lines and Listing.)

(NOTE: Signs of above are (1) TA mostly at 4.5 or 5.0 and doesn't come down. (2) Pc ARC breaky even after missed withholds clean [the items are now withheld] . (3) Pc looking bad, eyes watery. (4) No pain in session [a right goal on checkout always gives pain] . (5) All sen on listing [comes from pc suppressing or being careful of or failing to reveal, these being the Sensation buttons, or from wrong goal] . (6) Bank getting more solid. (7) Pc sick and nauseated. [6 and 7 only occur with a wrong goal.] )

(NOTE: The Tiger Drill buttons or any button or word can itself be Tiger Drilled using the ordinary 6 buttons, all with good effect.)

1. WHO OR WHAT WOULD WANT
2. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT WANT
3. WHO OR WHAT WOULD OPPOSE
4. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT OPPOSE
5. WHO OR WHAT WOULD (Effect wording of goal)
6. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT (Effect wording of goal)
7. WHO OR WHAT WOULD OPPOSE (Effect wording of goal)
8. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT OPPOSE (Effect wording of goal)

(Effect wording can include "be the effect of")

9. WHO OR WHAT WOULD HELP SOMEONE OR SOMETHING (goal)
10. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT HELP SOMEONE OR SOMETHING (goal)
11. WHO OR WHAT WOULD HELP OPPOSE SOMEONE OR SOMETHING (goal)
12. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT HELP OPPOSITION TO SOMEONE OR SOMETHING (goal, ing)

Now into the next blank spaces fit the following buttons, one full consecutive set of lines for each button; make the line (both goal and button) make sense if it does not:

Suppress	Protest about	Damage
Invalidate	Hide from	Withdraw from
Be Careful of	Reveal things to	Create
Suggest things to	Make a mistake about	Destroy
Withhold from	Assert things to	Agree with
	Change (or alter)	Ignore

(Each button is used on each of the following lines consecutively through all lines before the next button is put in the lines.)

- WHO OR WHAT WOULD (goal, ing)\_\_\_\_\_?
- WHO OR WHAT WOULD (goal, ing) NOT\_\_\_\_\_?
- WHO OR WHAT WOULD\_\_\_\_\_(goal, ing)?
- WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT \_\_\_\_\_(goal, ing)?
- WHO OR WHAT WOULD (goal, ing) HELP\_\_\_\_\_?
- WHO OR WHAT WOULD HELP\_\_\_\_\_(goal, ing)?

#### DIRECTIONS

Make the button form and the goal form into a sensible sentence in each line. Pc must be able to answer it.

*Don't* take up the lines with the pc out of session or in session before you list. Do the lines very well before you even go near a session with your pc. Then, in actual auditing and listing the first time through, after pc has answered the last line fully to his or her satisfaction, clear the command of the next line with the pc. Don't alter its sense. Just arrange its word-form so pc can answer it. Then list it and so on. Take up the lines with the pc as you come to them in auditing and not before.

Take a number of stiff cards, any standard size such as 5" x 7". Write a line across the top of each card, the long way.

Number the cards in the upper right-hand corner, consecutive from the first lines above.

In auditing place the card stack on the table. As each card is answered with any items pc has, turn it over, face down, on top of the last cards done so as to preserve numerical order.

Take a pencil or ball-point. Make a small slant mark (/) for each item pc gives you in answer to auditing question.

Take more than one item per question if given. Take items until pc begins to comm lag. Then turn card to next question and use that as before. Do not leave items unaccepted.

Do not write down items. Only make a small slant mark (/) for each item given. For every fifth item, cross out the preceding four.

For the first run of slant (/) marks use a black pencil. For the second run when the whole card is filled with black, overstrike with a red pencil using the same system. For the third run when the card is black and red filled, start again with a green pencil. This should give around 800 items to one card, which should be enough. Cards that drop behind can then be spotted in cleaning up free needles and questioned. Only the 1st 12 cards should have parity.

Pcs should buy their own cards or pay for them in student auditing.

Use rubber bands to enclose cards between sessions. Mark pc's name and date on the 1st card.

Don't challenge pc's answers. Take all the items pc will give you. Don't force pc to give you items.

If pc objects to the wording of a line as unanswerable try to make it answerable by rewording or omit it. Mark F on card each time the line produces a Free Needle. Don't list beyond a Free Needle. Leave card in stack and test each time through.

Make the goal fire *well* by Tiger Drill at the start of each listing session and at the end after end ruds and before room rud.

Get in Mid Ruds with "Since the last time I audited you", if pc is upset or can't seem to get on with listing.

If a line continues Free Needle after a question is asked, don't force pc to answer it.

LRH :drjh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 2 OCTOBER AD12

BPI

### **WHEN YOU NEED REASSURANCE**

(Cancels HCO Bulletin of September 27, AD12, "Dream Come True".)

When you hear people growling, when the lines are all awry, when the auditor has flubbed and the world of Scientology looks black, just remember that in the dozen years of sometimes despairing work and heart-breaking set-backs, the dream has yet come true. We have it now. We can and are clearing them all—and you.

In Scientology just remember this when all looks dark:

IT WILL ALL COME OUT ALL RIGHT.

LRH:jw.bh  
Copyright Q 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6210C02	SHSBC-196	3GA Listing Lines by Tiger Buttons
** 6210C02	SHSBC-197	3GA Listing Session—Listing Lines by Tiger Buttons—2nd Lecture

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 OCTOBER 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**TIGER DRILLING**

I recently noticed that a pc's goal at start of listing sessions was only rock slamming or ticking, and the pc's TA very high.

I told the auditor to clean it up so it would read with rockets. I told her to stress failed to reveal, invalidate and careful of.

Here is the auditor's note giving result.

Dear Ron,

Thanks for your note re Jane.

The RS on her goal showed up during the 13 buttons + and-, in the body of the question, and I had seen it earlier in tiger drill on the goal, but not since.

I did work those 3 buttons (f to r, careful of and inval) hard in yesterday's session; got a cleaner read on the goal, but no rocket. Today, I reworked specifically the auditing in which the goal was found, after which it read with a slow only; then the listing, and got one small rocket a trifle latent; then did instructor's check and got a small instant fall. (The auditor who found the goal RSed. Uncovered more invalidations in that bit of auditing, and got the rest of the inadvertent missed W/H from the time during listing when she thought the goal had blown.)

TA came down to 2.25, and we listed about 900 goals in the remaining 1 1/4 hours with TA 2.25 - 3.25, (.5 - .65 per 20 min), needle looser and clean.

Love,  
Donna.

**GOAL WORDING**

Here is the case of an altered goal wording which kept the pc from going clear over four months of constant auditing:

Dear Ron,

Further to my letter of yesterday I had a wonderful session with Esta today. The Tone Arm came down from 5 - 3 and a stuck needle went free.

I was running "Since April 1962 (1 month before goal was found) on the goal "To express myself" what has been agreed upon," and the stuck point and the missed withhold emerged and I pulled it.

After the goal was found in May (by another auditor) Esta was run on 4 lines but the goal was *altered* from "Myself" to "Himself". Esta agreed to this but thereafter ran *himself* instead of herself. She cognited she had partially gone into her son's valence and had been trying all the time to clear her son and other sons. She had been sitting there wanting to get clear herself and instead was running himself. Since then she had been avoiding auditing until now, and searching for herself. The missed withhold was *herself* as a result of the substitution of himself.

This also restimulated her Rock—for this was a *Sun*—but *her* goal was before the Rock.

There was an RS on Son/Sun. Esta cognited she had switched valences from "Myself" to "Himself".

So there has been this missed W/H since last May. She had identified with Son/Sun as a first creation.

Her goal is now reading well.

So it proves over and over again the terrible importance of not altering goal wordings and getting the lines exactly right.

It was a Session which seemed like a miracle.

All my love, Ron,  
Anne.

#### NEW LINE LISTING

And here is what happens when a goal is right and is made to read well at session beginning and is listed as per HCO Bulletin of 1 October 1962:

Dear Ron,

I listed on the new lines today. It really was marvellous. I must have listed around about 1500 items and on one line I went up to 75 items before I comm-lagged. The big thing I noticed, Ron, was that I didn't have to "*think*" or figure-figure on what the lines were about. I just dealt the items off my bank (like you say). Once my auditor cleared the questions with me and I had the understanding of it, I was away. I knew when I had given him all the items and I just stopped. It really was very textbook. Not much 2-way comm, my auditor occasionally asking me—"How I was doing" and me just sitting there chanting items. Marvellous—Thanks Ron.

Love,  
Irene.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 3—4 October 1962

** 6210C03	SH TVD-15A	Prepchecking a Goal, Part I
** 6210C03	SH TVD-15B	Prepchecking a Goal, Part II.
** 6210C04	SHSBC-198	Modern Security Checking
** 6210C04	SHSBC-199	Making a Goal Fire

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 8 OCTOBER AD 12

CenOCon  
Sthil Students  
Registrars  
Saint Hill Grads  
HCO Secs  
Assn & Org Secs

*IMPORTANT*

**HGC CLEARING**

The plan of HGC Clearing is simple and direct but unless it is scrupulously followed, it will cause upset and dissatisfaction.

If a Central Org is not clearing the public, the public will be upset with it. This is the simple matter of the penalty of not-auditing.

You can make lots of Clears on the staff or in special cases but if you do not do routine clearing in an HGC you will continue to have trouble.

As only recent Saint Hill Graduates are qualified to find goals—in actual fact, they are the only ones who safely can—the backbone of an HGC is a Saint Hill Graduate.

No Saint Hill Graduates can be D of P or D of T at this time, and may be Technical Directors or Association or Organization Secretaries only with my specific permission. This will hold true until the scarcity is solved.

The primary appointment of a Saint Hill Graduate in an Organization is "Goal Finder" in the HGC. When enough exist in an Organization to fill the bare needs of the HGC, then a Saint Hill Graduate will be appointed Staff Staff Auditor as per Staff Clearing Program HCO Policy Letter of September 10, 1962.

The HGC system is therefore as follows:

HPA or HCA Staff Auditors do the following:

1. Handle any CCH case.
2. Give Problems Intensives.
3. Give the "In Auditing" and "On Goals" and past goals Goals Prepcheck (TV Demo tape 3 October 1962 and other lectures of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course). This includes all old goals that were found or went out hard.
4. Do the required 850 goals list.
5. List goals to clear.

At this point, unless the goal was found in 3 above (not 4 above), the HPA/HCA staff auditor turns the pc over to the Goal Finder. This can happen at any time that the Goal Finder has time available.

Once the pc is turned over to the Goal Finder he or she receives no further auditing from other staff auditors, only the Goal Finder. The Goal Finder takes the new pc the moment the last pc's goal was found.

There is no extra charge for the Goal Finder's Auditing and the auditing time of a Saint Hill Graduate may not be sold as such by an HGC. The Goal Finder's Units may be high. The Goal Finder may not take private pcs on his or her own. There may be no part-time HGC Goal Finders. Any Sthil Graduates willing to work part-time to help the Organization should be assigned to the Staff Training Program or the Academy to heighten the level of technology. An exception is the auditing of staff members,



particularly the Organization or Association Secretary. Part-time Saint Hill Graduates may not be used in the HGC.

## FEES

A Central Organization or City Office does not sell auditing hours by the hour ever. It sells (1) Clearing (2) De-Suppression (3) Longevity. It sells these by Intensives as always. It cannot sell "Ten Hours from a Saint Hill Graduate" or charge fees "for special auditing by a Saint Hill Graduate".

Goals finding by an HGC is only undertaken as a part of the clearing assembly line. One cannot come into an HGC just to have a goal found or checked and get other auditing elsewhere. The practice would be very pernicious and result in few clears and many wrecked cases.

A Saint Hill Graduate's auditing time is available in the HGC only if the pc signs the Clearing Contract ("We take Full Responsibility for Clearing you"). Then the person who signed the contract is put on the assembly line for clearing. This policy is not to be varied in *any* way.

Casual pcs coming in for intensives who do not sign the Clearing Contract must sign up for Intensives as always.

All former "Estimate of number of hours" procedures are now abandoned due to effectiveness of pulling Missed W/Hs and a modern Problems Intensive.

A pc signing up for health reasons is just given a routine Missed W/H check and a Problems Intensive. The same is done for Geriatric Cases (longevity of life).

So a pc signs up in the HGC either for Clearing and is put on the Assembly Line, or for Intensives and is given Missed Withholds and a Problems Intensive by an HPA/HCA and is made satisfied by good technical application in either case.

Single hours of auditing may not be sold by a Central Organization, City Office or District Office "to see how it goes". It's Intensives or nothing.

## CLEARING ASSEMBLY LINE

Clearing is sold by Intensives, purchased when auditing is available. A careful log of time is kept. This is TIME IN THE HGC, not time for this or that.

The pc buys one or more intensives and is handed over to the D of P.

The D of P thereafter tells the pc what the pc gets and assigns the pc as necessary.

The line is regulated by the number of Goal Finders and the Goal Finder time available.

Care is taken not to waste the pc's time. Depending on state of case and lack of Goal Finder time available, the pc has the following, some of it or all of it, done.

1. Missed Withholds and Hav process found.
2. Problems Intensive.
3. (For a long-time pc, Dianeticist or Scientologist.) One or more Intensives cleaning up "In Auditing" and "In Self-Auditing", Prepchecks.
4. Do an 850 goals list.
5. (For pcs who have had former goals found, wrongly or otherwise.) Prepcheck on the goal or goals, each one chronologically cared for (1st one taken up first, etc).
6. (For pcs who have been listed on goals or wrong goals and not to clear.) Prepcheck on the Auditing of goals, listing, etc.

7. Tiger Drill on every button (on suppress has anything been suppressed, etc).
8. Straighten up pc's HGC time with a Prepcheck.

All the above are HPA/HCA actions. They are not done by the Goal Finder. If they have to be done, the Goal Finder turns the pc back to HPA/HCA's.

The moment a Goal Finder has completed finding and checking a goal or finding one which must wait for checking by another Goal Finder, the Goal Finder grabs another pc out of the HGC or has one called in. No Goal Finder time is wasted. This may become the source of much sweat and urgency by HGC Admin, but Goal Finder time must be salvaged by grabbing up pcs for him or her.

The Goal Finder uses current methods to find the goal and check it out.

The moment that action is done the pc is returned to an HPA/HCA for a Prepcheck on the goal and listing it.

The Goal Finder must review the lines and personally see the goal fire before permitting it to be listed and must see the pc's folder routinely to make sure it is going well.

All further Prepchecking and listing is done by HPA/HCA's.

The freeness of needle is checked by the D of P.

The goal is fully Tiger Drilled and Prepchecked after the needle goes free on all lines.

This is the Assembly Line for Clearing. The Goal Finder is on no other line, does no other auditing. The only way the pc can be on this line is by signing a Clearing Contract.

## FORMS

A form for each pc undergoing clearing, giving the steps, must be part of the pc's folder and kept up by the auditor. This is based on the above data.

If a pc has had a recent Problems Intensive and now signs a Clearing Contract this is made part of the Clearing rundown. If done, however, by an outside auditor, the pc must be given another Problems Intensive.

A Special Form showing all steps and evidence of a clear must be sent to me.

The idea is to get results, to turn out clears and to keep HPA/HCA's well occupied and at a high technical level.

## ACCIDENTAL GOAL FINDING

It will happen that in cleaning up old goals found or even by sudden disclosure, the HPA/HCA staff auditor may find a goal that fires and is *the* goal. If so, it is checked out by the Goal Finder and listed unless other orders are given regarding the pc (such as unburdening the goal).

HPA/HCA's are not, however, to attempt to find goals at this time and it is highly illegal for an HGC to employ non-Saint Hill Graduates to find goals no matter what the public pressure. It could be very destructive to Scientology to have a lot of wrong goals about or getting listed.

In due course this last injunction will be released so far as Tiger Drilling the 850 list by HPA/HCA's is concerned. But wait until technology is better. This will apply only to experienced staff auditors.

## METERS

Only the latest Mark Meters are to be used by Goal Finders. Mark IV and onwards may be used by HPA/HCAAs.

It would be dishonest to use less.

## SUMMARY

HGCs must afford public Clearing of individuals. Clearing Co-Audits of the public are a special role and are to be relegated to District Offices as soon as possible. It is no part of my plans to retain them in a Central Org or City Office.

Only the highest technology and most exact adherence to policy can keep us afloat at this time. These are not ordinary policies. These are survival itself for Scientology.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

9—11 October 1962

** 6210C09	SHSBC-200	Future Org Trends
** 6210C09	SHSBC-201	Instructors' Bugbear
** 6210C11	SHSBC-202	3GA Goals Finding
** 6210C11	SHSBC 203	3GA Goals Finding

sthil

## **PROCESSES**

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course  
(Effective at once)

### **X Processes**

The X Unit Processes shall consist of processes as follows:

1. Security Check by Rock Slam, with an adequate report of results in the student's folder. This is done in Model Session with Meter.
2. Model Session and Havingness Processes. All with Meter.
3. Liberal use of Random Rudiments and Middle Rudiments.

All X Processes are done with full use of the E-Meter.

Rudiments and results will be routinely observed and reported on by the Auditing Supervisor.

Students apparently not yet capable of getting rudiments in, handling auditing cycle and making the pc feel and look better will be promptly G.A.E.ed without waiting for end of week.

Rock Slammers, before being so designated, must be retested by the Auditing Supervisor. Rock Slammers may be specially designated in auditing assignment.

### **Y Unit Processes**

The Y Unit carries out the following schedule only:

1. With Meter, in metered Model Session, fully clean missed withholds from the pc with any version of the following questions: "What have we failed to find out about you?" "What has an auditor failed to find out about you?" "What have I failed to find out about you?"
2. With Meter, in otherwise unmetered Model Session, list and assess by elimination the following question, "In this lifetime what change have you decided to make? When was that?"
3. Complete the Problems Intensive (Routine 2A) using the Meter only to make sure of TA action, otherwise the Model Session and running to be done without recourse to needle.

The above should be less than 25 hours of auditing, 3 to 5 hours for missed w/hs and 20 to 22 for the Problems Intensive.

Leaving withholds missed, a wrong assessment, failure to get TA motion, or failure to get spectacular results on the pc will G.A.E. the student to the X Unit.

This Problems Intensive and the pulling of missed withholds are and will be fundamental Academy and HGC actions, so the student should become expert in them.

### **Z Unit Processes**

The Z Unit is totally concerned with current rundown of Routine 3GA.

If the student fails to get the Detested Person, Dynamic and Item of the pc within 30 auditing hours, the student is G.A.E.ed to the Y Unit.

Sthil  
Franchise Airmail

### GOAL FINDER'S MODEL SESSION

Where the pc has been well Prepchecked and is well under auditor control, a Goal Finder in a 3GA session may omit rudiments in Model Session, using only goals for session, and havingness, goals and gains at end and General O/W, Mid Ruds and Random Ruds where needed in the session. This salvages about an hour's auditing time per day. Start and end of session commands are used, just no rudiments; General O/W may be found necessary on some pcs at session start in lieu of rudiments to get a cleaner needle.

This does not apply to Rudiments and Havingness Sessions or Prepcheck Sessions and Problems Intensives.

For a pc who is well smoothed out by staff auditors, then, and who is well under the Goal Finder's control, the following may be used, particularly with a Mark V Meter.

### GOAL FINDER'S MODEL SESSION

Usual session start, adjust chair, squeeze cans and put in the R Factor:

GOAL FINDER: "Is it all right if I start this session now?" (If so) (Tone 40) "START OF SESSION."

"Has this session started for you?" (If pc says No, say again, "Start of Session. Now has this session started for you?" If pc says No, say, "We will cover it in a moment," and run General O/W after goals are set.)

GOAL FINDER: "What goals would you like to set for this session?" "Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?"

Goal Finder inspects needle. If rough, or if session didn't start for pc:

GOAL FINDER: "If it is all right with you, I am going to run a short general process." "The process is 'What have you done?' 'What have you withheld?'" (Runs it very permissively until needle looks smooth.) "If it is all right with you I will give these questions two more times and then end this process."

"Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?" (Not Tone 40.) "End of Process. We will now (whatever it is they were going to do)."

### *Mid Ruds*

Use either "Since the Last Time I audited you ....." (usually the first time used in the session) or "In this session ....." for the Middle Rudiments "has anything been ....." (suppressed, invalidated, suggested) and "is there anything you have ....." (failed to reveal, been careful of).

Random Rudiment: "Have I missed a withhold on you?" or "In this session have you thought, said or done anything I failed to find out?"

### *Ending the Session*

The Goal Finder closes the body of the session with "Is it all right with you if we end off .....now?" "Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I do so?" "End of ....."

(Goal Finder observes pc. If pc very agitated Goal Finder does General O/W as above. If needle rough but pc not bad, Goal Finder puts in Mid Ruds with "In this session".)

GOAL FINDER: (Adjusting Meter) "Please squeeze the cans." (If squeeze test not all right, Goal Finder runs pc's havingness until can squeeze gives an adequate response.)

GOAL FINDER: "Have you made any part of your goals for this session?" "Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?"

*End of Session:*

"Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?" "Is it all right with you if I end this session now?"

"Here it is: (Tone 40) END OF SESSION."

"Has the session ended for you?" (If not, repeat it. If session still not ended, say, "You will be getting more auditing.") "Tell me I am no longer auditing you."

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 OCTOBER 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 3GA**  
**LISTING**

The reason some pcs go to clear on listing and the reason some don't at once lies *entirely* with the auditor.

The dominant rules are two:

1. Don't force the pc to list more items than he has, and
2. Don't prevent the pc from giving items.

The number of ways an auditor can dream up, or overlook, to violate 1 and 2 above are countless.

Example:

If pc can't answer the line easily skip, omit or change it, DON'T Tiger Drill it to force an answer.

LISTING IS NOT PREPCHECKING. You don't wait for the pc to say he has no more before you stop asking a line. THE AUDITOR REGULATES HIS QUESTION BY THE PC'S COMM LAG. When the pc *first* comm lags (without asking for a repeat of the Line wording) the auditor comes *off* the line. The auditor doesn't ask the line *again* just "to make sure" or ask the pc "do you have any more". Asking it again when the pc has comm lagged leaves, amongst other things, an unanswered auditing question.

The line is asked. The pc answers until he or she comm lags. The auditor then acks and goes instantly to next line. If the pc says he has more on the old line, the auditor says "sorry" and takes them.

A LINE IS RUN TO FIRST COMM LAG. How long is a comm lag? It is the pause before the strained grope.

A pc's decline in answering goes as follows:

1. Bright rapid giving.
2. Comm lag while looking.
3. Groping for more.
4. Comm lag while groping.
5. Can't quite say it.
6. Starts picking up and rejecting.

From 3 above onward the auditor is at fault. Right at the *end* of 2 the auditor acks and gives the pc the next line.

The auditor takes only the bright, easily gotten flows.

If the pc goes fumbling and groggy the auditor is at fault and is *doing wrong*.

Listing is a rapid action. The way to keep it rapid is to deftly see that the pc has given all and then get out of there!

Auditors whose pcs dope and grope will soon have pcs that mope.

The auditor avoids Q and A. The auditor *never* repeats an item back to the pc or asks if it fits on the line. The auditor's role is *permissive* with good *presence*.

If the auditor does not understand an item he or she says so but does not include *any* repeat of the item in saying so. That's evaluation.

Listing is slightly contrary to early auditing philosophy. Then, if the pc protested, the auditor forced the pc to answer. In listing this is *never* done.

Then, if the pc comm lagged, the auditor flattened it. In listing one *never* flattens a comm lag. One shifts the moment the first comm lag appears, but without startling the pc.

Listing auditing is different. The pc is always right. In listing if you trick a pc into more items and prevent the pc from giving those items he has readily to hand, the whole case may have to be patched up before it will clear.

It is *so* easy to list right as an auditor that many will fumble all over the place before they get the knack. And almost all errors will be additive errors.

Listing is the biggest barrier to clear now that we can find goals.

Other listing methods may appear, but these will only alter What lines. Nothing is going to alter the above, so you better learn it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: gl.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



HCO BULLETIN OF 17 OCTOBER 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise

## AUDITOR FAILURE TO UNDERSTAND

If a pc says something and the auditor fails to understand what the pc said or meant, the correct response is:

"I did not (hear you) (understand what was said) (get that last)."

To do anything else is not only bad form, it can amount to a heavy ARC break.

## INVALIDATION

To say, "You did not speak loud enough\_\_\_\_\_" or any other use of "you" is an invalidation.

The pc is also thrown out of session by having responsibility hung on him or her.

The *Auditor* is responsible for the session. Therefore the auditor has to assume responsibility for all comm breakdowns in it.

## EVALUATION

Far more serious than invalidation above, is the accidental evaluation which may occur when the auditor *repeats* what the pc said.

NEVER repeat anything a pc says after him, no matter why.

Repeating not only does not show the pc you heard but makes him feel you're a circuit.

The highest advance of 19th Century Psychology was a machine to drive people crazy. All it did was repeat after the person everything the person said.

Children also do this to annoy.

But that isn't the main reason you do *not* repeat what the pc said after the pc. If you say it wrong the pc is thrown into heavy protest. The pc must correct the wrongness and hangs up right there. It may take an hour to dig the pc out of it.

Further, don't gesture to find out. To say, pointing, "You mean this item, then," is not only an evaluation but a nearly hypnotic command, and the pc feels he must reject very strongly.

Don't tell the pc what the pc said and don't gesture to find what the pc meant.

Just get the pc to say it again or get the pc to point it out again. That's the correct action.

## DRIVING IN ANCHOR POINTS

Also, do not shove things at a pc or throw things to a pc. Don't gesture toward a pc. It drives in anchor points and makes the pc reject the auditor.

## ROCK SLAMMER

The reason a person who Rock Slams on Scientology or auditors or the like can't audit well is that they are wary of a pc and feel they must repeat after the pc, correct the pc or gesture toward the pc.

But Rock Slammer or not, any new auditor may fall into these bad habits and they should be broken fast.

## SUMMARY

A very high percentage of ARC breaks occur because of a failure to understand the pc.

Don't *prove you* didn't with gestures or erroneous repeats.

Just audit, please.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is reissued verbatim as HCO B 23 May 1971, Issue VI, Basic Auditing Series 6, *Auditor Failure to Understand* It is also edited for use on the HQS Course as HCO B 25 October 1971, Issue III, *Auditor Failure to Understand*.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 18 OCTOBER AD 12

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**3GA**  
**LISTING BY PREHAV**

If your pc is not doing well in listing the goal on any earlier system (particularly the 114 lines which haven't done well at all in auditors' hands) the following line system should work. Prehav levels were the original breakthrough on clearing.

Take the old Auxiliary Prehav Scale. Just do an ordinary Assessment by Elimination (no reference to the goal). (It is possible some change will be made in this but it will do for now.)

Fit the resulting level into the following lines. Make sure it makes sense and makes sense to the pc. Any alteration of the word must register as well as the original word found when you add (ing) or vary its participle:

(System of Marking Cards same as 114 Line HCO Bulletin)

(Blanks refer to Prehav Level)

1. Who or what would \_\_\_\_\_(goal)?
2. Who or what would not \_\_\_\_\_(goal)?
3. Who or what would (goal)\_\_\_\_\_?
4. Who or what would (goal) not\_\_\_\_\_?
5. Who or what would oppose \_\_\_\_\_(goal)?
6. Who or what would not oppose \_\_\_\_\_(goal)?
7. Who or what would \_\_\_\_\_opposition (goal)?
8. Who or what would not \_\_\_\_\_opposition (goal)?  
(Omit effect wording lines of goal if no effect wording exists.)
9. Who or what would \_\_\_\_\_(effect wording of goal)?
10. Who or what would not \_\_\_\_\_(effect wording of goal)?
11. Who or what would (effect wording of goal)\_\_\_\_\_?
12. Who or what would (effect wording of goal) not\_\_\_\_\_?
13. Who or what would oppose \_\_\_\_\_(effect wording of goal)?
14. Who or what would not oppose \_\_\_\_\_(effect wording of goal)?
15. Who or what would \_\_\_\_\_opposition (effect wording of goal)?
16. Who or what would not \_\_\_\_\_opposition (effect wording of goal)?
17. Who or what would help \_\_\_\_\_(goal)?
18. Who or what would not help \_\_\_\_\_(goal)?
19. Who or what would (goal) help \_\_\_\_\_?
20. Who or what would (goal) not help \_\_\_\_\_?
21. Who or what would help oppose \_\_\_\_\_(goal)?
22. Who or what would not help oppose \_\_\_\_\_(goal)?

23. Who or what would help\_\_\_\_\_opposition (goal)?
24. Who or what would not help\_\_\_\_\_opposition (goal)?
25. Who or what would want (goal)?
26. Who or what would not want (goal)?
27. Who or what would oppose (goal)?
28. Who or what would not oppose (goal)?  
(Effect wording lines may be omitted if none exist for goal.)
29. Who or what would want (effect wording of goal)?
30. Who or what would not want (effect wording of goal)?
31. Who or what would oppose (effect wording of goal)?
32. Who or what would not oppose (effect wording of goal)?

### **Directions**

Flatten every level found by going over and over lines until TA action stops.

Use strike marks as in 114 Line HCO Bulletin. Four slants and a long cross.  
Don't use fully written down lists of things pc gives.

Don't demand more than pc has. Don't prevent pc from giving what he has (such as stopping automaticities of flow). Don't Q and A. Be Permissive with Presence. Don't get the pc into Protest as Sen will turn on. Fix lines so pc can answer cleanly, without confusion.

If pc is being shifted from another system of lines, give auditing on goal a rapid Prepcheck before using this system.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.jh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### **SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES** 23—25 October 1962

- |             |            |                               |
|-------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| ** 6210C23  | SHSBC-202X | 3GA Criss Cross               |
| ** 621 0C23 | SHSBC-203X | 3GAXX Following the Rock Slam |
| ** 6210C25  | SHSBC-208  | 3GAXX                         |
| ** 6210C25  | SHSBC-209  | 3GAXX Secondary Pre-Hav Scale |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 OCTOBER 1962

Sthil Students  
CenOCon  
Franchise Airmail

**R3GA**

**HCO WW FORM G3, REVISED**

**FAST GOALS CHECK**

*(Keep completed form in pc's folder)*

This is a rapid checkout of a goal for use by Auditors and particularly Instructors and Auditing Supervisors. By an Auditor it is done in Model Session. By an Instructor or Supervisor it is done as a simple checkout.

ALWAYS COMPLETE WHOLE CHECK.

PC's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Org Location \_\_\_\_\_

Goal \_\_\_\_\_

A: Read goal rapidly to pc three times Note reaction and inform pc if in or out.

B: Repetitive Ruds. (Early reads are acceptable as instant reads on ruds, not on goal which must be instant only.)

On the goal is there anything you have

- |                          |                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Suppressed _____      | 4. Invalidated _____ |
| 2. Been careful of _____ | 5. Suggested _____   |
| 3. Withheld _____        | 6. Mistaken _____    |

Only when each is clean, go to next and when all clean go to C.

C: Read goal rapidly to pc three times Note reaction and tell pc if in or out.

D: Do Fast Ruds: In this session (or checkout) is there anything you have suppressed, suggested, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of? When all nul, go to E.

E: Section E must be read all in one sweep to be valid, with no read on any rud and a rocket read (sharp downward tick at least 1/4 Of an inch) each time exactly at end of reading the goal. Don't add in the goal until all six ruds items read nul in one sweep. Then read the ruds line and the goal 3 times in one breath.

On the goal \_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have suppressed, suggested, invalidated, withheld, mistaken or been careful of? (Goal) \_\_\_\_\_  
(Goal) \_\_\_\_\_ (Goal) \_\_\_\_\_

If none of ruds in this section reads and goal did read, providing the meter reading of the check was flawless it is a listable goal.

Goal Checked Out \_\_\_\_\_

Goal Didn't Check Out \_\_\_\_\_

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Auditor, Auditing Supervisor, Instructor)

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 OCTOBER 1962

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**PRE-CLEARING INTENSIVE**

(Most appropriate to Z Unit Sthil or HGCs)

On cases that have been run on many clearing procedures or goals or types of lines or who have had frequent changes of auditors, to speed eventual clearing, the following can be done:

1. Assess the Pre-Clearing Scale (below) by elimination.
2. Choose a period one month before the first session the person ever had in Dianetics and Scientology. Use only the month and year.
3. Run the seventeen buttons by Prepcheck on the Command "Since\_\_\_\_\_(date) in (or on)\_\_\_\_\_(subject from Scale below) is there anything (or has anything been, as appropriate)\_\_\_\_\_(button)?"
4. Clean once through the buttons only and assess again.
5. Keep the Mid Ruds in.

**ASSESSMENT FOR CLEARING INTENSIVE**

Auditing	Processing
Self-Auditing	Working
Clearing	Preclears
Dissemination	Auditors
Practising	Talking
Teaching	Goals
Learning	Hopes
Living	Helping
Intention	Finance
Sessions	Problems
Courses	Sex
Training	Dianetics
Processes	Scientology
	Organizations

LRH:dr.bh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6210C30	SHSBC-204	Pre-Hav Scales and Lists
** 6210C30	SHSBC-205	Listing Goals
** 6211C01	SHSBC-206	The Missed Missed Withhold
** 6211C01	SHSBC-207	The Road to Truth

## **WRONG GOALS, IMPORTANCE OF REPAIR OF**

(Use of this HCO Bulletin. Get it hat checked on all auditors whether classed or not. If an auditor is found to have found a wrong goal, make him or her pass this HCO Bulletin again.)

If a wrong goal has been found on a pc and has been "confirmed" as correct but later refuted, that goal *must* be Big Tiger Drilled out of existence, all pain and sensation and meter reaction off, *at once*.

If a wrong goal has been found on a pc, checked out as correct and *listed*, that wrong goal must be Prepchecked out of existence, and all pain, sensation and reaction on the meter removed and *immediately*.

These are first, primary, important and mandatory actions. They must be done *at once* on the discovery of the wrongness of a goal.

No other action may be done until the above is done. And the above must be done right now, not "next month when we have an auditor available". And poetically it should be done by the person who "found" the goal if immediately available, and should be done in addition to that person's regular auditing. Even finding the right goal does not straighten out the "found" wrong ones.

If more than one wrong goal has been found and listed or not, the wrong goals must be eradicated chronologically, the first wrong goal found is the first one to be done. The above rules apply as to whether the goal was listed or not (in other words, what is to be done with each wrong goal is governed by the first two paragraphs of this HCO Bulletin).

Now these rules are not because of policy. They are technical. And the technical is extreme in its validity and so this HCO Bulletin becomes policy because it has such heavy technical validity.

Finding and running wrong goals is *very* destructive and very dangerous to a pc's life and health.

The most *effective treatment* a pc who has had a wrong goal found or run can have is the eradication of the goal by Big Tiger or Prepcheck. The pc will get a gain beyond mere repair.

In the presence of a wrong goal found or found and run, no other processes will work. I.e., a Problems Intensive or General O/W or Missed W/Hs. The presence of a wrong goal found or found and run will develop a PTP that stops all further progress. An auditor will just make no headway on a case that has had a wrong goal found or found and run until one or the other of the first two paragraphs of this HCO Bulletin has been done properly.

-----

### **SYMPTOMS OF A RIGHT GOAL LISTED WRONGLY**

1. TA getting High and Sticky (4.5 or 5) and nothing brings it down, or TA staying below 2 and nothing brings it up.

2. Pc looking bad, old, grey, weight increasing.
3. Pc acting blowy.
4. More sen than pain on pc.

#### SYMPTOMS OF A WRONG OR IMPROPERLY CLEANED GOAL UNLISTED

1. Doesn't rocket read and no Prepcheck can make it rocket read even once out of three times.
2. Checking it gives pc sen only, and no pain during check-out.
3. Pc blowy.
4. Pc says or feels goal is overwhelming.
5. Pc can't wrap his or her wits around goal.
6. It's not something pc really wanted in this life.
7. Pc has had no pain while auditor was cleaning goal up by Prepcheck.
8. Pc tries to fit goal into life.
9. Pc has had no cognitions on goal.
10. Pc looks worse than usual.
11. Pc very upset during check-out or in total apathy. (Pc's often nervous on a right goal during check-out, but with a wrong one pc is a wreck and very ARC breaky or totally uncaring.)
12. Pc very doubtful as to whether it is or isn't the goal.
13. Pc rock slamming during check-out.
14. Pc has no reality on goal.
15. Pc has to get into a certain position or spot on the time track to make goal read.
16. Pc very worried about being checked—a lot of anxiety. This sign also accompanies a goal which is very charged because of poor prepchecking. When it's the right goal pc is usually calm.

(The above 16 are taken from HCO Tech Letter of October 22, 1962.)

#### SYMPTOMS OF A WRONG GOAL LISTED

1. TA mostly at 4.5 or 5 (or could be below 2).
2. Pc ARC breaky.
3. Pc blowy.
4. Pc looks very bad, older, greyer, skin tone poor.
5. Pc's eyes watery.
6. Only sensation predominant on list.
7. Pc dizzy.
8. Pc nauseated, or vomiting.
9. Bank getting more solid.
10. Pc gaining weight.



11. Rudiments can't be kept in.
12. Missed W/Hs even when pulled, fail to get pc cheerfully into session.

#### SYMPTOMS OF A RIGHT GOAL UNLISTED

1. Goal rocket reads 2 out of three on Instructor's check.
2. Goal rocket reads 2 out of three on check after a Prepcheck on it.
3. Goal won't go out entirely and if it does it bobs back up.
4. Pc relaxed during check-out, co-operative but not selling the goal particularly.
5. Pc gets cognitions on the goal.
6. Tiger Drilling, Prepchecking or checking gives pc pain.
7. If sen is on, a clean-up wipes it off and turns it to pain.
8. Pain never wholly vanishes. Handling goal doesn't wipe out all its pain for very long. Pain always returns even when briefly departed.
9. Goal goes out and in, sometimes does, sometimes doesn't read.
10. Right goal reads are different. Wrong goal reads are very constant and rarely rocket after maybe once or twice when found.
11. A rocket read can always be recovered on a right goal even when it has vanished, right up to the time it vanishes and the pc goes clear. The rocket read gets shorter, gets early or late, but it doesn't vanish entirely until the goal is blown.
12. Pc looked better after goal was found.
13. Rudiments easier to keep in.
14. Pc co-operative.

-----

It is hard for an auditor to get a reality on a goal until he or she has found a goal.

For experience the auditor tends to hope his or her way through and trust that "even if it doesn't read, the pc will be disappointed" or the auditor feels he or she would look bad. To our shame, auditors have faked a goal to a pc or instructor. Also, an auditor who is green tends to throw the burden on the checker and do a job that's "good enough for a check". Only the right goal, reading properly, is "good enough for a check".

An auditor who finds a goal and doesn't get it to read properly before a check, or who finds a goal and doesn't get it checked by another auditor who is expert, is irresponsible. And an auditor who will not immediately sweat to clean up a wrong goal or work overtime and on his own time too to clean up a wrong goal that's been *listed* is just not worthy of the name.

-----

Wrong goals are dynamite.

Prevent them by being properly trained and by doing a good job.

With goals processing in our hands we can deliver results greater than any ever achieved before anywhere. Thus, such a powerful weapon must also be respected and used right.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 NOVEMBER AD12  
Issue II

CenOCon  
Franchise Airmail

**ROUTINE 3-21**  
**THE TWENTY-ONE STEPS**  
**FINDING GOALS**

I have been doing considerable research auditing and case inspection and have worked out the following method of clearing.

**THE TWENTY-ONE STEPS**

The first reliable clearing method, 3GA, is to be found, improved, in 3-21, carrying the pc who can be handled this way, all the way to OT goal by goal. For the difficult pc it is only varied in Step 4 below, which is changed on difficult pcs to 3GA XX or variations of it.

Clearing has been improved by the advent of Tiger Drilling and Goals Prepchecking and by new data on finding goals and on listing. The greatest hold-up in clearing was lack of an adequate Prehav Level finding system. I have now developed this in HCO Bulletin 7 November, Issue III. This will be of enormous help both in finding Rock Slams to find goals and running out goals when found.

There is, however, *no* substitute for a well trained, accurate auditor out to help the pc. This is a *fully* understood requisite to this method.

The method is briefly as follows:

1. Tiger Drill or Prepcheck out of the way any earlier found goals in accordance with HCO Bulletin 7 November AD12, Issue I.
2. Prepare the pc with a Problems Intensive, new style.
3. Have pc do a goals list 850 long.
4. Tiger Drill goals from goal 1 on forward. (Do not preselect goals to be TDd ever on *any* list just do the list.) Stop at that goal which won't go out by TD, and which can be made to Rocket Read occasionally. (Only this step (4) is changed on a tougher pc when it includes different goal finding methods.)
5. Prepcheck that goal until it Rocket Reads with consistency.
6. Take the basic four lines
  1. WHO OR WHAT WOULD WANT \_\_\_\_\_
  2. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT WANT \_\_\_\_\_
  3. WHO OR WHAT WOULD OPPOSE \_\_\_\_\_ING
  4. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT OPPOSE \_\_\_\_\_ING

and list and nul *each one* to an Item.

Do a list of around 100.

Do a routine assessment on each. If more than one stay in, take the one that reads best as *the* Item. (If the pc's early lists, on a pc whose goal has been found for some time, are missing or unavailable do this step just as above. Otherwise use old written lists as in footnote below.)

7. Repeat 6 above.
8. When pc's tone arm ceases to be active (with all rudiments in and goal firing on 6 and 7) do a Roll Your Own Prehav Assessment (see next HCO Bulletin) on the goal.
9. Use the lines
  1. WHO OR WHAT WOULD (GOAL) (LEVEL)?
  2. WHO OR WHAT WOULD (GOAL) NOT (LEVEL)?
  3. WHO OR WHAT WOULD (LEVEL) (GOAL)?
  4. WHO OR WHAT WOULD NOT (LEVEL) (GOAL)?

and do a written list for each and assess as in 6 above. The lines must make sense to the auditor as well as the pc and be answerable without distorting goal. If the PH Secondary Level is changed in prefix or suffix or tense make sure it reads as well as the original.

10. When TA ceases to move on 9 do a new Roll Your Own Prehav and repeat 9.
11. Continue as in 9 and 10 until pc is having no trouble whatever in spotting and blowing items.
12. When last PH Level has taken all motion out of TA by 9, 10, and 11 is evident, get a new Roll Your Own Prehav and proceed using the lines of 9 but no longer writing down items, using the pages of composition book and four slant marks with a fifth crossing them out as a tally.
13. When neither old nor new Prehav Levels can any longer be made to react on the goal and the needle is free, Prepcheck the auditing on the goal.
14. When the auditing is clean, Prepcheck the goal.
15. Test all previous Prehav Levels for the goal and have somebody qualified inspect and attest the absence of goal read and the freeness of the needle. This is a first goal clear.
16. Repeat all above steps for the second goal.
17. Repeat steps 1 to 15 for the third goal as feasible.
18. Repeat steps 1 to 15 for the fourth goal as feasible.
19. Repeat steps 1 to 15 for the fifth goal as feasible.
20. Repeat steps 1 to 15 for the sixth goal as feasible.
21. Find consecutive goals as feasible and run them out.

Tips: The cardinal rule of listing is to never demand more than the pc has and never prevent the pc from giving items he or she does have.

Keep the pc in session, but don't use the Mid Ruds to punish the pc every time the pc originates.

If the pc gets very ARC Breaky and missed W/Hs don't cure it, then in Step 4 you have *passed* the pc's goal in the last page or two, so get Suppress and Protest clean and redo them.

In Tiger Drilling the goal is always ahead of you, never behind you. You leave nothing behind you on the goals list.

Keep a *careful* record of the PH Primary and Secondary Levels run or used in any way.

Treat a pc's goals and Items lists like jewelry. Don't lose them.

-----

Above, we have a highly standard clearing procedure, the best of everything that has worked. Only the four lines in 6 and 9 are subject to change.

On the easy case this is the *best* rundown for finding goals and clearing.

More difficult cases are characterized by two things—(a) pc's needle is occasionally very dirty, or (b) goals go out *hard* on Tiger Drilling. These are the *only* two guiding points which dictate a change. Even so *only* Step 4 above is changed (finding the goal).

Even if some other method than Step 4 is used to attain the goal, *the rest of the above* is still followed. I surmise that on less easy pcs only the *first* goal will require other goal finding than Step 4 and that the above holds good for all second goals onward for all pcs. This however is only a surmise and other means than Step 4 may be needed on some second goals.

Therefore, today, we have no variation from the above except in actually finding the goal. Further about 50% (at a guess) of one's pcs require *no* variation from the above to find or run a goal.

As more data becomes available some of the above can be expected to be modified in the interests of speed and positive results. But the Twenty-One Steps are based on vast quantities of experience and data.

-----

Note: Where a pc has had his goal found some time ago and written lists exist for the first four lines, recover these lists and take them in consecutive sections of 100 and nul them by usual means to an Item.

Then, again in rotation, take the next 100 and nul each to an Item. The lists however must be from the correct wording of the goal, not an earlier variation as they then would not apply. In the latter case do only the steps as above.

-----

## ROCK SLAMMING ITEMS

Note: Items in the Twenty-One Steps which Rock Slam when found in listing the goal may have to be opposed or otherwise handled to discharge them. (See forthcoming HCO Bulletins on 3GA XX.)

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 NOVEMBER AD12  
Issue III

CenOCon  
Franchise Airmail

**"ROLL YOUR OWN" PREHAV**

(Cancels all earlier HCO Bulletins on how  
to do a Prehav Assessment)

Roll Your Own Prehav Assessment has been developed:

- (a) To avoid lengthy Prehav Assessments,
- (b) To get much more accurate levels for the pc for use in both finding and listing out goals,  
and
- (c) To enter the Rock Slam channel easily.

The assessment is done on any available or special Prehav Scale for the purpose of the assessment. (For instance the 1st 65 levels of the Auxiliary Prehave Scale.)

The assessment follows the exact steps below:

**HOW TO DO ONE**

It is very easy to do a Prehav Assessment. It is not so easy to do a completely accurate one.

When clearing is going hard, the most likely source of error is the Prehav Assessment. It is ridiculously easy for an auditor to make a bad one. The Preclears attention hangs up on a button he tells himself *isn't* it and the invalidation makes it stay in and voila you have a wrong assessment.

Like goals, a Prehav Assessment must be kept clean of Tiger Drill buttons.

You get a wrong assessment if the pc has invalidated or protested a button. Or if he or she has suppressed the right one. Also if too many levels are staying in or too many are going out, the Mid Ruds are out.

A Prehav Assessment requires *careful* auditing. Only experience can give an auditor the full data.

**TERMS**

Prehav Scale = Any scale giving degrees of doingness or not doingness.

Level = Any doingness or not doingness on the scale. Any word in the scale itself.

Assessment = Any method of discovering a level on the scale for a given pc.

Read = Any reaction of the needle different from its regular action for the pc, occurring during or slightly after a level has been called.

Mid Ruds = The middle rudiments of the current model session.

Tiger Drill = That series of buttons which are capable of preventing a right goal or level from reading or making a wrong level read, combined in an appropriate exercise.

**THE MOST ACCURATE ASSESSMENT**

Realize that the most accurate assessment of a Prehav Scale would be by the Tiger Drilling of each level in turn.

By average, on a rough pc, this would require about one minute per level. This would be three hours for a 180 level scale.

Unless scales are shorter, assessment by elimination would normally be faster, if done with due care.

But Tiger Drilling a scale to find a level cannot be ruled out as a means of finding the real level with superb accuracy.

## DOING THE ASSESSMENT

One puts the pc in session, gets the Mid Ruds in, takes a Prehav Scale and calls out each level *once*, noting its reaction on the meter.

If the auditor was not sure or didn't see it, the level is called a second or a third time.

If too many levels go out consecutively, there is a suppress. If too many levels are staying in, there is another Mid Rud out.

One marks only those that *read*. Those that do not read are not marked.

A pc has his own Prehav Scale mimeo copy in his folder. This is used over and over.

The pc's name and date of the first assessment is written at the top of the mimeo sheet.

A new symbol is used for each consecutive assessment and the level found on the mimeo sheet and that symbol is marked at the top at the end of the assessment.

The list is covered once. Those that read are marked in.

The Mid Ruds for the session are put in at the end of the first nulling.

The list is covered again but only those that stayed in the first time are now read. If they read again they are again marked in, using the same symbol.

The list is covered a third time but only those that stayed in the second time are read and marked in, using the same symbol.

When the list has not more than eight (on a rough pc) and not less than three levels left in, the remaining levels are Tiger Drilled.

One level will remain—or will react better than the others. Take this as the PRIMARY LEVEL and mark it in at the top of the mimeo sheet with its symbol.

## ROLL YOUR OWN

In times past, this Primary Level would have been enough, but using the Prehav to locate the Rock Slam Channel or to list out goals requires a SECONDARY LEVEL.

To "Roll Your Own" is to get the pc to give you a secondary scale that is in its turn assessed.

This is done as follows:

Take the Primary Level, found as above. Put it in the sentence "If somebody were fixated on (or 'wanted to' or 'intended to' or 'wished to') \_\_\_\_\_ (Primary Level) what would that person do?" Or use the sentence "What would \_\_\_\_\_ (Primary Level) represent to you?" The sentence must cause the pc to give doingness. Otherwise it must be changed, using the Primary Level, so that the pc does give doingness.

The auditor, as in any assessment, lists down the pc's answers on a 13" (foolscap or legal) sheet with the pc's name, the date and the question at the top of it.

When the pc says that's all, the auditor puts in the Mid Ruds and lists the question against the meter. If the meter reads on the question, the list is incomplete and must be completed.

When the question gives no read with Mid Ruds in, the list is complete. This list is now handled exactly as the original scale above.

The resulting level is the pc's level and is used for finding Items in 3GA-XX or in listing out goals. The Primary Level is not otherwise used.

The Secondary List is not used again. A new Primary Assessment is done for the next full operation. Only these Secondary Levels are actually used in auditing.

Various Primary Prehav Scales may from time to time be developed for various purposes.

## **SOMATICS**

### **HOW TO TELL TERMINALS AND OPPOSITION TERMINALS**

It is important that a clearing auditor be able to distinguish pain from sensation, terminals from opposition terminals, and to have the data at the level of instant knowledge. To understand it less is to invite serious errors in clearing. Failure to sort terminals from opposition terminals can confuse the pc or even degrade the case. All a pc's somatics, deformities and distortions proceed from terminals, opposition terminals and combination terminals. Thus they are of vast importance to the pc and the auditor.

### **DEFINITIONS**

**SOMATICS** = This is a general word for uncomfortable physical perceptions coming from the reactive mind. Its genus is early Dianetics and it is a general, common package word, used by Scientologists to denote "pain" or "sensation" with no difference made between them. To understand the source of these feelings, one should have a knowledge of engrams, ridges and other parts of the reactive bank. To the Scientologist anything is a SOMATIC if it emanates from the various parts of the reactive mind and produces an awareness of reactivity. Symbol SOM.

**PAIN** = PAIN is composed of heat, cold, electrical, and the combined effect of sharp hurting. If one stuck a fork in his arm, he would experience pain. When one uses PAIN in connection with clearing one means awareness of heat, cold, electrical or hurting stemming from the reactive mind. According to experiments done at Harvard, if one were to make a grid with heated tubes going vertical and chilled tubes going horizontal and were to place a small current of electricity through the lot, the device, touched to a body, would produce the feeling of PAIN. It need not be composed of anything very hot or cold or of any high voltage to produce a very intense feeling of pain. Therefore what we call PAIN is itself, heat, cold and electrical. If a pc experiences one or more of these from his reactive mind, we say he is experiencing PAIN.

"Electrical" is the bridge between sensation and PAIN and is difficult to classify as either PAIN or sensation when it exists alone. Symbol PN.

**SENSATION** = All other uncomfortable perceptions stemming from the reactive mind are called SENSATION. These are basically "pressure", "motion", "dizziness", "sexual sensation", and "emotion and misemotion". There are others, definite in themselves but definable in these five general categories. If one took the fork in the pain definition above and pressed it against the arm, that would be "pressure". "Motion" is just that, a feeling of being in motion when one is not. "Motion" includes the "winds of space", a feeling of being blown upon, especially from in front of the face. "Dizziness" is a feeling of disorientation and includes a spinniness, as well as an out-of-balance feeling. "Sexual sensation" means any feeling, pleasant or unpleasant, commonly experienced during sexual restimulation or action. "Emotion and Misemotion" include all levels of the complete tone scale except "pain"; emotion and misemotion are closely allied to "motion", being only a finer particle action. A bank solidity is a form of "pressure", and when the sensation of increasing solidity of masses in the mind occurs, we say "the bank is beefing up". All these are classified as SENSATION. Symbol SEN.

**TERMINAL** = An Item or Identity the pc has actually *been* sometime in the past (or present) is called a TERMINAL. It is "the pc's own valence" at that time. In the Goals Problem Mass (the black masses of the reactive mind) those identities which,

when contacted, produce *pain*, tell us at once that they are TERMINALS. The person could feel pain only as himself (thetan plus body) and therefore identities he has been produce *pain* when their mental residues (black masses) are recontacted in processing. Symbol TERM.

OPPOSITION TERMINAL = An Item or Identity the pc has actually opposed (fought, been an enemy of) sometime in the past (or present) is called an OPPOSITION TERMINAL. As the person identified himself as *not it* he could experience from it only sensation. An OPPOSITION TERMINAL, when its mental residues (black masses) are recontacted in processing, produces only *sensation*, never pain. Symbol OPPTERM.

COMBINED TERMINAL = An Item or Identity the pc has both been and opposed produces therefore both pain and sensation when it is “late on the track”, which is to say, after the fact of many Terminals and Opposition Terminals. The Combination Terminal is the closure between Terminal and Opposition Terminal lines which possesses attributes of both and the clarity of neither. It signifies a period toward the end of a game. It is found most commonly when the pc’s case is only shallowly entered. They exist on all cases but are fewer than terminals and opposition terminals. Symbol COTERM.

ITEM = Any terminal, opposition terminal, combination terminal, significance or idea (but not a doingness, which is called “a level”) appearing on a list derived from the pc. Symbol It.

RELIABLE ITEM = Any Item that Rock Slams well on being found and at session end and which was the last Item still in after assessing the list. Can be a terminal, an opposition terminal, a combination terminal or a significance, provided only that it was *the* Item found on a list and Rock Slammed. Symbol RI.

ROCK SLAM = That needle agitation which erratically covers more than three quarters of an inch on the E-Meter dial.

A Rock Slam is the response of an E-Meter to the conflict between terminals and opposition terminals. It indicates a fight, an effort to individuate, an extreme games condition which in the absence of auditing would seek unsuccessfully to separate while attacking.

As the pc’s attention is guided to the Items involved the games condition activates and is expressed on the meter as a ragged, frantic response. The wider the response the more recognizable (to the pc) is the reality of the games condition and the violence of the conflict.

The Rock Slam Channel is that hypothetical course between a series of pairs consisting of terminals and opposition terminals.

If the conflict is too great for the pc’s reality no Rock Slam results. Later in auditing as the pc’s confronting rises, Items which did not react earlier in auditing now begin to be real and so express themselves on a meter as a Rock Slam. The pc with the lowest reality level is the hardest to attain a Rock Slam on, but in contradiction a pc who has the least control over himself in certain zones of life has the largest Rock Slams.

The Rock Slam vanishes under Suppression and activates on Invalidate or Withhold or on other Prehav Levels.

This is the most difficult needle response to find or attain or preserve. And it is the most valuable in clearing.

All Rock Slams result from a pair of Items in opposition, one of which is a terminal, the other being an opposition terminal.

It can exist in present time where the pc is the terminal and what the pc is faced with is the opposition terminal. Symbol RS.

INSTANT ROCK SLAM = That “Rock Slam” which begins at the end of the major thought of any Item. Symbol IRS.



DIRTY NEEDLE = That erratic agitation of the needle which covers less than a quarter of an inch of the E-Meter dial and tends to be persistent. Symbol DN.

DIRTY READ = That more or less instant response of the needle which is agitated by a major thought; it is an instant tiny (less than a quarter of an inch) agitation of the needle and is in fact a very small cousin of a Rock Slam but is *not* a Rock Slam. It does not persist. Symbol DR.

## TESTING

The method of testing for the character of an Item whether Term, Oppterm or Coterm is extremely simple.

If the Item, when said to the pc in any way, turns on PAIN in the pc's body it is a TERMINAL.

If the Item, when said to the pc in any way, turns on SENSATION around or in the pc's body it is an OPPOSITION TERMINAL.

If the Item, when said to the pc in any way, turns on both PAIN and SENSATION in or around the pc's body it is a COMBINATION TERMINAL.

## WAYS OF ASKING

The rule is, "Give the Terminal Cause, the Opposition Terminal Effect in any listing, wording or use."

The simplest form is, of course, just chanting the Item at the pc a few times. This is not always workable.

The simplest but not always workable form is:

For a Terminal — "Would a \_\_\_\_\_ commit overts"

For an Opposition Terminal — "Consider committing overts against \_\_\_\_\_"  
Using PH Level.

Instead of "Committing Overts" the Prehav Level by which the Reliable Item was found is normally used:

For a Terminal — "Would a \_\_\_\_\_ (Item) \_\_\_\_\_ (PH Level)" or  
"Consider a \_\_\_\_\_ (Item) \_\_\_\_\_ ing (PH Level)"

For an Opposition Terminal — "Consider \_\_\_\_\_ ing (PH Level)  
a \_\_\_\_\_ (Item)".

## USING TD BUTTONS

The above sentences may also be used, or their rough approximation, with a Tiger Drill or Prepcheck Button, and if a Rock Slam is present, it may develop.

No matter what method is being used in saying the Item being tested to find out if it is a Terminal, Opposition Terminal or Combination Terminal, the rules of Sensation and Pain apply. Sensation means Oppterm. Pain means Terminal.

It is important to know if an Item is a Term, Oppterm or Coterm, as its character as one of the three determines the listing question.

The same rule for testing applies in listing. If it is a terminal, it (Prehav Levels). If it is an opposition terminal it *is* (Prehav Leveled).

Example: For a Terminal, A Waterbuck, Prehav Level Snort. Proper Listing question: "Who or what would a waterbuck snort at?"

Example: For an Oppterm, A Tiger, Prehav Level Snort. “Who or what would snort at a tiger?”

Of course the reverse can be listed but is rarely necessary except to get a longer list when the pc stalls.

## THE LINE PLOT

A Line Plot must be made up for any pc for his 3GAXX or the Listing the Goal Steps of Routine 3-21 (Steps 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and II. of 21 Steps).

This consists of a heavy Blue 13” (foolscap or legal) sheet of paper, kept in the pc’s folder and kept up to date every time a Reliable Item (or even last Item in) is found.

On this Line Plot one column, the left-hand one, is reserved for Opptterms. The right-hand column is reserved for Terms and lines indicate whenever Terms or Opptterms are derived from each other.

A Reliable Item is designated as such on this Line Plot with the symbol RI. Non-Reliable Items are not designated.

The date each Line Plot Item was found is added after the Item so it can be found again in the auditor’s reports without a scramble.

The full behaviour and character of any Item found is written into the auditor’s report of that session in which it was found. The width of the Instant Rock Slam in inches, whether the slam turned on every time the Item was read, what wording turned it on, and whether it would still RS by session end are all made part of the auditor’s report.

About 20% or 25% of the cases that appear for clearing can have Reliable Items found on them at once by exploring the words “Scientology”, “A Scientology Organization”, “An Auditor”, “Me (the auditor)”, “Ron”, or the head of the local Scientology organization by name. These are considered to be opptterms by any pc whose realization of his goal would be interfered with, he or she feels, by Scientology. It does not matter what wording (see above) turns on the RS so long as it can be consistently turned on for a bit. If it is at first only a Dirty Read, it is Tiger Drilled to try to make it Rock Slam. Only in this peculiar instance is the person called a Rock Slammer or is considered a Security Risk. Everyone alive RSs on something. In any event, if Items such as those in this paragraph turn on a Rock Slam, they are put on the Line Plot as Reliable Items and used in handling the case.

The above material is in actual fact a partial anatomy of the Goals Problems Mass, its identification in auditing and the behaviour of an E-Meter towards it.

As it has never before been viewed by any practice, mental science or religion, it has to have special terminology.

The terminology has been stably in use for quite some time in Scientology. I have made the definitions more precise in this HCO Bulletin.

Anyone working in clearing should have this HCO Bulletin data at his instant call without referral to the HCO Bulletin.

With very few additions, this is the track one walks in clearing and going clear.

Know it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :gl.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

### 3GAXX

#### STRAIGHTENING UP 3GAXX CASES

(This is an interim HCO Bulletin issued  
while the Main HCO Bulletin on Step 4 of  
3-21 is in composition.)

All cases being run on Dynamic Assessment must at once begin the following actions to speed progress.

This applies to cases both before and after the goal has been found.


Any slowdown of a case in running stems from failure to oppterm *every* Reliable Item, when found.

Cases develop a “phantom Rock Slam” when this is not done. Further, the pc is to a greater or lesser degree puzzled as to “what was the package”.

Do the following:

1. Make a complete Line Plot for your pc (HCO B 8 November AD12) and get your already found Terms and Oppters in the right places and every Reliable Item noted with RI.
2. Oppterm every Reliable Item found to date, whether in searching for or listing out the goal.
3. Represent every RI which still has an RS after being oppterm.

Your pc's Line Plot probably currently looks like this:



In short, fill in all the blanks where no oppterming was done before.

See HCO Bulletin 8 November AD 12 for all details of how it's done.

Your pc's attention is hung up where you haven't made a pair. The GPM is full of pairs of terms and oppters.

The rule is on all future Items: Oppose every Reliable Item. Represent every one that still RSeS when the oppterm or term matching it is found.

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 NOVEMBER AD 12

Central Orgs  
Franchise Airmail

**3GAXX**

**DIRTY NEEDLES AND INCOMPLETE LISTS  
HOW TO ASSESS**

I have long been aware of the penalties of making Incomplete Lists for nulling. But only last week did I find the *only* sources of the DIRTY NEEDLE.

Most auditors are sitting there beating their pcs to death with Mid Ruds every time the needle dirties up. This is a Gross Auditing Error. The auditor who neglects this manifestation of DIRTY NEEDLE is going to wind up with no Item or RS on his or her pc.

With the single exception of the first entrance to a case, when cleaning a needle depends on finding an Item, or Item No.1, all DIRTY NEEDLES STEM FROM INCOMPLETE LISTS OR MISSED ITEMS.

On even rough cases, the complete listing of the first line that will produce an RS will banish chronically dirty needles. And the dirty needle won't return until the auditor fails to complete a list.

The best test for a complete list is to nul the first ten items and if a dirty needle shows up *at all* (which is to say if the Mid Ruds go out) then the list must be added to, the Mid Ruds put in and nulling resumed. DON'T just put Mid Ruds in. You'll ruin them for the pc, get a protest going and never get anything done.

If the last 6 or 8 Items suddenly collect a necessity to put in Mid Ruds before you can go on, do the same operation: add to the list, *then* put in the Mid Ruds.

It is timesaving to complete the list. Even if it *seems* longer to nul a longer list, how can you do it with a Dirty Needle? And you'll come to nothing anyway.

Sometimes you have to use your judgment and get the Mid Ruds in enough to coax the pc to list more. But the *easy* way is to list more and then get the Mid Ruds in.

**ASSESSMENT STEPS**

The basic procedure of Assessment is:

- (a) Determine the line to be listed (the question).
- (b) Clear the question as needful with the pc.
- (c) Ask the question often enough to keep the pc going but don't use it to stop the pc from listing, acknowledge softly if at all while writing Items or Levels.
- (d) When pc says no more, put in the Mid Ruds and see if the question (a) reacts on the meter. If it does and the reaction is not an ARC break, continue the listing. If an ARC break, clean it up and test again. If the question reacts, continue the listing until pc says no more, get in Mid Ruds and test question.
- (e) Repeat (d) if question still reacts after listing.

- (f) Start nulling.
- (g) If Dirty Needle develops at any stage of nulling, add to list, get in Mid Ruds and continue nulling.
- (h) Nul down to 3 to 8 Items or Levels in. Tiger Drill each Item or Level in turn. If Dirty Needle develops continue listing, get in Mid Ruds, come down again to 3 to 8 Items or Levels in and start Tiger Drilling.
- (i) Choose the last Item in. It won't go out if all the above were done right.

*Don't* use Mid Ruds or any part of them as a response to a pc origin. Don't punish the pc for originating or commenting.

DIRTY NEEDLES mean incomplete lists. They don't mean anything else.

A dirty needle *can* be turned on by *very* lousy CCHs and *very* lousy 3GAXX. The usual answer is a *good* Problems Intensive.

However, one good assessment with the right question, listed to a complete list and a Reliable Item will turn off the dirtiest needle in Christendom or China either.

What is a Complete List?

COMPLETE LIST = Any list listed for assessment that does not produce a Dirty Needle while nulling or Tiger Drilling.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.jh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 13—15 November 1962

** 6211C13	SHSBC-210	The Difficult Case
** 6211C13	SHSBC-211	Entrance to Cases
** 6211C15	SHSBC-212	Terminals
** 6211C15	SHSBC-213	Clearing Technology

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 NOVEMBER AD12

CenOCon  
Franchise Airmail

**ROUTINE 3-21**

The following data and other R3-2 1 HCO Bulletins to follow are an expansion of Routine 3-21 HCO Bulletin of November 7, AD12, Issue II. It requires a full understanding of that Bulletin as well as HCO Bulletin November 7, AD12, HCO Bulletin November 8, AD12, HCO Bulletin November 11, AD12, and HCO Bulletin November 12, AD12.

It is VITAL that pcs being cleared be run *only* on Routine 3-21 as many cases have “lost their goals” or become hung up on listing or have failed to go clear in a reasonable length of time. These difficulties are now overcome in Routine 3-21, providing the auditing is good. One can get the pc into difficulties that need repair or skilled re-do by failing to write down Items listed from the goal as in 114 lines. Routine 3-21 handles all cases and *all* cases must be shunted over to it in order to prevent *any* hang-up.

DEFINITION: BY-PASSED ITEM

When a list has been made, either in 3GAXX or R3-21 and includes a Reliable Item (HCO Bulletin November 8, AD12) and that Reliable Item was not used to find an item in Opposition to it, the Item which was not so found is called a BY-PASSED ITEM. See HCO Bulletin November 11, AD12. On the picture in that bulletin the Items with balloons around them are BY-PASSED ITEMS until found. It is *this* Item which causes the goal to submerge when finding or listing. It is *this* Item (or bad auditing) which causes the TA to go up and stick. It is the BY-PASSED Item which turns on the constant sen or pain that does not relieve.

The rule is: Whether in finding items before or after the goal has been found, all lists must be used to find items and all Reliable Items found must be used to find their Opposition Item. In short, always nul lists to a Reliable Item whether listing to find the goal or listing from the goal. Auditing of the GPM must result in a LINE PLOT no matter how that Line Plot is achieved. (HCO Bulletin November 8, AD12.) Whether listing Items from lines to find Rock Slams or from the goal to find them you must wind up with a written picture of the pc’s GPM. This is the Line Plot. It is begun by 3GAXX in trying to find the goal. It is *continued* after the goal is found right down to the Rock and Opposition Rock, the two basic Items of the GPM. This also applies to goals found in some other way than 3GAXX.

RELIABLE ITEMS (HCO Bulletin November 8, AD12) are ALWAYS IN PAIRS. Leave one side of these pairs unlocated and you have left the BY-PASSED ITEM raising the devil with the pc. Always oppose a reliable item whenever found and you will never leave a BY-PASSED ITEM and the case will run and clear. This applies both before and after finding the goal.

The difference between the case that lists Items easily to clear and the case that doesn’t is this: The case that just listed to clear without fuss was able to assemble the pairs (terms and opptems) as it went. The case that didn’t list straight to clear didn’t get the pairs straight and needed help; this case had BY-PASSED ITEMS, so the Tone Arm went up and stuck and the goal, overwhelmed, ceased to fire. Using HCO Bulletin November 11, AD12 version of listing, this shouldn’t happen. The pc won’t by-pass one side of a pair and so won’t hang up. It is understood that bad auditing or a wrong goal would also cause a mess.

Thus the second case above—the case where the goal has been listed on and is hung up and won't fire—is a case of either wrong goal or By-Passed Items. The remedy is to take the first written lists from the goal and nul sections of them. Take, for instance, the "Who or What would want the goal" list and nul down just calling each item out once, about a hundred. When you have assessed an item on this list (HCO Bulletin November 12) and have a good Reliable Item, you oppose it (HCO Bulletin November 8) and find, by making the list of items that would oppose it or it would oppose, the other part of the pair.

If you don't find the *pairs* the pc won't go clear but will hang up on the BY-PASSED ITEM or ITEMS. The more that hang up (by-passed items) the more unclear your pc will feel.

I've really been lifting the roof trying to find the reason for this hang-up and there it is. The By-Passed Item keeps cases from going clear.

The *exact* way to do Routine 3-21 Step 6 is as follows:

- (a) Compose the basic four lines using the pc's goal or the goal to be proven by listing.
- (b) Put each line wording at the top of a sheet of paper, a separate sheet for each basic line. Put pc's name and date and page number on each sheet.
- (c) Take Sheet One and get Items from pc until pc runs out of Items for that line.
- (d) Take next sheet in rotation and list until pc runs out. Continue to do this until an RS occurs. See next step.
- (e) Keep pc on meter, turn sensitivity down a bit so you have no trouble keeping needle on dial but can still see an RS. (HCO Bulletin November 8 definitions page 2.) As soon as you see an RS continue with that list. (Be sure RS wasn't just a body movement.) List it down until the dwindling Rock Slam, if any, is gone. List out any Dirty Reads. In short, *complete* any list that RSes. Don't go on to the next list.
- (f) Nul the list that RSed. (Get Mid Ruds in, call off each Item once, leave in all that react on meter. Eliminate these the same way. TD the last few Items, as per HCO Bulletin November 12, AD12.) Nul to a Reliable Item.
- (g) Establish as per HCO Bulletin November 8 whether RI found is term or oppterm.
- (h) List a list in opposition to it. (If a Term, Who/What would it oppose; if an Oppterm, Who or What would oppose it.)
- (i) Nul list as in (f) and obtain a Reliable Item.
- (j) Establish with pc that these two RIs oppose each other and put on PC'S LINE PLOT.
- (k) Nul the remaining lists rapidly looking for an RSing Item. If one found, repeat step (f) to (g) above. (Experience will tell if this is necessary on your pc. It may be possible to abandon all lists of Items done from goal. If so just get four fresh sheets and start again, using as the first line to list the one most likely to now have a potential RS.)
- (l) Repeat (b) to (k) over and over.

This is New Step 6 Listing.

Keep your rudiments in, don't upset the pc, be sure to note, find and run out RSes.

## URGENT

On *ALL* pcs whose goals have been found or found and listed by *any* earlier procedure, relocate the earliest item lists written from the first four lines and nul these and oppose the Reliable Items found in every list. The pc will brighten up and start to make fast progress.

The Goals Problem Mass becomes, in the pc's folder, the Line Plot.

It is safe to do the above on any goal that consistently produces pain as well as some sen. But beware the moment it goes all sen.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 20—22 November 1962

** 6211C20	SHSBC-214	The GPM
** 6211C20	SHSBC-215	Fundamentals of Auditing
** 6211C22	SHSBC-216	Q & A Period, Part 1
** 6211C22	SHSBC-217	Q & A Period, Part 2



HCO BULLETIN OF 23 NOVEMBER AD12

CenOCon  
Franchise

*URGENT*

**ROUTINE TWO-TWELVE  
OPENING PROCEDURE BY ROCK SLAM  
AN HPA/HCA SKILL**

Note: Hat Check this HCO Bulletin with a stiff examination before permitting its use.

Note: This Procedure is to be done on *every* HGC pc, every course student of every course as a pc, as early as possible and definitely *before* Prepchecking or CCHs. Done correctly it will end the no-results or slow result case and guarantee faster gain to the fast case. *ALL* Cases must have this done at once.

The slow student as well as the slow gainer is always a Rock Slammer.

**THE SLOW-GAIN, NO-GAIN CASES**

The slow or never gain case has been a target with me for twelve years.

I have now made a breakthrough on this. It is, I'm afraid I have to tell you, *the* breakthrough. You could straighten up the head of the Medical Association with it, it's that powerful. It undercuts all the reasons why. It must be done on all students. And also *every* HGC pc.

Unfortunately the solution is similar to a Routine 3 process, but there's nothing for it but HPAs/HCA's must learn the steps in this HCO Bulletin if we are to survive. For these skills encompass more than 50% of the cases, in some areas up to 80%. And these will clear slowly or not at all unless this first step is taken first. Even a Problems Intensive will fail on about 30% of these cases.

Here are the progressive data which led to this breakthrough:

DATUM 1953 - A Problem is postulate-counter-postulate.

DATUM 1954—Persons with heavy overts on Scientology make *no* case progress. No Case Gain = Suspected Person.

DATUM 1955—A person with a present time problem will get no graph change.

DATUM 1961—The Goals Problem Mass consists of Items (valences) in opposition to one another. Any pair of these Items, in opposition to each other, constitute a specific problem.

DATUM 1961—A person with a hidden standard won't go clear.

DATUM 1962—Rock Slammers. Persons who Rock Slam on Scientology or associated Items are Security Risks.

DATUM Nov 1962—When a GPM Item Exists in Present Time It Constitutes a Present Time Problem. If one of the opponents in a Problem (Item versus Item) is part of the Goals Problem Mass, that problem will not resolve without resolving at least a portion of the GPM.

DATUM Nov 1962—All non-gain or slow-gain cases have a GPM Item in their present time environment. The companion or opposing Item to the PTP Item is buried out of sight.

CONCLUSION—All slow-gain or non-gain preclears *have* to have the GPM Item that is in the present time environment located and opposed before they will make adequate gains in processing or study.

Suddenly it becomes of vital *technical* interest whether a person is any variety of

Rock Slammer or not. Before, it and other security measures were only of administrative interest. Now it is a question of whether or not the case will *ever* improve.

Thus we have to have (a) a broadened definition for a Rock Slammer, (b) an easy method of detecting one and (c) quick procedures to remedy the condition. We have all these now.

**DEFINITION**—A ROCK SLAMMER is a preclear who Rock Slams on a Present Time GPM Item in his or her Immediate Environment.

Until this Item is located and opposed the Rock Slammer will make slow gains or no gains in clearing.

The Routine 2-12 method of discharging the influence of a Rock Slamming Item is actually taken from 3GA Criss Cross (3GAXX), and is a specialized routine from Routine 3. We will, however, since it does not touch goals, designate it as Routine 2.

This routine will have to be learned by all HPAs/HCA's and used by all staff Auditors. It does not include clearing. It includes only Item Assessment. By labelling it Routine 2 it comes within the reach of all trained auditors.

#### ROUTINE TWO-TWELVE

1. Make or use a list of Scientology Items. This includes Scientology, Scientology Organizations, an Auditor, clearing, auditing, Scientologists, a session, an E-Meter, a practitioner, the auditor's name, Ron, other Scientology persons, parts of Scientology, past auditors, etc. (See HCO Bulletin November 24 and subsequent HCO Bulletins for "Scientology Lists".) The list need not be endless as it will be easy to catch a trace of the GPM if the person is a Rock Slammer. The list is composed by the auditor, not the pc.
2. Assess the list, calling each item once (or until auditor is sure of the read). Eliminate down to the last 3 or 4 items.
3. Tiger Drill the Items still in. Select the one with the biggest dirty read or the last one to go out or the one that went out hardest. No matter how faintly or sporadically the Item found now reads, if the last one in stayed in at all, use it for Step 4 below. If, however, the Item found in this step produced a good Rock Slam (Reliable Item) omit Steps 4, 5 and 6 below and do the tests in Step 7 and continue with the remaining steps. If two RIs are found in this first step, oppose each one as in Steps 7 onward.
4. Using the Item selected, list a list from the line question "Who or what does (the Item found in 3) represent to you?" (It can happen that Steps 4, 5 and 6 are unnecessary. If the Item in Step 3 consistently Rock Slammed a third of a dial to a dial wide and kept on doing it when the auditor said "Consider committing overt's against \_\_\_\_ (the Item found)", use it instead of doing the Step 4 List. If this Rock Slam is on and then vanishes even with "Suppress" clean, do Step 4, using the Item that so slammed but vanished. In doing listing beware of stopping listing while the needle is still dirty or stopping just because the pc says the last item was it. (The *real* RS Item you want usually comes after the pc says the last one he put on was IT.) (If the pc stops or refuses to go on, get in your Mid Ruds and continue to list until there is no dirty needle or RS when pc thinks of Items before saying them to the auditor.) Mark every Item that RSed or DRed on Listing. While listing keep the meter at about Sens 8 and keep an eye on it to note RSs and DRs.
5. Nul the list, saying each Item on it once (or more if the auditor didn't catch the read). Be sure the Mid Ruds are in. If a dirty needle turns on while nulling, add to the list, get the Mid Ruds in and test the question for reaction. If needle reacts to question the list is incomplete or the pc is protesting the question. Leave any Item in that reacts. Eliminate all but the last 3 or 4 Items.
6. Tiger Drill the last Items in. Select one Item with the biggest needle reaction or Rock Slam. (Two Items can appear on any list. If they both Rock Slam equally and neither goes out, you have found two Items, in which case you must do the following steps to each.)

7. Find out if Item turned on Pain or Sensation when being Tiger Drilled, or say it to the pc and find out. If Pain, say to pc, "Consider \_\_\_\_\_ (Item) committing overts." If Sensation, say, "Consider committing overts against \_\_\_\_\_." This should turn on a Rock Slam if it isn't on already whenever the Item was said or Tiger Drilled. This is called a Reliable Item if it Rock Slammed. The Rock Slam is very touchy sometimes and has to be Tiger Drilled back on. If an Item slammed while *being nulled* it is probably it. Those that RS while being listed do not have to RS flicker at all while being nulled, and usually don't.
8. If the Reliable Item found turned on Pain, list "Who or what would \_\_\_\_\_ (the Reliable Item) oppose?" If it turned on Sensation, list "Who or what would oppose \_\_\_\_\_ (the Reliable Item)?" Complete the list as in any listing. Don't stop just because the pc nattered or wept. Get the Mid Ruds in and get a list which gives no dirty needle (not dirty reads, there's a difference) while nulling. In case of a Coterm, test to see if there's more Pn than Sen or Sen than Pn and classify accordingly. If you can't decide, list both as opposed and oppose and nul as one list.
9. Nul the list saying each Item once, down to 3 or 4 Items.
10. Tiger Drill the last 3 or 4 that were left in. Select the last one left in.
11. Test and turn on the Rock Slam on the last one in (as in Step 7 above). Be sure to properly determine which is Term and which is Oppterm.  
  
Get pc to examine and align the package for correctness (and any Bonus Package) and put on the pc's Line Plot.
12. Go over the list used in Step 1 to see if there are any more dirty reads or traces of reads on the Scientology List. If so, repeat the above Eleven Steps on the pc. If not, make a list for the Step 1A etc, using questions given further on in this HCO Bulletin. Note: Only the Scientology List is tested again. Other lists for Step I are used only once.

-----

This is the only action known in auditing which will undercut the bank of a slow moving or non-gain pc. *Every* such pc is a Rock Slammer.

Why is this? Well, these two Items (a terminal and oppterm of the GPM) make a Present Time Problem. The pc is obsessively trying to solve *this* problem, not trying to get well or go clear. The pc won't come off trying to solve this sub-surface problem. He or she doesn't even "know" about it. So there's the Auditor trying to make somebody well, but the pc is trying to die "to prove Scientology doesn't work" or to get sick "to make my boss realize what he's done to me", etc, etc.

It's pathetic. In the largest percentage of cases, the auditor is opening the door to the next two hundred trillion years and the pc is reactively trying to get even with grasshoppers.

This disagreement between auditor and pc brings about the upsets and no gains.

No other technique known will get at this key problem or problems.

This technique doesn't try to diagnose the problem. Indeed the problem won't be known to the pc (or the auditor) until the action is complete. And then the auditor doesn't even have to ask for it or about it.

-----

What do you do with these two Items? Well, *this* will prove to be the third biggest source of falls from grace in using Routine 2-12. You don't do anything with the Items except establish which is the terminal and which is the oppterm and put them on the pc's Line Plot. The thing that *could* be done with them would be to get "Represent Lists" from them to find more Items. You can ask for missed W/Hs, saying, "When did

(oppterm found) nearly find out about you?" But it's best to leave the RS on for a goal finder as the goal finder will want to use them in 3GAXX. (Step 4A—Routine 3-21.) So don't spoil the RS. The pc will cognite all over the place and that's the benefit, and the pc won't be trying to chop up auditors and orgs, and should respond very well to CCHs and Prepchecking after the Two Items are found.

The biggest error that will be made is trying to do R2-12 with the Rudiments out,

and conversely, putting the Mid Ruds in every time a pc originates (a sure way to ruin a pc).

The second biggest source of error is making Incomplete Lists. These go out *hard* and give a dirty needle and result in no Item. The unschooled auditor will usually chicken out whenever the pc says, "That's all," or "I've just put it on the list. That last Item is IT," at which the auditor stops listing. And the Item that will Rock Slam is never put on the list and so is never found. And the auditor is left fighting a dirty needle and trying to read through it. The rule is, while nulling, if a simple question "What did you want to say?" fails to smooth out a suddenly dirty needle the list is incomplete. Complete it and then put in Mid Ruds. The average list runs 80 or more Items. (Get the precise difference between a dirty needle and a dirty read in HCO Bulletin November 8, AD 12.)

## QUESTIONS FOR THE SECOND PAIR

If you have found a pair of Reliable Items and can't find anything now on the basic list of Step One, *and you* want to continue Routine 2-12, the following questions will produce lists on which Reliable Items can be found. You ask the pc the question and write down whatever he says. You *never* correct the pc or refuse an Item. You only use *one* of these questions at a time for a full coverage with all 12 Steps.

## LISTS

List R2-12—1. The Basic Scientology List as given in Step 1. It is essential not to omit it as the first action in Routine 2-12. It may be done *again*, and should be, after other lists are used to get Reliable Items. (After other Items have been found, List 1 may come alive again as pc's case unburdens.)

List R2-12—1A. Special List for pc's environment. General Question, "In present time, who or what have you been upset about?" This, whatever the question, must get things like wife, husband, marriage, job, home, myself, my case, police, this country, machines, etc, etc. It is an effort to locate PT Items that keep the GPM keyed in. Use *only* after List 1. Pc gives the Items for this List.

List R2-12—1B. General Question, "Who or what would you prefer not to associate with?" Listed from pc. This list heading was developed for pcs who won't say they have enemies. It can be used on any pc. Use only what pc lists. Be sure list is complete.

List R2-12—1C. General Question, "Who or what have you detested?" Use only what the pc gives. Be sure list is complete.

List R2-12—1D. General Question, "Who or what isn't part of existence?" Use only what pc gives. Be sure list is complete.

List R2-12—1E. (General Question, "What Problem have you had?" Use only what pc gives. Be sure list is complete.

List R2-12—1F. General Question, "Who or what have you had to be careful of?" Use only what pc gives. Be sure list is complete.

List R2-12—1G. General Question, "Who or what have you invalidated?" Use only what pc gives. Be sure list is complete.

List R2-12—1H. General Question, "Who or what has nearly found out about you?" Use only what pc gives. Be very very very sure that list is complete or you'll have missed a withhold on the pc.

The above lists are numbered and lettered for proper sequence in use on the preclear.

In other words you could do Routine 2-12 many times (plus doing Step 1 on the Scientology List more than once) on a preclear. But *always* do the first step with Scientology Items as many times as you can get one of its Items to react and you'll never miss.

It is this first list of Scientology Items which holds up cases, so it must be used for all 12 steps again and again.

Further questions can be had from Prehav assessments.

The rule is: "If you get a Reliable Item *always* get its opposing item." Then you will never get a BY-PASSED ITEM, the thing that hangs up cases.

In getting any Reliable Items and their opposition, you are of course cleaning up the GPM and therefore clearing the pc. So this is a road to clear.

Items have many other uses, so never fake one and never fail to record one on the Line Plot.

-----

Occasionally you get a BONUS PACKAGE off one list. In addition to the Item you are looking for, sometimes two RSing Items will show up on the same list opposing each other and blow. They oppose each other, not what you're listing. Point this out to the pc when found and put these also on the Line Plot, marked BP (Bonus Package), one as a terminal and one as an opposition terminal. And go on and find your regular Item.

-----

Routine 2-12, coupled with Problems Intensives and CCHs, gives the HCA/HPA a full kit that can handle the worst cases, knock out the no-gain cases and can clear. So I haven't forgotten the HCA/HPA.

-----

Don't try to cover up the fact that somebody has a Rock Slam or a Dirty Read on Scientology etc. You'll have set him or her up to never have gains.

#### SKILLS REQUIRED

To accomplish a 3GAXX for Rock Slammers, an auditor needs to be drilled and thoroughly examined on the following:

1. The E-Meter and what is a Dirty Read, a Dirty Needle and a Rock Slam. Practical.
2. HCO Bulletin November 8, AD12, "Somatics". Theory.
3. Any future HCO Bulletins on Assessment for Rock Slamming Items. Theory and Practical.
4. Tiger Drilling. Theory and Practical.
5. This bulletin. Theory and Practical.

If the auditor can't do 3GAXX for Rock Slammers, it will be because he did not know or was badly examined on the five things above. There's neither difficulty nor mystery about the above 12 steps.

So study up and don't miss. This, but no Routine 3 process, is declared an HPA/HCA skill. If an auditor can't do it, he'll have a slow go or a no-win on about eighty per cent of all cases.

With the above, properly studied and well drilled, there will be great success on anybody who can be persuaded to begin a session.

And *also* this must be done on *every* case that hasn't gone clear already even after their goal has been found. It's a certainty that such a case is by-passing at least one side of a Present Time Problem that is part of and suppressing the whole GPM.

This is THE PC's BIGGEST MISSED WITHHOLD of all.

Note: There are *no* variations on the order of steps or actions above. One doesn't sometimes do this, sometimes that. This is a very rote procedure.

Note: On some very, very rough cases this system may not *work fully* until some regular 3GAXX is run by a Class IV auditor. In any event, a case on 3GAXX should be tested again as above after every 6 or 8 RIs are found.

Note: And just to clear up any possible misunderstanding you do R2-12 on *all pcs first* and you never vary its steps or sequence.

Note: No preclear will achieve a lasting case gain with overts on Scientology and allied Items. No free needle will stay free in the presence of these overts. Routine 2-12 removes the unwanted valences that commit such overts rather than endlessly sec checking the pc. The most insidious By-Passed Items are those that remain in present time prompting the pc to commit senseless overts to the dismay of his good sense and the peril of his case condition. He will make no fast gain until the Scientology List is worked over and over for any reaction.

#### FAST STEP RESUME

1. USE OR COMPILE A LIST 1, 1 A, 1 B, etc.
2. ASSESS LIST.
3. TIGER DRILL THE LAST 3 OR 4 ITEMS LEFT IN. TAKE THE ONE WITH LARGEST OR ANY REMAINING ACTION. IF ITEM FOUND IS AN RI OMIT STEPS 4 AND 5.
4. USING ITEM IN 3, LIST "WHO OR WHAT DOES \_\_\_\_\_ REPRESENT TO YOU?"
5. NUL LIST.
6. TIGER DRILL LAST 3 OR 4 ITEMS LEFT IN, SELECT ONE.
7. DETERMINE IF ITEM FOUND IS A TERMINAL OR OPPOSITION TERMINAL.
8. LIST FROM ITEM USING PROPER WORDING FOR A TERMINAL OR OPPOSITION TERMINAL AS ESTABLISHED IN 7. TERM = PAIN = W/W WOULD \_\_\_\_\_ OPPOSE? OPPTERM = SEN = W/W WOULD OPPOSE \_\_\_\_\_ ?
9. NUL LIST.
10. TIGER DRILL LAST 3 OR 4. SELECT LAST ONE LEFT IN.
11. TEST PACKAGE (AND ANY BONUS PACKAGE) WITH PC, MAKE SURE WHICH IS TERM AND OPPTERM AND IF THEY OPPOSE EACH OTHER AND PUT ON LINE PLOT.
12. DO ALL ABOVE STEPS AGAIN ON SCIENTOLOGY LIST UNTIL IT HAS NO GHOST OF A REACTION. THEN DO 1A, 1B, ETC, EACH ON ALL STEPS.

Note: This is a primary training skill. Do not give students more than instruction on the check sheet of Class IIb before turning them loose on Routine IIb as a heavy time auditing activity. They will learn little or nothing before being clean on R2-12. Put Comm Course and other instruction after R2-12 and the student will have a chance to learn it. Give the student further heavy instruction on R2-12 toward course end. Classify only on the end of course repass of the IIb check sheet. The point is don't waste instruction on basic Scientology until the student is cleaned up on Routine 2-12, particularly the Scientology List. I don't care how this is accomplished in the Academy or in the HGC. Just get it done.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 NOVEMBER AD12

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 2-12**  
**LIST ONE—ISSUE ONE**  
**THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST**

This is the List One of Routine 2-12. You can lengthen but do not shorten this list for Step 1 of R2-12. This list is used over and over on all 12 Steps until no reaction of *any* kind can be gotten off of it. If an Item on it reads sporadically, even, use it on the 12 Steps.

The Scientology List is called LIST ONE. Others, 1A, 1B, are called by their designations. All lists, including the Scientology List, are referred to in general as “A first list”, or “The first list”.

PC NAME	DATE
AUDITOR	LOCATION (CITY)
SCIENTOLOGY	A DIANETIC ORGANIZATION
SCIENTOLOGISTS	ORG SURVIVAL
AN AUDITOR	A CENTRE
AUDITORS	FIELD AUDITORS
STUDENTS	HCA'S
AN E-METER	D. SCN'S
METERS	HGC PCS
A SESSION	ACC'S
CLEARING	MENTAL SCIENCE
A CLEAR	A SCIENCE OF MIND
A RELEASE	MENTAL DOCTORS
A PRECLEAR	SAINT HILL
A PATIENT	COURSES
INSANITY	STATEMENTS
THE MIND	UNITS
MINDS	SCIENTOLOGY PAY
MENTAL HEALTH	WORLD CLEARING
DIANETICS	RON
BOOK ONE	L. RON HUBBARD
DIANETIC BOOKS	THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SCIENTOLOGY BOOKS	THE GOVERNING DIRECTOR
A SCIENTOLOGY MAGAZINE	THE FOUNDER
RON'S ARTICLES	MARY SUE
A SCIENTOLOGY CONGRESS	MARY SUE HUBBARD
A BULLETIN	THE ASSOCIATION SECRETARY
A POLICY LETTER	THE ORGANIZATION SECRETARY
A HAT	THE HCO SECRETARY
HATS	SECURITY
A SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATION	WITHHOLDS FROM SCIENTOLOGY
STAFF MEMBERS	OVERTS AGAINST SCIENTOLOGY
A REGISTRAR	YOUR CASE
SCIENTOLOGY LETTERS	PEOPLE'S CASES
INSTRUCTORS	TECHNIQUES
STAFF AUDITORS	PROCEDURES
THE D OF P	A SQUIRREL
THE D OF T	PSYCHOLOGISTS
HCO	PSYCHIATRISTS
HASI	HUMAN RIGHTS
THE CHURCH	ENTHETA
THE FOUNDATION	RUMOURS
THE CENTRAL ORG	BAD AUDITORS
THE ACADEMY	BAD AUDITING
THE HGC	SECURITY RISKS
HDRF	ROCK SLAMMERS
THE CO-AUDIT	NO RESULTS
CO-AUDITING	

<hr/> A bad Person in Scientology	<hr/> The worst Auditor pc had
<hr/> A bad Person in Scientology	<hr/> A Scientology Exec
<hr/> A bad Person in Scientology	<hr/> A Scientology Exec
<hr/> Auditor's formal name	<hr/> A Prominent Scientologist
<hr/> Auditor's informal name	<hr/> Something in Scientology worrying pc
<hr/> An Auditor pc had	<hr/> Something in Scientology worrying pc
<hr/> The first Auditor pc had	<hr/> Something in Scientology worrying pc
<hr/> The best Auditor pc had	

Note: Fill in all blanks with pc's help.

Note: The above when found can be Terms or Oppters. It doesn't matter which. All that matters is meter reaction unless an RI is found on this list. If so Identify for Term or Oppterm as in Step 7 and continue R2-12.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

# SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

27 November 1962

- \*\* 6211C27      SHSBC-218      Routine 2-12
- \*\* 6211C27      SHSBC-219      Routine 2-12



Central Orgs  
Academies

**R2-12**  
**PRACTICAL DRILLS**

The following drills were prepared by Brian Pope, Practical Supervisor Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. These drills may be used in any Academy or Course.

**R2- 12**  
**TRAINING DRILL**

To teach a student to audit with 2-12 he must have certain basic auditing skills. These are:

G.F. Model Session.  
Getting in Mid Ruds.  
Anti Q&A & TR4.  
Missed Withholds detection and cleaning.  
Completing a list. Tiger Drill.  
Nulling a list.  
Meter reading.

When an auditor has these skills he is capable of running 2-12 and can produce results without exception.

-----

The Coach has the student use the 12 steps of 2-12 in Model Session. His purpose is to give the student a reality on the mechanics of what he is doing and coach him to be able to stick to the rote procedure without variation. The coach uses the HCO Bulletin November 23 step by step giving the student on a gradient scale anything he is likely to have to handle during R2-12.

Student uses a dummy meter and coach uses a pen as a needle during listing and nulling Items.

*Drills*

1. The coach has student assess List 1 calling off each Item one at a time and makes sure that the student can null this list using a standard marking system and marking in any meter or pc phenomena which may be of value to him, i.e., Rock Slams, Pn or Sen, Dirty Reads, etc.
2. Coach has student drilled in Tiger Drilling the last 3-4 Items in as per "Tiger" (HCO Bulletin August 1, 1962).
3. Coach shows student various things that could happen on a List One assessment. E.g. 2 Rock Slamming Items stay in, 1 RS Item stays in, Sporadic Item stays in, nothing stays in, and teaches student what to do with the Item he is left with (Step 3 of 2-12).
4. Coach shows student how to get a represent list from a reading Item (Step 4, 2-12) coaching him on marking his list with any useful data that shows up during listing or nulling. Coach gives student reality on dirty needles and incomplete lists by "turning on" dirty needles during nulling, also gives student reality on out

rudiments during nulling causing Items to stay in—3 Items in a row stay in shows a Mid Rud out somewhere—coach has student have a complete list before nulling.

5. Coach has student null the list by saying each Item once until only 3 or 4 react.
6. Coach has student TD last few Items as in Step 2 to a Reliable—or 2 Reliable Items.
7. Coach has student do Step 7 of 2-12 practising all he has learned regarding needle behaviour and coaches student to recognise a term or an oppterm (HCO Bulletin November 8, 1962).
8. Coach has student complete the Steps 8-12 of R2-12 having him handle anything which may come up during a session and find a package or recognise a blown Item.

Instructor passes student when he can run the whole 2-12 steps and find a “package” on Instructor without any variation from procedure.

Coach uses HCO Bulletin on 2-12 throughout as his reference for coaching.

### COACHING NOTES

Coach should look for:

1. Poor marking system in nulling.
2. Incomplete lists.
3. Too many Mid Ruds.
4. Failure to get in Mid Ruds.
5. Failure to add Items to list.
6. Poor Tiger Drilling (Tiger Drill is a dust-off not a full-scale cleaning up job like a prepcheck).
7. Student failure to note RS Items during listing or nulling also failure to note any Pn or Sen pc originates.
8. Poor R factor—not keeping pc informed.
9. Failure to recognise a blown Item or package.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

29 November 1962

- |            |           |                                    |
|------------|-----------|------------------------------------|
| ** 6211C29 | SHSBC-220 | R2-12 Theory and Practice, Part I  |
| ** 6211C29 | SHSBC-221 | R2-12 Theory and Practice, Part II |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 NOVEMBER AD12

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 2-12**  
**LIST ONE—ISSUE TWO**  
**THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST**

This is List One Issue Two. Do not add to it or change it. This list is used over and over on all 12 Steps until no reaction of *any* kind can be gotten off of it. If an Item on it reads sporadically, even, use it on the 12 Steps.

PC'S NAME	AUDITOR'S NAME	DATE
SCIENTOLOGY	THE DYNAMICS	
SCIENTOLOGISTS	THE REACTIVE MIND	
AN AUDITOR	PAST LIVES	
AUDITORS	A CENTRE	
AUDITING	FIELD AUDITORS	
STUDENTS	CERTIFICATES	
AN E-METER	HCA's	
METERS	HPA's	
A SESSION	DSCN's	
CLEARING	HGC PC's	
A CLEAR	ACC's	
A RELEASE	MENTAL SCIENCE	
A PRECLEAR	A SCIENCE OF MIND	
A PATIENT	MENTAL DOCTORS	
INSANITY	SAINT HILL	
THE MIND	COURSES	
MINDS	STATEMENTS	
MENTAL HEALTH	UNITS	
DIANETICS	SCIENTOLOGY PAY	
BOOK ONE	WORLD CLEARING	
DIANETIC BOOKS	RON	
SCIENTOLOGY BOOKS	L. RON HUBBARD	
A SCIENTOLOGY MAGAZINE	THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
RON'S ARTICLES	THE GOVERNING DIRECTOR	
A SCIENTOLOGY CONGRESS	THE FOUNDER	
A BULLETIN	MARY SUE	
A POLICY LETTER	MARY SUE HUBBARD	
A HAT	THE ASSOCIATION SECRETARY	
HATS	THE ORGANIZATION SECRETARY	
A SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATION	THE HCO SECRETARY	
STAFF MEMBERS	SECURITY	
A REGISTRAR	YOUR CASE	
SCIENTOLOGY LETTERS	PEOPLE'S CASES	
INSTRUCTORS	TECHNIQUES	
STAFF AUDITORS	PROCEDURES	
THE D OF P	A SQUIRREL	
THE D OF T	PSYCHOLOGISTS	
HCO	PSYCHIATRISTS	
HASI	AUDITORS	
THE CHURCH	AUDITING	
THE FOUNDATION	ROCK SLAMMERS	
THE CENTRAL ORG	THETANS	
THE ACADEMY		
THE HGC		
HDRF		
THE CO-AUDIT		
CO-AUDITING		
A DIANETIC ORGANIZATION		

Auditor's Name\_\_\_\_\_

LRH :jw.bh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 NOVEMBER AD12  
Reissued to Franchise 12 February 1963

Sthil Students  
CenOCon  
Franchise

**ROUTINES 2-12, 3-21 and 3GAXX  
TIGER DRILL  
for  
NULLING BY MID RUDS**

(Replaces HCO Bulletin 1 August AD12)

(Note: In an actual session, in addition to Model Session script, only the words below are used. No additive words or departures are necessary except to clean up a constant dirty needle with *session* Mid Ruds if that misfortune occurs. And use *session* Mid Ruds only when you *can't* go on otherwise.)

**DRILL ON NEW NULLING PROCEDURES**

Position for this drill is the usual auditor-coach position. The coach only has the drill form and follows it exactly until the student auditor has each example down perfectly. When the student auditor and the coach have these drills down exactly, then the coach can give different reads and different goals for the student auditor to work on, the only caution being that the goals selected be those which would be most unlikely on anyone's goals list. The goal used in this drill is: TO BE A TIGER. On the drills below "A" is for auditor; "C" is for coach. Student and coach use only the words in the drill except when student em at which coach says, "Flunk!" and "Start," at which student starts at the beginning.

*Use of Tiger Drill:* This drill is used in Routine 2-12 to sort out the last 3 or 4 Items left in on each nulling. It is used in Routine 3-21 to null the Goals list and on the last 3 or 4 Items left in. In 3GAXX it is used on the last 3 or 4 Items left in and on any Goals list. This is the *Small Tiger Drill*. It is however simply called the Tiger Drill. Big Tiger is always called Big Tiger.

*Buttons used:* Only the following buttons are used in Small Tiger: Suppressed, Invalidated, Suggested, Failed to reveal and Mistake.

*Big Tiger* is the same drill except that it additionally uses Nearly found out, Protest, Anxious about and Careful of. One shifts to Big Tiger when making sure of the last Item in on the list or a goal that fires strongly.

Tiger and Big Tiger compare in buttons used to Mid Ruds and Big Mid Ruds.

*Drill 1:*

A: To be a tiger  
C: Null  
A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
C: Null  
A: To be a tiger  
C: Null  
A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 2:*

A: To be a tiger  
C: Read  
A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?

A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 3:*

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 4.*

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 5:*

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Null

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 6:*

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: On the goal to be a tiger is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has any mistake been made?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has any mistake been made?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 7:*

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Null  
 A: On the goal to be a tiger has any mistake been made?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has any mistake been made?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger

C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 8:*

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has any mistake been made?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read (Note that this goal is now ready to be checked out.)

*Drill 9:*

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested?

C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Drill 10:*

A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Read  
 A: On this goal has anything been invalidated?  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Read  
 A: That reads: What was it? Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: On this goal has anything been suppressed?  
 C: Null  
 A: To be a tiger  
 C: Null  
 A: Thank you. That is out.

*Acks*—These are used to complete and end a whole Drill Cycle. They can be used during the Drill if pc needs them, but *only* if pc needs them. It's better to use the Drill as is.

*Suppress*—Suppress is not used repetitively in Tiger Drilling, only in Mid Ruds and Prepchecking.

“Do you agree that that is clean”—This is not used.

“I will check that on the meter”—This is not used.

After doing Suppress always check the Goal.

If the pc has a tendency to lose sight of the goal on a long run you can always change, for a command, the wording to “On the goal To be a tiger has anything been\_\_\_\_\_?”



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 DECEMBER 1962

CenOCon

**GOALS & PREPCHECKING**

In Prepchecking pcs through Problems Intensives, it commonly occurs that the pc presents his or her goal to the Auditor.

When this occurs the goal should not be given vast importance or suppressed, either way.

The pc should be taken to a Class IV Auditor and checked out. The Prepcheck may then be shifted to the goal itself.

The usual actions of Routine 3-21 are then followed, of which the goals prepcheck is a part, so long as the auditing is done under the supervision of a Class IV Auditor.

It is a very bad action to just take the pc's goal and run it without its being thoroughly checked out. The health and even the life of the pc can be put at risk if it is *not* the pc's goal.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd jh  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 DECEMBER AD 12

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 2-12**  
**LIST ONE—ISSUE THREE**  
**THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST**

Do not add to list or you will get incomplete list phenomena.

PC'S NAME	AUDITOR'S NAME	DATE
SCIENTOLOGY	SOMATICS	
SCIENTOLOGISTS	PAIN	
AN AUDITOR	ENGRAMS	
AUDITORS	CIRCUITS	
AUDITING	VALENCES	
STUDENTS	THE DYNAMICS	
AN E-METER	PAST LIVES	
METERS	A CENTRE	
A SESSION	FIELD AUDITORS	
CLEARING	CERTIFICATES	
A CLEAR	HCA's	
A RELEASE	HPA's	
A PRECLEAR	D.SCN's	
A PATIENT	MINISTERS	
INSANE PEOPLE	HGC PC's	
THE MIND	ACC's	
MINDS	MENTAL SCIENCE	
MENTAL HEALTH	A SCIENCE OF MIND	
DIANETICS	MENTAL DOCTORS	
BOOK ONE	SAINT HILL	
DIANETIC BOOKS	COURSES	
SCIENTOLOGY BOOKS	STATEMENTS	
A SCIENTOLOGY MAGAZINE	UNITS	
RON'S ARTICLES	SCIENTOLOGY PAY	
A SCIENTOLOGY CONGRESS	WORLD CLEARING	
A BULLETIN	RON	
A POLICY LETTER	L. RON HUBBARD	
A HAT	THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
HATS	THE GOVERNING DIRECTOR	
A SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATION	THE FOUNDER	
STAFF MEMBERS	MARY SUE	
A REGISTRAR	MARY SUE HUBBARD	
SCIENTOLOGY LETTERS	THE ASSOCIATION SECRETARY	
INSTRUCTORS	THE ORGANIZATION SECRETARY	
STAFF AUDITORS	THE HCO SECRETARY	
THE D of P	SECURITY	
THE D of T	YOUR CASE	
HCO	PEOPLE'S CASES	
HASI	TECHNIQUES	
THE CHURCH	PROCEDURES	
THE FOUNDATION	ROUTINE 2-12	
THE CENTRAL ORG	A SQUIRREL	
THE ACADEMY	PSYCHOLOGISTS	
THE HGC	PSYCHIATRISTS	
THE PE	ROCK SLAMMERS	
HDRF	THETANS	
THE CO-AUDIT	TESTS	
CO-AUDITING	EXAMINERS	
A DIANETIC ORGANIZATION	GOALS	
THE DYNAMICS	TAPES	
THE REACTIVE MIND	LECTURES	
ABERRATION		

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Auditor's Name

L. RON HUBBARD

[Added to by HCO B 9 December 1962.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 DECEMBER AD12

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21  
AND  
ROUTINE 2-10  
MODERN ASSESSMENT**

The only actual test of a list is “Is it nullable?” Can it be nulled? Or will a dirty needle take over?

Assessment is *prevented* by the following:

- (1) List taken from erroneous source.  
(most corny)
- (2) List is incomplete.  
(most common)
- (3) Missed missed withholds.  
(least common)
- (4) List Mid Ruds out.  
(most overworked)
- (5) Session Mid Ruds out.  
(most neglected)

-----

DEFINITIONS

**ASSESSMENT**—The whole action of obtaining a significant Item from a pc.

**LISTING**—The auditor’s action in writing down Items said by the pc in response to a question by the auditor.

**NULLING**—The auditor’s action in saying Items from a List to a pc and noting the reaction of the pc by use of an E-Meter.

**ROCKSLAMMER**—One who produces a Rockslam during the nulling of the Scientology List on that list. Persons who produce Rockslam reactions on other lists are not Rockslammers. This is designated because a certain behaviour pattern can be expected of a Rockslammer and because this person, having a PTP from the GPM on Scientology or allied Items, especially will make no gain in other auditing or studying of any kind until that Item is properly opposed by R2-10 or R2-12 and the case further cleaned on 2-10 or 2-12. 3GAXX and R3-21 are no help to this case. Without 2-12 this case is condemned to the next two hundred trillion years in misery. So never miss in spotting a Rockslammer.

**NULLABLE**—The condition a list must be in in order to have an Item found on it.

**A DEAD HORSE**—A list which even with good auditing, failed for any other reason to produce a Reliable Item.

**SKUNKED**—A list with RSs on it in listing that failed to produce a Reliable Item.

## WRITING THE LIST

The list is written on 8" x 13" or 8 1/2" x 13 1/2" paper, on two sides of the paper, in one or two columns, depending on size of the writing. A fold of four pages is sometimes used, 8" x 13".

The pc's name in brief, the date and page number of the list and the question being asked are put on every sheet on the first side of that sheet or on the first page of a set of four pages unseparated.

The question is repeated only as often as actually needed by the pc.

Items are softly acknowledged now and then, not each Item.

All Items are written down that the pc gives.

The list is done with pc on the meter at sensitivity 8. The auditor keeps an eye on the meter. As the pc first thinks of an Item, the Item RSs or gives a DR. The auditor marks "RS" or "DR" after each such Item.

The auditor must be alert for a pc saying, "That's the Item. Now the list is complete." Invariably the RSing Items lie just after such a statement. Such a statement is acknowledged well and the auditor says, "We'll have to continue just to be sure I have a clean needle."

The list is complete when the needle is clean and flowing (but this won't happen with the Session Mid Ruds out).

An auditor never repeats Items to the pc after the pc says them. If the auditor doesn't understand he asks pc to spell it or if it is singular or plural. Don't fake an understanding. The list must be accurate or it will foul up the needle on nulling.

The danger sign of overlisting (there are three but this is the only one used in 2-12 and 3GAXX) is the pc invalidating or questioning Items as he or she says them. When this happens near the beginning of a list, it indicates a wrong source for the list. After a hundred Items or more it means that the list is as complete as it will ever be and the auditor should stop and try to null it.

If a first step 2-12 list produces no RSs one completes it anyway and uses it. In short, first step lists don't have to RS. However, a first step list that *does* RS is far more likely to produce results.

If a step 4 2-12 list produces no RS after being stretched on and on it is definitely a dead horse and should be abandoned. An RS usually occurs before 50 Items on a live list but this is a guess and some RSs have not turned on before 100 Items or more were listed.

In short, Represent and Opposition lists must produce an RS somewhere or they will not give a Reliable Item. These should be abandoned without nulling.

If an Item is an RSing Item it should only be opposed, represented (in 3GAXX) only after being opposed. Representing an RSing Item rather than opposing it will fail, as in representing an RSing Item the Reliable Item for the list is, of course, the Item the auditor already has.

The commonest flub is to fail to get in the Session Mid Ruds before writing or nulling a list and thereby getting a clean needle. Auditors who fail are auditors who won't clean up a dirty needle before nulling. A needle can be dirty before and during the writing of a list without harming anything. But the needle must be clean or cleaned up when the completion test (d) below is given.

The commonest source of a dirty needle is out list Mid Ruds, but a new case with no Items found may have a dirty needle until a good live list is listed out to complete. Then magically the DN vanishes.

Various shifts, all common to auditing, may have to be employed to clean up a needle for the first assessment. But if it is too hard, just do a Zero One 2-12 List and use it before the Scientology List and the needle will usually clean, especially when the first Reliable Item is found.

-----

Don't try to bat a perfect score of one list = an RI. An auditor often has dead horses. But when the average rises above 50% dead horse there is something wrong with the auditing. Excellent auditing gives less than 20% dead horses.

-----

Because an Item RSs when given in writing the list is no reason it will RS when nulling even with the Mid Ruds in. One RSing Item on a list will impart its RS to a dozen Items during the listing step.

-----

Don't harass the pc about a dirty needle. It's the auditor who dirtied it up with wrong sources for lists or incomplete lists or cleaning clean reads.

-----

If when getting the Rudiments in, an RS is noted, take no different action. RSs seen in the Ruds merely mean the pc is hot on a PTP that goes hard into the GPM and nothing but 2-12 will relieve it permanently. Other measures such as O/W turn it off for the moment but never permanently; only 2-12 can do that. Don't run 3-21 on a pc who RSs in the Ruds. Only 2-12 or 2-10.

-----

Never say "Floor. Floor. Floor," to turn off an RS or DN or DR. You don't care if things RS and a DN is cured only with Session and/or List Mid Ruds.

-----

It is fatal to fail to oppose an RSing Item found on List One or a first list of 2-12. If a Rockslammer test disclosed an RS on the Scientology List on Tuesday and another auditor on Wednesday just does a new List One Assessment and ignores the RS test result and doesn't oppose the List One RI, the case may breed dead horses thereafter. Use RSing Items when *known* or when found for opposition lists.

-----

How wide is an RS? This is a silly question as an RS is a repetitive slashing of the needle of any width. A DR is a different looking read, tiny in its strokes. One or two slashes make an RS. There isn't such a thing as an incipient RS. If it slashed up or down once call it an RS. A Rocket Read looks entirely different in velocity and decay.

-----

A common source of trouble in finding a Reliable Item is missing an in Item that is marked in and not re-nulling it. The auditor misses the slant / .

Each *page* of a list is examined carefully for all Items X before being abandoned. It is then marked with a big X in the upper left corner, meaning "all nulled". This saves an inspection of it again in going over the list.

## NULLING

When a list is *said* to be complete by the preclear (does not apply to Scientology List) the auditor

- (a) Gets in Session Big Mid Ruds.
- (b) Gets in the List Big Mid Ruds.
- (c) MAKES SURE THE NEEDLE IS *CLEAN* BEFORE DOING ANYTHING ELSE THAN (a) and (b).
- (d) Says the question of the list and sees if it reacts on the meter or upsets needle flow.
- (e) If meter reacts auditor completes list and does test of question as in (d) again until either the needle is smooth (c) or dirty. If dirty and won't clean by listing, does Session Mid Ruds (a) and List Mid Ruds (b) and checks needle (c).

(Until the (a) to (e) steps have been gone through carefully the auditor hasn't a prayer of nulling a list properly.)

(A pc can become harassed by an auditor trying to smooth a smooth needle with unnecessary Mid Ruds.)

The auditor now starts to null the list by the following steps:

- (f) Calls each Item on the list one time (or more times if read was missed by auditor the first time). (No committing Overts against, etc, is now used. Only the Item itself.)
- (g) Marks each Item that goes out with an X .
- (h) Marks each Item that stays in with a / .
- (i) If three or four Items stay in in a row, the auditor concludes that an Item earlier on the list has been invalidated and politely turns the list so the pc can see it and, indicating the already passed over Items, says, "Which one of these might you have had thoughts on?" The pc looks at list and answers. The auditor simply acknowledges politely and goes on nulling. He does not re-state the "falsely in" (/) Items.
- (j) Every ten or so Items that go out consecutively (X) the auditor asks for a possible suppress, "On this list has anything been suppressed?" If it reacts on meter it is cleaned up and the auditor draws a line down the side of the (X) Items from moment of the suppress to where he now is as a group to null them again next time. The auditor does not re-null them until the next time around.
- (k) At the end of the first time through the auditor gets in the List Mid Ruds until the needle is clean and flowing. It may sometimes be necessary to get the Session Mid Ruds in to accomplish a fully clean needle.
- (l) The auditor starts down the list again, calling off each Item left in (/) one time (or until he sees the reaction or lack of it).
- (m) Items now out are marked X and Items that are still in are marked / . Don't forget the X groups that were marked suppressed.
- (n) When the auditor has gone through the list a second time the List Big Mid Ruds are put in swiftly.

- (o) Do steps (1), (m) and (n) until the list is down to 3 or 4 Items.
- (p) *Briefly* Tiger Drill the remaining Items. Take the one that RSs as an RI.
- (q) If no Item now RSs and none can now be made to RS get in the Session Big Mid Ruds and do (p) again.
- (r) If no RS results, take the Items still reacting and ask the pc's opinion (packaging step of 2-12).

Don't oppose an Item that did not RS when found. Don't endlessly Tiger Drill an Item until it dies. Don't fail to oppose an Item that RSs.

### LIST APPEARANCES

A nulled list does *not* look like this (this is the result of Incomplete Lists or out ruds or improper source):

Tiger////////X  
 Waterbuck // X  
 Wind//////////X  
 Willow wand//////////  
 Catfish////X//X////X  
 Game Warden////////X


A nulled list also does not look like this:

Tiger  
 Waterbuck  
 Wind /  
 Willow wand //  
 Catfish  
 Game Warden


This is how a rightly nulled list should look:

Tiger DRX  
 Waterbuck X  
 Wind RSX  
 Willow wand RSpn/RS/RS/RS  
 Catfish X  
 Game Warden sen/X


If a pc's List Mid Ruds (On this list has anything\_\_\_\_\_) go out and if pc Inspection Step (i) above is not done, this is what happens:



If a pc suppresses an Item or something else this is what happens:



This is the way the list just above is marked when the suppress factor is found on check as in Step (j) above:



## ASSESSMENTS

Assessment by greatest Reaction is the earliest method of Assessment. It still works but is used now only to decide on last two or three Items that were Tiger Drilled. It is not terribly inaccurate but is no tool for a really skilled auditor as RSs transfer about on some lists.

Assessment by Elimination depends wholly on the right Item being charged enough to peer through the out rudiments. One just goes over and over the list marking things in or out as above until one stays in. This is crude but it works. It is no tool for a trained auditor.

## ROUTINE 2-10 (R2-12 Short Form for Beginners)

The Short Form of R2-12 can be used by untrained auditors with some effect until they are trained in Mid Ruds and other niceties.

Do not use Model Session or Goal Finder's Model Session. Just use "Start of Session" and "End of Session". No Ruds, havingness or other actions.

*Step One:* Assess first lists by Elimination above, taking whatever survives and reads. If an RS is found oppose it at once. Except for Scientology List, list a standard first list question to get this first list. Label paper as in Step Six below. Be sure to list until needle looks smooth or pc has *really* run out.

*Step Two:* Using the Item found in Step One above, list a "Who or What does \_\_\_\_\_ (Item found) represent to you?" list, marking "RS" all Items that RSed before being said by pc or when said by pc. List until needle looks very smooth.

*Step Three:* Null list by RS. Neglect everything that didn't RS when said to pc. Go over Items that RSed again until only one does.



Read *all* Items to pc. Don't mark Items that don't RS with an X as the list actually hasn't been nulled.

*Step Four:* Circle Item or Items that still RSed on Nulling on the list. (Get it checked out by the Instructor if one is present.) Choose whatever continues to RS now and then when said.

*Step Five:* Establish if Item made pc sick or dizzy (sen) or hurt or hot or cold (pn)

*Step Six:* If Item in Five above was sen, list question is "Who or What would oppose \_\_\_\_\_ (Item found)?" If Item was pn, list question becomes "Who or What would a \_\_\_\_\_ (Item found) oppose?" Write proper question and pc's name, date and page number at the top of each sheet.

*Step Seven:* List the question in Six until needle looks clean and isn't Ticking or kicking as pc thinks of Items. Get the list complete. Be sure that every Item that RSed when pc thought of it or said it was marked "RS" after it.

*Step Eight:* Read list Items once each to pc and note any Item that RSs when said to the pc. Go over RSing Items again.

*Step Nine:* Circle the Item or Items that still RS. (Get it checked out by Instructor if one is present.)

*Step Ten:* Find out with pc's help which opposes which in the Items found, or if anything opposed anything, and mark them on pc's Line Plot.

Repeat all steps using same first list until it is clean on Step One and then obtain a new first list from another question.

The above Routine is far less reliable than 2-12 but if a student or auditor does not know Model Session, Mid Ruds or Tiger Drilling, it will be less upsetting to the pc and get more done. Of course RSing Items will get lost by suppression but probably can be refound if the student just keeps working at it. A rather difficult ("never" RSing case) will get minimal gain on R2-10. There really are no "never" RSing cases except for a horribly inept auditor.

The percentage of dead horses with 2-10 will be found much greater than with R2-12. But 2-10 does work somewhat.

R2-10 can be used by new students, old auditors who are not recently trained and in Clearing Co-audits under Instructors, but should not be used by trained auditors. These should use R2-12. Others should use 2-10 only until they can be trained in 2-12,

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.jh.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[The above HCO B incorporates HCO B 8 December 1962, *Corrections-HCO Bulletin of December 5, AD12*, and HCO B 17 December 1962, *Correction to HCO Bulletin of December 5, 1962*, which simply corrected errors in the writing, typing and proofreading of the original mimeo issue.]

**R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX  
DATA, THE ZERO A STEPS AND PURPOSE  
OF PROCESSES**

**RULE: WHEN AN RSING ITEM IS FOUND ON LIST ONE THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST IT MUST BE OPPOSED.**

**COROLLARY: WHEN AN RSING ITEM IS FOUND ON LIST ONE AND IS NOT OPPOSED THE CASE WILL TEND THEREAFTER TO PRODUCE NO ROCKSLAMMING LISTS.**

The Rule and Corollary are so much fact that if the auditor fails to oppose an RSing Item on List One and only represents it, the case will produce dead horses thereafter.

This is true mainly for The Scientology List. As Scientology is what is helping the pc, having a GPM type present time problem about it will prevent any further case gain.

On four cases now, where no RS was found on List One, The Scientology List, although DR Items were found and represented, no RSes occurred on the lists.

Thereafter the history of these cases was gone into, older auditor reports were examined and it was found that in each of these cases during a Security Check that an Item like "Scientology" or "Auditor" or "LRH" had RSed. The case then fully suppressed it and it did not come up on a new assessment of The Scientology List.

As soon as these Items were opposed RSes turned back on on the Lists and all went well thereafter.

Further, the nattery nature of the pc was extreme until this was done.

So it can be concluded that a BIG 2-10 or 2-12 goof is to fail to oppose Items that RS on List One, The Scientology List.

It is an INDICATOR that if a pc is very nattery or upset on 2-10 or 2-12, it is probable that somebody overlooked and didn't oppose something that RSed on List One.

It is an Indicator that if a pc is producing Dead Horses on listing, somebody overlooked and failed to oppose an RSing Item on List One or that the pc should be run on List Zero-One or List Zero-Two.

A common form of missing an RSing Item on a *represent* and being unable to make a list *nullable*, is that the Item from which the represent list was taken, being unburdened by the listing, now begins to RS and becomes the Reliable Item.

Rule: When having difficulty getting a clean needle on a represent list at the end of listing, and before nulling, always Tiger Drill briefly the Item the list is coming from to see if that Item is now RSing. If it is, don't bother to null the represent list just made. Do an oppose list on the original Item.

Example: List One Item found—The Church. Gives a DR. A represent list is written 200 or more Items. Meter still rough. Check The Church. It will occasionally be found to be RSing and is therefore taken as the RI and now should be opposed. The represent list made is abandoned.

In trying to run R2-12 on a first goal clear, use R2-10 instead and use any tick an Item gives instead of an RS in order to oppose that Item. A persistent tick or reaction = RS on a 1st goal clear.

## ZERO LIST QUESTIONS OR R2-12

Where a pc is producing Dead Horses on List One, there are Zero Lists that can be used.

The procedure is this:

R2-Step 02—

Check up on the pc's record to see if an RS was ever observed on Scientology, the orgs, auditor, LRH and if so oppose that Item at once.

R2-Step 01—Lists 0A

If a Dead Horse is produced by (1) above, then assess the following for largest read on the meter:

- |           |                         |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| List 0A0  | Keep Hidden             |
| List 0A1  | Be Reasonable About     |
| List 0A2  | Rather not think about  |
| List 0A3  | Rather not know about   |
| List 0A4  | Ignore                  |
| List 0A5  | Avoid                   |
| List 0A6  | Stay away from          |
| List 0A7  | Not Communicate with    |
| List 0A8  | Hold off                |
| List 0A9  | Rather not have appear  |
| List 0A10 | Have to help            |
| List 0A11 | Fail to help            |
| List 0A12 | Dislike                 |
| List 0A13 | Fight                   |
| List 0A14 | Advise others to Attack |
| List 0A15 | Attack                  |
| List 0A16 | Do away with            |

Then use the result (largest read or RS) in the blank of the following question:

“In present time who or what would you\_\_\_\_\_”

Step 1-0A:

Make your first List by asking the pc the question formed in (02).

Proceed then with the usual remaining steps of R2-12 (or R2-10).

Note: These steps do not replace the 1-A series in the original issue. The Zero A series as given above are all prior to List One, The Scientology List, which must be done after the Zero A series.

The Zero A series can be assessed several times for new lists.

But remember, the pc who has a hot List One (The Scientology List) will make minimal progress on Routine 2-12.

On a pc newly on R2-12 or 2-10, if an RS was missed on List One, and nobody can discover if this pc ever RSed on it, and List One gives two Dead Horses in a row, fall back on the Zero A List. Then after two or three packages are found from it, re-assess List One. The List One RS will have been caught by the Zero A Lists or will be there on List One again.

#### “NEVER RSing” PCs

If a pc cannot be made to RS on Represent Lists taken from List One, then List One was already RSing or the Zero A List must be resorted to.

There are no never RSing pcs. *All* pcs RS. Those that are mediumly bad off RS very easily. Those that are way down RS less easily. Those that are in fair shape RS well but the RS is rather moderate (less wide) and their RS turns on every time an RSing Item is said to them. The bad off pc's RS suppresses very easily. The mediumly bad off pc has a wide, wild frantic RS that sometimes RSes within the RS as it slashes.

The progress of a pc can be marked by this cycle:

Horrible shape = Hard to find RS.

Mediumly bad off = Frantic wide, sporadic RSs easily suppressed.

Not too bad = Easy to find RS turns on easily on auditor's statement of Item. Mediumly wide.

Fair shape = Easy to find, easy to turn on, doesn't suppress, fairly narrow and regular.

Good shape = Very easy to find, very easy to turn on by command, blows on cognition.

A pc in horrible shape goes through all these phases. Any other case on the scale moves up.

The GPM RS is the pathway through the GPM. *Any* Item that RSes was part of the GPM and has another Item in opposition to it.

Thus, you could, in theory, clear a pc by just finding Items on and on.

However, the goal sooner or later presents itself, usually in the form of a Rocket Reading Terminal. By listing what goal that terminal may have one gets a goals list that can be assessed. (The RR Item still must also be opposed.)

But wrong goals are *so* deadly and R2-12 Items are so beneficial when found that a Class II Auditor takes his pc's health and life in his hands to fool about with goals. Leave that to Class IVs and go on finding Items.

#### ROCKET READS vs RSes

The Rocket Read is superior in value to an RS. The RS is superior in value to a DR. A DR is superior in value to a fall.

A beginning RS is sometimes mistaken for a Rocket Read. But it won't repeat itself. And a Rocket Read always goes to the right with a fast spurt which rapidly decays. The slash of an RS is all of the same velocity and doesn't decay, it just ceases.

The Rocket Read is the Read of the goal or the Rock itself.

The RS is the read of the Rock vs the Opposition Rock and every pair above them on the cycle of the GPM. It marks the path to the Rock.

Just below the Rock lies the pc's goal.

The ROCK SLAM CHANNEL is the pathway through the pairs of Items that compose a cycle of the GPM and lead to the Rock and goal.

The Rock Slam marks the path of Interest of the pc. RS = Interest = Cognitions. No RS = No Cognitions.

Below the 1st Goal is a whole new undisclosed GPM. The 1st goal clears off a cycle of the GPM. The second goal a 2nd cycle, earlier and stronger. And so on. This is therefore the road to Theta Clear and Operating Thetan.

But the first goal is too heavily overburdened to be found easily or run on the vast majority of cases. Therefore R2-12 is needed and 3GAXX.

## PURPOSE OF PROCESSES

The target of R2-10 is fast result in the pc and greater reality for the auditor.

The target of R2-12 is the packages in Present Time which bend the GPM out of shape and give the pc PTPs and Hidden Standards.

The target of 3GAXX is Items on which goals lists can be compiled and unburdening.

The target of Routine 3-21 is Clear, Theta Clear and Operating Thetan. Second goals are easily found by R3-21 alone without Step 4A (3GAXX).

This then is the whole road from Homo Sapiens to Homo Novis to Operating Thetan.

It requires only precision and the auditing skill now taught on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

11—13 December 1962

** 6212C11	SHSBC-222	R2- 12 Data
** 6212C11	SHSBC-223	Phantom R/S
** 6212C13	SHSBC-224	R2-12 Data—Needle Behavior
** 6212C13	SHSBC-225	Repair of R2-12—Clean Needle

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 DECEMBER AD 12

Sthil Students  
Academies

**TRAINING**  
**X UNIT**

The biggest hole in student auditing is the inability to clean up a needle.

Students who try to do assessments fail to get results when they attempt to null with a needle that is already filthy.

It is rather easy to clean a needle and the results on the pc are highly beneficial.

The basis of an inability to read a meter is state of case. This is remedied by R2-12's List One cleaning. When List One is burnished bright, the student will be able to read a meter.

In V unit the auditing is heavily supervised and the student's reality is raised by accurate R2-12 or R2-10.

In X unit therefore, the first indicated step is to teach the student to use the Mid Ruds.

This is done by Havingness by Mid Ruds.

The pattern of the session is Goal Finder's Model Session.

The Purpose of the X unit Sessions is to clean a needle and to demonstrate that a needle can be cleaned.

The Auditor notes the pc's can squeeze before session start.

The session is started with the usual Goal Finder's pattern.

The Rudiments are put in by Big Mid Ruds, "Since the last time I audited you ....." (or "Since the last time you were audited ....." " if this is the auditor's first session, or "Since you decided to be audited .. ..." for raw meat).

The general missed W/Hs of the pc are pulled in *the body of the early sessions*. When this has been done, remaining sessions are devoted to havingness.

The pc's havingness process is tested for and found, or is run.

The body of the session is closed.

The Big Ruds for the session are then put in.

The pc is then asked with meter at Sens 16 "In this session was the room all right?" and this is cleaned. The can squeeze test is then made with Sens 1.

Goals and gains are taken up and the session is ended.

By end of session the needle should be without pattern and the pc should be cheerful.

LRH:jw.cden  
Copyright ©1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 DECEMBER AD12

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 2-12**  
**LIST ONE**  
**ADD TO LIST ONE ISSUE THREE**  
(HCO Bulletin December 4, AD 12)

Correction: Auditor's name at end of second column is part of second column and is used in assessment.

**DIRECTIONS:** If anything has ever Rockslammed on List One itself it must be opposed even if it doesn't Rockslam now. The data of all observations and security checks is used to find if anything Rockslammed. The case will give dead horses if a Rockslamming Item is by-passed. Cases that give dead horses on R2- 12 *had* a Rockslamming Item on List One that was never opposed. On cases that have been giving lists on which no RSs occur, Tiger Drill List One until you get an RS on any button or pain or sensation on any Item and just oppose it.

After a List One Item has been represented always check it again to see if it now is Rockslamming. If so, do an opposition list to it in accordance to whether it gave pn or sen.

Add these additional Items to List One Issue 3:

FRANCHISE	FAMILY
10% <sub>s</sub>	HOME
SCIENTOLOGY GROUPS	LOVE
GROUP AUDITING	PARENTS
MEMBERSHIPS	FATHER
REPORTS	MOTHER
DISSEMINATION	A GROUP
INFRACTIONS	GROUPS
PABs	GOVERNMENT
ASSESSMENTS	ORGANIZATIONS
MID RUDS	COMPANY
CHECK OUTS	MANAGEMENT
EXAMINERS	LABOUR
GLASSES	A CLUB
HEALTH	PEOPLE
MEDICINE	MANKIND
MEDICAL DOCTORS	SPECIES
HEALING SYSTEMS	LIVING THINGS
PROCESSING	MATTER
TESTS	MASSES
I.Q.	ENERGY
TRAINING	SPACE
YOURSELF	TIME
YOU	FORM
ME (meaning pc)	FORMS
ME (meaning auditor)	AUDITING ROOMS
SEX	THETANS
SEXUAL PRACTICES	SPIRITS
A MAN	GHOSTS
MEN	KNOWLEDGE
A WOMAN	THOUGHT
WOMEN	RELIGION
A CHILD	GODS
CHILDREN	GOD
MARRIAGE	SUPREME BEING

LRH :dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

Franchise

*URGENT*

**R2-12**  
**THE FATAL ERROR**

The surest way to retard and upset a case with Routine 2-12 is to find a Rock Slam on List One, Tiger Drill it down to a dirty needle and then represent it.

That case will then hang up, 2-12 can be pronounced as unworkable and the whole thing can be skipped.

Yes, the represent list so taken will RS. Yes, the List One Item tested again will probably now RS. Yes, the auditor has followed the rules of R2-12. A11 except one, and that rule is:

IF AN ITEM ROCKSLAMS WHEN CALLED ON LIST ONE OR AT ANY TIME DURING TIGER DRILLING, NO MATTER HOW BRIEFLY, THAT ITEM *MUST* BE GIVEN AN OPPOSITION LIST.

And another rule:

IF YOU AREN'T SURE IF A LIST ONE ITEM GAVE PAIN OR SENSATION, THE OPPOSITION LIST MUST BE MADE BOTH WAYS, "WHO OR WHAT WOULD IT OPPOSE" AND "WHO OR WHAT WOULD OPPOSE IT".

If more than one Item RSed on List One you take what RSed longest or was closest to the session.

List One Items do not have to continue to Rockslam forever in order to do opposition lists to them.

Most pcs who know the rules lie about pain or sensation in order to pretend List One Items are terminals. Do the opposition lists both ways as above and nul all.

Routine 2-12 has only this frailty: Rockslammers will not find rock slams on List One. And Tiger Drilling can be counted on, in inexperienced hands, to suppress the RS.

A case BOGS when you represent an RS-ing Item.

NEVER represent an RS-ing Item. Always oppose it.

Hear me, now. Almost 100% of R2- 12 cases will fail if no attention is paid to the above.

If you get a case that gets only dead horses, don't go to the Zero A List. Just write an opposition list to Scientology. You'll be right ninety percent of the time. The other ten percent RS on Scientology Orgs and Auditors.

Opposition Lists only on RS-ing Items. Hear me now.

If a case EVER ROCKSLAMMED ON A LIST ONE ITEM, whether on an old Security Check, a Joburg, a Rock Slam Sec Check, and you now do only represent lists from List One, that case will hang, or make small gain on R2-12 until somebody is smart enough to look at the record and oppose that RS-ing Item.

Honest, the case is finished right now, kaput, wrecked, smashed, ended, snarled, messed up, ruined, stopped and skewered until a List One Item that RSed ever so briefly is opposed. Represent Lists will get it nowhere until this is done.

Hear me, *please*.

LRH: dr.vmm.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 DECEMBER AD12

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*URGENT*  
*IMPORTANT*

**ROUTINES 2-12 & 2-10**  
**CASE ERRORS**  
**POINTS OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE**

The errors in doing Routine 2-10 and Routine 2-12 are divided into two broad divisions:

- (a) Those of auditing itself;
- (b) Those deriving from errors in doing the exact skills of Routines 2-10 and 2-12.

**AUDITING ERRORS**

This bulletin touches only briefly on the errors of (a) Auditing Errors. These consist of sloppy form, bad TRs, inability to read a meter, Auditor Code breaks, Q and A-ing, missing missed W/Hs, doing bad Mid Ruds or Tiger Drilling and using Auditing form to hold up results.

One remedies bad auditing (as different from bad 2-10 or 2-12) by following this prescription:

The poorer the auditor, the more a supervisor or instructor takes away from him the tools of auditing. In short, if an auditor makes bad auditing errors, one simplifies the auditing to prevent the errors. Don't let him or her do 2-12. Make such an auditor use only 2-10. Then, as the auditor's skill in basic auditing improves, the more he or she can be trusted with 2-12.

Do NOT let an auditor who can't do any kind of a job of basic auditing do 2-12. Let such an auditor do only 2-10. And then as that auditor's case improves on 2-10 or 2-12, and as training drills are passed, let the auditor graduate up to 2-12.

Remember this: 2-12 works all by itself with *no* auditing niceties. And it can be prevented from working (but only to some degree) by bad auditing form or intention.

Strip off Model Session, Mid Ruds, Tiger Drilling, and *two-way* comm, demand it be run muzzled, muzzled, muzzled, use the meter only to find Rockslams, and modern Routine 2 works like a dream, a dream, a dream even for an auditor whose auditing skill is terrible.

Let a Q and A artist clean cleans on a meter, muck up the Mid Ruds, yap at the pc, and Routine 2 *won't* work because it never gets done.

So the training stress and the *use* stress of Routine 2 is *first* on Routine 2, its rules and how it's done, and when the auditor has case gains and wins, auditing *form* is then entered upon.

The backwards way is to insist on a good hard study of form before training on Routine 2. Always hammer Routine 2 home first and get it *done*, not fooled with by the Mixed-up Kid from Mid Rud Gulch.

Your main trouble will come from not teaching Routine 2 hard just as itself before entering upon the niceties of auditing. You have to show the wild man it's a house before you teach him to serve French Pastry a la Partie.

Of course nothing in this HCO Bulletin should be used to degrade the value of good auditing form.

Good metering, a smooth command of the TRs, a grip on the basics and a firm knowledge of fundamentals are *vital* in an auditor.

You can't get all there is to get out of Routine 2-12 with rough auditing.

Auditing skill is not just something to acquire. It's the only thing that gets real auditing done. And good auditors are scarce and I appreciate them. I've had my share of rough auditing and I know the diamonds and gold of a smooth, flawless auditor.

But Routine 2, at the time of this writing, and for always in some area of the world as we expand, will be handled with rough auditor skill. Therefore, for the purposes of this HCO Bulletin, we will consider the auditing skill to be rough and show what Routines 2-10 and 2-12 can do in unpolished hands.

And never fear, when their cases are better and the training can be stepped up, they'll become polished, never fear. And appreciate being so. It's my brag I can get a pc out of anything with just auditing skill. That makes me pretty brave as an auditor. But this "Bring on your lions" attitude is born out of auditing skills, taught, not "native". I use the same pattern and patter as you do if you audit text book. But I don't clean cleans often or miss reads ever and I don't Q and A. You can audit just as well as I can with practice and study. Why do I know this? Well, auditing is not my main forte, not even close to my appointments and goals.

We're probably all Rockslammers somewhere on List One and this is Man pulling himself out of the mud indeed.

So don't run down pure auditing skill. It's more precious than anything in this universe.

But you can acquire it as you do Routine 2 and after.

Meanwhile don't overrate the power of Routine 2 to work with rough auditing, so long as the Routine 2 is done right.

-----

## THE ERRORS OF ROUTINE TWO

Routine Two (by which is meant 2-10 & 2-12) has its own rules and these must be learned first and learned well.

Routine 2 today is a powerful process. And if it can straighten up a pc so fast, it can also cave him in fast. However such cave-ins, while dramatic, are very easy to remedy even though they must be remedied with accuracy. (The remedies are all contained in this HCO Bulletin.)

Remember, in doing Routine 2, the primary pc upset is from badly done Routine 2, not badly done auditing. To repair a car don't look for paint scratches when somebody has removed the engine. Auditing form is paint scratches. The removed engine is flubbed Routine 2.

Routine 2 must be taught hard, not just as a version of auditing but as itself. It is its own technical package and it doesn't even infringe on the basics of auditing.

## AUDITOR RESPONSIBILITY

Routine 2 has several hills to climb. One of them is Auditor responsibility. This process has the peculiarity of handing all responsibility for case gain or worsening to the auditor.

You will hear people who haven't a clue on Routine 2 crying about bad pcs, bad D of P-ing, bad Ron and blaming everyone but themselves. Investigate and you'll find only an auditor flub on Routine 2.

All Routine 2 auditor flubs consist of:

- (a) Not knowing Routine 2.
- (b) Not doing Routine 2.

There are no other Routine 2 auditor flubs.

*In Routine 2 all gain or lack of gain is assignable directly and only to the auditor.*

Frightening isn't it?

But encouraging too. For it puts the auditor at cause, wholly and completely, over the pc's case. You might have known that would happen with the first all case fast gain process.

## DURATION OF PROCESS

Routine 2 is here to stay. You've been used to the changing face of processing.

That discouraged learning any process very well and setting up to get it done by one and all. Well, Routine 2 is here to stay. It isn't going to change. You can invest a great amount of time and effort on learning it.

It's here to stay because where it doesn't get results, the auditor didn't know it or didn't do it, and we can always remedy that.

It only produces mediocre or worsening results when it either isn't known or isn't needed.

Further, it is quite easy to do.

And it produces fast, stable results, very startling to even raw meat. There is more miracle in 50 hours of well done Routine 2 than in the entire history of the church.

Further it has to be done on every case before a goal can easily or reliably be found, or even if found, before it can be run.

So there it is. Learn it.

## NO AUDITING

The first and greatest error of Routine 2 is No-Auditing.

Yes, the auditor may be sitting there like a one-man band, busy as free beer at the boiler works and yet not be auditing Routine 2.

Example: Eat up two-thirds of every session with needless beginning, middle and end rudiments.

Example: Spend two hours Prepchecking the Mid Ruds and then find the reason the needle is dirty is an incomplete list.

Example: Spend three sessions full of general O/W trying to calm an ARC breaky pc when in actual fact the auditor has been opposing an Item off an incomplete list.

It's not just Audit the pc in front of you. That's vital enough. But Audit the pc in front of you with *correct* Routine 2.

Auditors have been known to spend hours, days, running old processes to get the pc "up to running 2-12" when five minutes of 2-12 would have had the pc sailing.

NO AUDITING means "While seeming to deliver auditing, actually get nothing done." It's the greatest crime in Routine 2 or Routine 3. NO AUDITING can be reduced to the finest art. Doing a wrong list, re-doing a dead horse, these aren't no-auditing. Auditing may have been wasted or may be slow, but it's still auditing. No, NO AUDITING means going through endless, useless motions, perhaps in top form, perhaps perfectly, none of which are calculated to advance the pc's case one inch. Doing havingness every half page, endlessly Tiger Drilling, doing Mid Ruds just because it's "good form", all these and a thousand more add up to NO AUDITING. Absolute essentials, bare bone, and bounteous correct 2-12 *are* AUDITING.

Mid Ruds, Tiger Drilling are necessary to good auditing but using them an inch beyond necessity is NO AUDITING.

### FAILURE TO SAVE RECORDS

Almost the only way to completely bar the door on the pc is to lose his case folder or fail to put all lists and reports in it.

Every sheet of every list must have on it the pc's name, date of the list and the question from which the list comes.

This is the biggest MUST in Routine 2: Preserve the records and make them identifiable and usable.

### FAILING TO FIND RSs ON LIST ONE

Failing to find and utilize an RS on List One is the most common (but not the most destructive to the pc's health) error in Routine 2.

Example: Auditor has three dead horses. Abandons case. Another auditor assesses List One, Tiger Drills the RSs out, represents a tick. Gets another dead horse. Abandons case. Pc now known as a "tough pc". A third auditor gets cunning, looks over the original assessment, sees "Auditor" RSed once long ago. It doesn't now, having been Tiger Drilled to death. Opposes it. Gets a beautiful RSing List. Case starts to fly

This error has been done over, and over and over *and is the source of all* dead horses.

*Rule:* Oppose Every RS found on List One or IA or a "PT consists of" list. Oppose them even when they only RSed on Tiger Drill buttons. Take the RSing Item most intimate to the actual session as the first one to use. If in further doubt take the RSing Item closest to the session the pc is interested in.

List One, I A or "PT consists of" lists do not have to be RIs to be opposed. They are locks on RIs. They only need to briefly RS, or to have been seen to RS at some time, to be opposed. If they RSed at any time they *must* be opposed according to whether they are terms or oppters.

I have seen a case fail to give more than dead horses until somebody recalled that on a Sec Check test a year before the case had RSed on "Scientology Orgs" (now not even a tick). When that was opposed, a dial-wide RS turned on for 55 consecutive pages of Items, a high record.

One remedy is to Tiger Drill "On List One\_\_\_\_", but it isn't infallible.

## REPRESENTING AN RSing ITEM

One of the three most destructive actions to the pc is *Representing an RSing Item*. (The other two are opposing the wrong way and opposing an RSing Item taken from an incomplete list, both included below.)

Representing an RSing Item puts a terrible strain on the pc's attention. The list may even RS, probably will. But the opposing Item, now hidden, wreaks havoc on the pc all the time its companion is being listed on a represent list. A real calm pc can turn into a screamer if an RSing Item is listed with a represent list, whether it has been opposed or not.

(Note: This is contrary to a 3GAXX action which could be done only because a detested person wasn't a vital oppterm. It should not be done even in 3GAXX.)

*Rule:* Only do opposition lists on RSing Items. Never represent them.

## OPPOSE RIs

Always oppose an RI and continue to oppose RIs until you get a satisfactory package. Never leave a BY-PASSED Item.

To do so is destructive to the preclear. This is not the greatest source of destructiveness and not every RI by-passed will ruin the preclear. But once out of three times the pc will be upset.

Example: "Scientology" RSes. A Reliable Item "A slavemaster" is found on the opposition list. It is not then itself opposed. Pc is upset by presence of a hidden Item that opposes "A slavemaster". Pc stays upset until "A slavemaster" is opposed and its RI companion Item "A freedom Fighter" is found. "Slavery" shows up on the "Opp Scientology" List as the thing that actually fronted up to "Scientology" when the whole thing was packaged.

*Rule:* When a First List RSing Item is opposed and an RI is found, then Routine 2 steps are incomplete until the found RI is itself opposed.

It goes Represent—oppose—oppose or Oppose, Oppose.

It will be seen that First List RSing Items are usually locks into PT on actual RIs. It will also be seen that the Rockslams on the First List, the first opposing RI and the RI that opposes that all match. They have the same width and speed and pattern. They seldom all RS at the same time but in sequence of when first found.

*Rule:* All Items found must be completely packaged.

*Rule:* All RSs in a package must match in character and vanish when fully packaged.

Leaving a by-passed Item is also possible because of incomplete lists. (See below.)

## INCOMPLETE LISTS

If, after nulling, you have several Rockslamming Items remaining, your list is *always* incomplete.

Bonus packages vanish as soon as spotted. They occur once in a while. They can be ignored in this rule:

*Rule:* If you find more than one RS in *nulling* a list that list is incomplete and must be completed.

Example: “Preclear (pn)” once RSed so it is opposed. The “Who or what would a preclear oppose” list is listed and a dozen RSs were seen on listing (OK so far). The list tested without reaction on the question. The auditor starts to null the list. *Some* of the Items that RSed while being listed, RS now on nulling. List is nulled down to 3 (!) RSing Items. Auditor chooses one. It RSes nicely. This is “A control device (sen)”. Auditor now lists “Who or what would oppose a control device?” List RSes well. However, masses tend to close in on pc. Havingness drops. Pc possibly ARC breaky. Auditor continues On listing. And on. And on. Finally gets to nulling. Very hard job. Pc cutting up. Auditor tries to pull missed withholds. After much blood auditor finds four RSing Items left on list, chooses “A wild man” and tries to package. Pc glum. Very little cognition. *TWO* Items have been By-passed. How? Auditing supervisor sees that several Items on the “Who or what would a pc oppose” list RSed on nulling. Assumes rightly list was incomplete. Directs it to be completed. Pc smiles brightly and with a suddenly clean needle lists 80 more Items (several of which RS on listing). Masses fall away from pc again. No ARC breaks. This time only one Item RSed on nulling. “A controller (sen).” (Only new list is nulled of course. You never re-null in 2-12.) RS has mysteriously (and correctly) vanished off every other RSing Item on that list. The list “Who or what would oppose a control device?” is wholly scrubbed, being wrong. The auditor now lists “Who or what would oppose a controller?” The pc happily lists 200 Items (many RSing). The needle goes clean. The auditor starts nulling. Finds he has two Items on the first three pages that RS. Has learned his lesson and, leaving off nulling for the moment, gets pc to add 50 Items. Auditor goes on nulling. Nulls down to one RSing Item, “An Insane Idiot”. The RS on “A Preclear”, “A Controller” and “An Insane Idiot” all matched when seen each in turn (but “a preclear” doesn’t RS any more). Pc cogniting like mad. Very happy. Masses all moved off and havingness up.

*Rule:* If in nulling more than one RS is seen on list, that list is incomplete and must be completed.

There are no exceptions to this rule. Bonus packages blow off on a completed list.

Also, to clarify, keep in mind this rule:

*Rule:* If a list does not RS now and then or at least once when being listed, it will become a dead horse.

That some list Items RSed when the pc said them during listing is natural.

If, with Suppress clean, more than one of them RSes during nulling, that list is incomplete.

Also, in passing, don’t finish nulling a list before adding to it as a general practice. Add to it when the pc’s needle is dirty or when you see more than one RS on it during nulling. The pc ARC breaks if you keep completing the nulling of the existing list and then adding.

## WRONG WAY OPPOSE

Pcs are not always right when telling you it’s a terminal (pn) or oppterm (sen). They even sometimes lie to try to save their face (to keep from looking bad in an auditor’s eyes or the world, or to seem even more villainous than they are).

The only real test of a right way oppose is whether or not the list lists easily with IMPROVED SKIN TONE in the pc and improved cheerfulness, and if it produces *one* RSing Item that packages later.

If you just can’t tell which way to oppose, oppose both ways and then decide on pc’s appearance which way was right and continue it.

Wrong way opposition is not usual. Usually the pc tells the truth and all is well. But when a list is listed wrong way to on opposition it’s long, horrible and deadly.

The pc goes faintly grey, green yellow or blackish, looks worse, and the list gets endless. A wrong way list will RS. So it's only pc appearance that tells the story. Routine 2 is beneficial. Pcs that are listed with right way opposition look brighter, younger, with a more translucent skin tone. You won't make a mistake if you can tell the difference between a young boy and an old man, it's that distinct. (Remember, a pc will also look worse as above if you took an Item from an Incomplete list or committed any of the other R2 errors in this HCO Bulletin.)

### LISTS THAT WON'T COMPLETE

The only reasons a list will not complete are:

- (a) Wrong Source
- (b) Wrong Way To Oppose.

In either case there is something wrong with the source of the list.

That a list in listing RSe is no guarantee of rightness of source. A wrong way to list will RS. Some lists taken from a wrong source cycle RS, DR, Clean needle, RS, DR, Clean needle.

Wrong sources are:

1. A First List Item is opposed that didn't ever RS,
2. An "RI" grabbed off an incomplete list that must be completed,
3. An Item that was a terminal being opposed as though it were an oppterm and vice versa,
4. On a represent list, the Item being represented actually was an RSing Item,
5. On a represent list the Item being represented was badly chosen and of no interest to the pc.

There are no other wrong sources and thus no other R2 way to get a list that won't complete. But when you *do* get a list that won't complete, be very careful to look over the above 5 reasons and pick out the right one. You may have to complete an earlier list first and scrub the one you're on.

Incompleting lists are usually abandoned without further patch-up.

How long is an Incomplete List? How long is a piece of string?

### LONG LONG LISTS

Don't ever be afraid to have a long list, only be afraid of short ones. But when a list is running up toward thousands, something is wrong.

Endless Lists stem basically from wrong source as above or from the auditor's failure to understand what indicates a complete list.

If, on close study of the case folder and pc, Routine 2 errors seem to be absent—the source is right and not something taken from another list itself incomplete, if the oppose is right way to, then look for the following:

- (a) Pc is not answering auditing question or
- (b) Pc has *decided* something was his Item and is representing it or is otherwise operating on a *decision*.

The remedies are to get *Decide* in well and to make sure, without upsetting him, that the pc is answering the auditing question.

And if that is all OK, then it's just a long list, so complete it.

*Rule:* A list is complete when it can be nulled and when it produces just one RI that RSeS on Tiger Drilling and stays in.

A list can be nulled only when a needle is *clean* (except in 2-10).

The definition of a CLEAN NEEDLE is one which flows, producing no pattern or erratic motions of the smallest kind with the auditor sitting looking at it and doing nothing. A CLEAN NEEDLE is not just something that doesn't react to a particular question. It's a lovely slow flow, usually a rise, most beautifully expressed on a Mark V at 64 sensitivity.

A list has to be listed until this needle flow is observed (with no Mid Ruds put in). But ruds or no ruds, a CLEAN NEEDLE always appears when a list is complete.

A DIRTY NEEDLE is one that jerks, tips, dances, halts, is stuck or has any random action on it with the auditor sitting looking at it doing nothing.

There are the *Auditing* methods of converting a dirty needle to a clean needle, both as defined above. These are all the skills of auditing used with Big Mid Rud buttons.

Now entirely and distinctly separate from *Auditing* skills for cleaning a needle, there are the Routine 2 methods for converting a dirty needle to a clean needle.

Usually both *Auditing* and *Routine 2* methods are used to clean a needle so that one can nul, the former briefly, the latter abundantly.

However, do not overlook the demonstrable fact that Routine 2 methods for cleaning a needle are *very* beneficial and lasting in results, whereas purely *auditing* methods (like Mid Ruds) have value only for the moment and, even though auditing methods are desirable in this operation, when the Routine 2 is in error, the clean needle is really impossible to achieve longer than seconds with *auditing* methods.

The obvious solution to cleaning a needle is to first have *Routine 2* as perfect as possible (the errors outlined in this HCO Bulletin uncommitted or being rapidly corrected) and *then* use auditing methods.

Try it in reverse (auditing methods first and then using corrections of Routine 2) and you will not only fail to get a needle clean longer than seconds, you may also waste the better part of an intensive trying to do it.

So spend *hours* straightening up Routine 2 errors and doing it right and brief minutes with auditing methods when necessary.

And don't revile a pc for having a dirty needle. It's the auditor who dirties it up with incorrect or inaccurate Routine 2, not the pc.

Now a clean needle is vital in order to nul a list. Don't *ever* try to nul a list with the needle dirty. If the Routine 2 is right, the needle will clean up with two minutes' work of Big Mid Ruds. If Routine 2 errors (wrong list source, list incomplete, wrong way oppose, etc, as per this HCO Bulletin) exist and Routine 2 is being done wrong, then two hours' worth of Big Mid Ruds will not clean a dirty needle.

Any of the Routine 2 errors taken up in this HCO Bulletin will create a dirty needle and keep it dirty and leave the auditor sweating over Mid Ruds and the pc going mad trying to answer the questions. Yes, the Mid Ruds are out. But why? Because one or more serious Routine 2 errors as described in this HCO Bulletin are present.

So see the light. If you sweat on Mid Ruds as an auditor, curse them as a pc or see a co-auditor dripping exasperation over Mid Ruds and the needle won't stay clean, look



at the Routine 2, *not* the difficulty with Mid Ruds. Look for the errors here described. Check them off on the case, one by one, and don't even be satisfied that it's only "No-Auditing". Check all the errors off, section by section. You'll be startled.

So in general, difficult Mid Ruds and dirty needle indicate wrong Routine 2, not bad auditing. Somebody has flubbed the Routine 2 before the *auditing* was flubbed. Once the Routine 2 is in error, auditing becomes impossible.

This gives no excuse for bad metering, cleaning cleans, trying to look like an auditor but ignoring results. Auditing errors *do* exist. And can be serious, but a pc running on right Routine 2 would forgive the Pope for having a forked tail. You almost can't muddy up a pc running on right Routine 2.

Here's a trick. Don't try to nul a list until you've seen a clean flowing needle for a *lot* of Items, maybe 50. Then get in fast Mid Ruds on the list and do it without cleaning any cleans. Then start nulling. If the needle dirties up after 30-40 Items, skip Mid Ruds, just show the pc the page and have him spot any big thoughts he had on it. Then immediately get back to nulling. If the needle is dirty still, resume listing until it's clean. Just do those actions and (given error free Routine 2 as per this HCO Bulletin) you'll have a smooth, smooth happy time of it in nulling.

Do anything you don't *have* to do in auditing Routine 2 and you're in trouble in the auditing department. Bang out almost total Routine 2 and you're in clover. Give 1/10th of the session over to goals, Mid Ruds and other auditing actions and 9/10ths of the session to pure Routine 2 Actions and you'll really win. And that 1/10th includes any Mid Ruds on the list as well. Give half the session to auditing and half to Routine 2 and you'll be in continuous trouble.

The righter the Routine 2, the less auditing you'll have to do.

So how long is a list? Can you nul it with a needle that requires only a pc inspection of a page to keep it clean? Are all but one of the RSs that happened in auditing dead when you nulled? Are your pages long streams of X's? Did you have to use suppress only once per page (fast check) to keep it clean?

Well, that's a complete list. If it gave you an RI. Just one.

So how long is a list?

But if all the above is true and a pc's lists are still *very* long, another thing can be wrong.

That wrongness usually is the pc's confronting ability being driven down by auditor unfrontability. (But also can be caused by a wrong RI or other errors gone before it as covered in this HCO Bulletin.)

The auditor Qs and As, yap, yaps, nags the pc, blames, gets in endless Mid Ruds, cleans cleans, misses reads or does something else.

The length of an auditor's pc's lists is to some degree proportional to the Rough auditing or no-auditing done by the auditor. (And also by a failure to use Mid Ruds and TD in the right places when necessary.)

We have known since '55 that rough auditing reduces havingness. Here's why: Rough auditing lowers the pc's ability to confront in the session. The pc's havingness is proportional to his ability to confront in the session. If a pc's havingness by can squeeze test is lower at session end than at beginning on Routine 2, then there's something wrong with the auditing or with the way Routine 2 is being applied (one of the above Routine 2 errors is being made).

The remedy for the bad auditing is to make the auditor only acknowledge anything and everything the pc says or put it on the list. Tear out all Rudiments, Tiger

Drills, two-way comm, and forbid any chance to comment or act on an Origin by the pc, and get only Routine 2 done.

The remedy for Routine 2 errors (and the errors themselves) are given above in this HCO Bulletin.

## CONCLUSION

Routine 2 does not have an endless parade of DO-NOTS. They are basically just those above.

Simple, really.

And I've not seen one session on Routine 2 that was going really wrong, go wrong on auditing errors alone. Routine 2 sessions go wrong on bad Routine 2. The auditing form and meter errors start to pile up after Routine 2 has been balled up. One or more of the above Routine 2 errors has been done and overlooked.

The reason why Routine 2 errors are more deadly than purely auditing errors is that Routine 2 is handling the pc by batches of lifetimes. All the stress and gore- and agony of generations exist on the lists of any one package. An auditing error can be gross and get by unless it is sitting on a Routine 2 error. Then the tiniest auditing flub can produce a reaction like an earthquake. The charge is all coming from Routine 2 mishandling and is evident on the surface only by the auditing error.

## CASE REMEDY

Routine 2 case patch-up is elementary, done with a knowledge of the above errors. Just find out which one of the above sections is being violated. And get it done. The error will only be one of the above to cause case non-progress or worsening.

The sections are given in order of importance.

I will shortly work up a series of actual case history case repairs. So save the records and you save all.

## SUMMARY

Routine 2-10 and 2-12 are their own technology and must be learned as such.

Routine 2 errors are more shaking to a case than errors in form and meter (except where the auditor can't even see a Rock Slam!) and where a case is not winning on Routine 2 auditing it is the Routine 2 that must be reviewed—and fast. The elements to be reviewed are all listed above by sections in order of importance. Of course many other smaller fantastic errors can be done and will be invented but they will be junior in value to those listed above and will be reported when found.

Routine 2 will be with us a long, long time and it is worth learning well. It takes the toughest case apart and is the *only* process that can start the actual clearing of 805's or more of all cases.

I have done or reviewed thousands of hours of auditing in forming and organizing and testing Routine 2.

It is the most gratifying (and sometimes hair-raising) auditing I have ever done or viewed. You can't oversell Routine 2. You just can't. For it is the first gateway to light, life and liberty for all Mankind at last.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 JANUARY AD13

Central Orgs

**ACADEMY CURRICULUM  
HOW TO TEACH AUDITING AND ROUTINE 2**

INTRODUCTION

With the placing of a clearing technology into HCA/HPA hands, we must revise our concept of training.

Routine 2-12 is complicated and exact. But as it is the only thing known which cracks all cases, we have no choice in the matter. We can and must learn it well. It must not be indifferently learned. But as it is not going to change as is well proven, time and effort can be spent upon it and must be.

We must rise to the occasion. We must use all we know to learn and teach all we have to teach to get Routine 2 done.

CHECK SHEETS

There are two distinctly different series of check sheets for doing Routine 2 processes and auditing. These are:

- (a) Those that apply to Routine 2, the GPM and data listing, nulling and case errors and repair;
- (b) Those that apply to auditing, its basics, skills, the meter.

Although these associate and interlock, they are two separate subjects of study.

For years we have faced the arbitrary that those whose cases got in the road of their auditing yet had to assimilate auditing theory and practice.

Routine 2 well done removes with some rapidity these case barriers to auditing.

Therefore there are several phases desirable in studying auditing and Routine 2.

V UNIT CLASS 0  
FIRST PHASE

For a new student, doing Routine 2-10 precedes study of auditing and Routine 2. This is done under close supervision on a co-audit basis with the Co-audit Supervisor taking a hand on cases, checking out Items, correcting cases, etc.

This is done until the student has found in another and has had found in himself 2 or 3 packages. *Accuracy* is the essence of this first step, otherwise the wasted time and wrong Items will give the whole action the tone of despair.

Only good results are stressed, not the form of how they are achieved.

In this first phase we want the student to see that Routine 2 produces changes for the better in himself and the pc and is worth learning. This is what we're trying to show.

We remove, if the Routine 2 is good, the barriers to learning auditing and Scientology.

All we want then from the first phase is:

- (a) Reality on the benefits of the process and auditing; and
- (b) Removal of the barriers to being a good auditor.

W UNIT CLASS Ia  
SECOND PHASE

This phase actually starts the training of a Scientologist. He or she, however, should have started its check sheets in the V unit.

We teach the basics of Scientology, its history, the Auditor's Code, Axioms, the ARC triangle and Tone Scale out of the old Notes on Lectures booklet.

In practical and auditing we teach and do objective processes, Op Pro by Dup and the CCHs.

We wish to accomplish this in this phase:

- (a) A Reality that Scientology is a real subject and very precise, not a mixture of Indian philosophy and cute tricks, and give the student solid grounding on pure Scientology basics, disrelated from auditing; and
- (b) Get the student capable of repetition of commands and unafraid in actual physical handling of other bodies.

#### X UNIT CLASS Ib THIRD PHASE

We now enter the student upon a phase of formal auditing consisting of theory and practical, using all the basics of auditing, the TRs, the meter, fine points.

This phase should specialize in basic auditing skills, very precisely applicable to handling an auditing session, a meter, meter drills, anti Q and A, TRs 0-4, Model Session, Mid Ruds, Missed Withholds, etc.

And we get the student to run formal processes on the Meter until he or she understands a meter. These processes consist only of ARC Straight Wire, comm processes, nothing that will disturb 2-12 or run out Rockslams. The idea of this auditing is to get the student used to handling a session with competence.

From this phase we expect:

- (a) The basics of auditing in theory and practical; and
- (b) Confidence in confronting a bank and handling a pc on a meter with good form.

#### Y UNIT CLASS IIa FOURTH PHASE

In the fourth phase our interest is in Prepchecking as an action and a prelude to lists in the form of a Problems Intensive.

In theory and practical we teach how to do a Problems Intensive, advanced metering, how to detect case changes, better sessioning, more TRs 0-4, more basics of Scientology such as Axioms and Logics.

In auditing, the student does a Problems Intensive and receives one. The stress is on good sessioning and RESULTS.

From this phase we expect:

- (a) A good command of a Problems Intensive theory and practical, how to detect case changes; and
- (b) The ability to actually audit to a good result and keep Mid Ruds in and CLEAN A NEEDLE.

#### Z UNIT CLASS IIb FIFTH PHASE

This is a theory and practical phase for Routine 2-12.

The student also audits Routine 2-12 under supervision.

The whole check sheet for Routine 2-12 is thrown at the student. The long HCO Bulletins are segmented into a page or two and thereby made into several passes (the student studies and is examined on them in segments).

In auditing, the student is permitted to do full 2-12 and the stress is on RESULTS with accurate Routine 2-12.

#### PG UNIT—CLASS II SIXTH PHASE

This is a post-graduate phase on Routine 2-12. It was formerly known as “Interne”.

The theory and practical are all on the stress of CASE REPAIR and how to supervise Routine 2.

The student is used to help supervise V unit students as his auditing activity with stress on case errors.

The remainder of the student's time is taken up with preparation for examination for his HCA/HPA.

The student may be used for charity cases and what was formerly Interne work.

### SUMMARY

This is about a three months' course if steamed through. If it takes longer, then the V unit was flubbed.

If a student hangs up longer than a reasonable time in any upper phase, he is returned to the V unit and is required to do and receive Routine 2 while continuing to try to pass upper level check sheets so as not to hold him up.

Students are, of course, expected to study evenings and week-ends.

The three section course plan is adhered to of Theory, Practical and Auditing.

Auditing in the Auditing Section is done for RESULTS, not to teach auditing. Practical is where they practise.

Students are progressively assigned to their units and are re-classed as they pass out of a unit.

The Model of this Course is Saint Hill but it may not be so advertised.

The chief difference of course is the necessary re-introduction of a student body tape programme such as in the old days. The last hour of the day is used for this. A sequence of about 75 tapes, mainly of general historical or auditing interest, are played to the whole student body, assembled in the main assembly hall, one tape each day, regardless of the students' classification. They are given quizzes on these tapes, very brief. No other tape use is made in an Academy. There are no headphone recorders. If tape play speakers are not good the students won't learn anything from the tapes. When tapes are omitted as a whole class activity, the whole direction, meaning and ethic of Scientology goes sour in an area and the students haven't a clue what Scientology is for and you find them idling about driving off pcs with nutty chatter.

This Academy Curriculum requires a D of T and two instructors. To this can be added a Training Admin who is also Extension Course. The D of T becomes Auditing Supervisor, the other two instructors are the Theory Supervisor and Practical Supervisor.

The Classes are awarded on the Completion of the phase and designate the check sheets. Students get canceled out of units but not off check sheets.

The only things that can keep students from passing through this course rapidly are (a) failure to schedule precisely, (b) failure to demand and obtain auditing results in all units, (c) local non-comprehension of R2-12, (d) capricious and unreal theory and practical examinations and (e) failure to enforce the course regulations. A full Academy will attend to all these things. An empty one will have ignored them.

It is no real sin to do a lousy job of auditing. It is a terrible crime to do a bad job of training and dissemination because then there's nothing left to pick the cases up in this life or the next. Every bad auditor we turn out costs us a hundred preclears. Every good one puts us closer to our objectives.

An Academy Class II should be good enough to go to work at once as an HGC auditor without causing the HGC a moment's worry.

It *can* be done because it must be.

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6301C08	SHSBC-226	R2-10 and R2-12
** 6301C08	SHSBC-227	Case Repair
** 6301C10	SHSBC-228	R2-12
** 6301C10	SHSBC-229	How to Audit

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JANUARY AD13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 2**

*IMPORTANT*

**OPPOSITION LISTS  
RIGHT AND WRONG OPPOSE**

Most PT terminals and oppterminals look more like Coterminals than clean Terminals or Opposition Terminals when first contacted. They become more definite Terms or Oppterminals after they have been listed a page. While you should be able to make the right choice in most cases by the usual test given in the 2-12 steps you *can* err.

Your lists will become endless and unnullable and your pc will go downhill if you oppose an RI wrong way to.

Therefore, while listing, carefully observe the needle and the pc. The TA is meaningless in this test. The Indications for testing “Right Way Oppose” and “Wrong Way Oppose” are the subject of this bulletin.

In opposing a Reliable Item you can consider it a Terminal (because pc said it gave pain) and list “Who or What would a Catfish oppose?” Whereas in actual fact it was an Oppterm and should have been listed “Who or What would oppose a Catfish?” Or Vice Versa. Sad consequences follow a wrong choice.

**POTENTIAL MISCALLING AN RI**

Even the best auditor can make a mistake in calling an RI he’s gotten a Terminal or an Oppterm. The pc is foggy as to what’s pain or sensation. The RI may have both. Sometimes Terminals are so covered with Sen there is no pain at first. Sometimes the hidden Terminal is so hard down on the Oppterm RI it seems like a Terminal.

Further, you can be doing an Opposition to an RI list, expecting a Terminal to come up and get, in fact, *another* Oppterm. This is fine. Accept it if the list only RSed once on nulling. But the opposing Terminal is still hidden and must be gotten. Pcs, you see, often put Terms and Oppterminals on the same list.

**STABLE DATUM:**

Always regard the identity of an RI as a Term or Oppterm as potentially wrong until listed and tested as per this HCO Bulletin. Do the best you can with usual tests to tell what it is before you start listing and choose your oppose question accordingly. But be ready to find that what was a Terminal is really an Oppterm or vice versa and should have been opposed “the other way around”.

You have only two list questions to use in opposing a Reliable Item. These are “Who or What would oppose a     ?” and “Who or What would a     oppose?” For *every* Reliable Item there is only one of the above that is right. The other is wrong. There are no true Coterminals—they only seem to be both a Terminal (pain) and an Oppterm (sensation).

When it comes to listing you will benefit the pc *only* by listing the right way. The other oppose question then is the wrong way.

If you list the “wrong way” (using the wrong question), you’ll get an ENDLESS LIST that never completes and won’t nul.

You therefore have a choice of two questions and one of them is right and the other wrong, always. If you choose the right one and list it, the pc benefits. If you choose the wrong one and list it the pc will get worse rapidly, right in the session before your eyes.

It often happens that you start listing the wrong way. This is because you failed to find out correctly if the RI you were about to list an opposition list to was a Terminal (pain) or an Opposition Terminal (sensation). The pc said he had “sen” but actually felt “pain”. Or the pc did have “sen” and the pain appeared afterward. In short, because PT Terminals look like Coterminals very often, neither the pc nor the auditor can tell on some RIs. This happens to *some* RIs on every case.

The solution to the dilemma is to test by listing a page or two.

There are certain definite signs of wrong way opposition. They can be seen with half an eye. There is no need to go on until your pc is caved in and you have 99 pages of Items to find out you can’t nul and should have opposed the other way around.

A list right way to or wrong way to will Rockslam, so that’s no test in itself. The tests, five in number, are a little more delicate:

Aside from original tests for Term or Oppterm, how to tell if an oppose list is right way to:

#### RIGHT WAY INDICATIONS

1. In Listing needle is loose and gets looser;
2. Pc’s skin tone gets progressively better as he or she lists;
3. Masses move *out* off pc;
4. Pc gives Items easily;
5. List completes easily.

#### WRONG WAY OPPOSE INDICATIONS

If List is wrong way oppose (which is to say the wording is reversed, such as “Who or What would oppose a Catfish?” as different from “Who or What would a Catfish oppose?”) these things will *always* happen:

1. In listing, the needle gets tighter, stiff and tends to jerk. It goes in cycles, DR, RS, DR, clean, DR, RS, DR, clean, etc;
2. The pc’s skin tone gets progressively worse, darker and off colour and the pc looks older;
3. Masses move into the pc and make him feel more or less squashed;
4. Pc gives Items with some small difficulty and tends to invalidate them and RI being listed from;
5. List doesn’t ever complete. You may be able to nul a while but the needle will dirty up and no amount of Mid Ruds will clean it.

Whether your list is right way oppose or wrong way oppose the pc may get pain and sensation, even nausea. Indeed, be worried only if the pc *doesn’t*. These don’t

count. Pain and Sensation are used for the first test you make in selection. But aren't used beyond that test given in the Steps of 2-12. It's the darkening colour of the pc and his or her apparent age that count. Your tests above are *visual* not getting data from the pc. Pcs will list wrong way to and plow themselves right on in with no complaint.

If you start listing wrong way to, and then turn it around, the pc will have trouble giving right way to Items for a bit, and then they come at a rapid easy flow and you get all the above 5 things for the right way list. Unless you change around to the right way and continue to list the wrong way you will continue to get the 5 indications given for wrong lists.

Sometimes an RI is so fouled up you have to test by listing one way, then the other and then back to the first way again.

A little experience is solid gold, for you begin to see the 5 indications for right lists and the 5 indications for wrong lists and recognize them more quickly.

When you have opposed wrongly and then, in opposing right way to you get a complete list, you never bother to nul the wrong way list. You just abandon it. The RI won't be on it. You only nul the right way oppose list.

Rule: Never nul lists taken from wrong sources. Just abandon.

No list ever went to 50 pages that was right way to. Right Way Oppose Lists that can be completed are probably all below 500 Items, the usual being around 250 Items.

Wrong Way Oppose is the chief source of difficulty for any opposition list, rivalled only by Incomplete Lists as a trouble maker in Routine 2.

A wrong way oppose list is of course "Wrong Source" as one is using "Catfish" as a Terminal instead of "Catfish" as an Optterm or vice versa.

Endless lists also come from just continuing to list on and on and on, the pc's needle being dirty by "Protest". This is just silly. Some supervisor may develop as a stable datum, "If the needle is dirty, just continue listing." And this is wrong. A needle does get clean when a right way oppose list is completed. But wrong way oppose or Mid Ruds Out can also make a needle dirty.

On an oppose list, if a needle is dirty three main things can be wrong:

1. List is right way oppose but incomplete. Remedy: Complete it to one RS only seen on nulling.
2. List is wrong way oppose. Remedy: Oppose it the other way and watch the signs (above) until you're sure. Then go on and complete.
3. Mid Ruds are out—pc protesting the session or overlisting.

Wrong Source (opposing a wrong item) can mess up a pc also. But why'd you take an Item from an incomplete or wrong way list in the first place and then oppose it? The remedy of this one lies before the fact of wrong way oppose, so is not the subject of this HCO Bulletin.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 JANUARY 1963

CenOCon  
Franchise  
Students

*URGENT*

**ROUTINE 2—SIMPLIFIED**

(Communicator: Mimeo AT ONCE and  
RUSH TO ALL TECH DIVISIONS)

I will shortly release Routine 2-12A which will incorporate Routine 2-10 and 2-12 with enormous simplification.

While the basic processes and purposes remain the same, I have worked out a number of simplifications that are greatly needed.

Having seen some of the trouble with R2- 10 and 12, I have been furiously working to improve Indicators. I've now proved out some invariable indicators that will completely wipe out flubs if followed exactly as given in this HCO Bulletin. If they don't work for you, the R2 being done is from wrong source. These indicators are not wrong.

I have also succeeded in developing a system in 2-12A that eliminates nulling, thus saving half the auditing time, and eliminates Tiger Drilling—a weak spot for HPAs. As the sessions can be run with almost no Mid Ruds or ruds, this leaves auditors with only an RS to see on the meter and cuts out almost all other meter reading. R2 then comes much more easily into the realm of Co-Audit.

If you don't get results from R2 it's being done wrong. I've got the variables pretty well licked.

Until the full release of R2-12A, incorporate these changes which belong to 2-12A into any R2 you are doing or supervising. Change over *at once*. Abandon the old way where it conflicts as these data below will keep you out of trouble and stop some of the glaring errors being done. Apply these below to any 2-10 or 2-12 currently being done.

**TONE ARM**

The *Tone Arm* is used in R2- 1 2A.

On *any* list done on a preclear, whether source, represent or oppose, RUN *ALL* THE TONE ARM ACTION OUT OF THE LISTING. LIST AT LEAST 50 ITEMS BEYOND THE POINT THE TONE ARM BECAME MOTIONLESS.

Keep the tone arm readings in the left margin of the list column. Note TA action about every 5 Items or at every change.

In a wrong-way-to oppose list, the TA tends to be more stationary.

If you don't run the TA action out and at least 50 Items beyond, plus 50 Items beyond the last RS seen on listing, the list will be incomplete.

Sometimes several pages have to be listed with a motionless TA before the final RS comes on the list but ordinarily the final RS comes within 50 Items after the TA has been motionless for 50 Items.

**LIST BEYOND LAST RS**

List at least 50 Items beyond the last RS on the list. Do not stop listing with the last RSing Item. If you do you can be fooled. If you get a new RS in the 50, list 50 more beyond that and so on.

**TEST LIST BOTH WAYS**

List a few Items on each way oppose as a conclusive test to find right way oppose. The needle gets stiffer on the wrong way oppose. THE NEEDLE LOOKS LOOSER ON RIGHT WAY OPPOSE. If you still can't decide, again test either way until you are sure.

Use all normal tests but list a little each way to be sure.

## WRONG WAY LIST

A list is wrong way to if

1. The list doesn't RS.
2. The RSeS on the list increase in incidence—more RSeS per Item on later pages. (The number is quite marked.)
3. The pc looks darker and mass is pulling in on the pc.
4. The list is inordinately long—40-50 pages.
5. The needle gets tighter and stiffer as you list (the most noticeable test). (A needle also gets tighter on an added to list if you didn't read the right Item to the pc.)

## VANISHED RS

If a case *has* RSeD and suddenly can't be made to no matter what you do, the RS is swallowed into some earlier incomplete or fumbled action.

Go back and handle the earlier action correctly.

Sometimes an Item grabbed off an incomplete source list (but *never* use one that was found by representing an RSing Item) has to be handled fully to get the RS back. Example: Incomplete Parts of Existence List. "God" RSeD heavily on it. Some auditor grabbed it and opposed it. List abandoned when directions came to use Items only from complete source lists.

Eight Reliable Items later, RSeS on the case vanish or get tiny. Pc's PTPs heavy and not being resolved by R2. Solution: Go back and get the "God" package complete. The big RS will come back on. (Make sure it's opposed right way to this time.)

## FOUR ITEM PKGS

The biggest change from 2-12 to 2-12A is the four Item Package.

Always get four Items in a row.

Complete any existing 2 or 3 Item packages on a case to 4 Items whether the last Reliable Item found still RSeS or not.

The four are:

- (1) Reliable Item taken from a completed source list.
- (2) Reliable Item taken by opposing (1).
- (3) Reliable Item taken by opposing (2).
- (4) Reliable Item taken by opposing (3).

It will be found that (4) is in opposition also to ( 1 ) if all was done correctly.

All lists (1) to (4) must be complete, to no TA action and beyond, right-way-to opposition in each case. Where a represent enters in (which is seldom), there are five lists for four Items. These are:

- (1) Source list (complete to no TA for 50 Items but no RS).
- (2) Represent list from last Item in on source list. This is RSing Item. This is the first RI. List must be complete.
- (3) Oppose list on RI found in (2) just above. This gives second RI.
- (4) Oppose list on RI found in (3). This gives third RI.
- (5) Oppose list or RI found in (4). This gives fourth RI.

Whether you get your first RI from an oppose or represent list, you always wind up with 4 RIs.

## PACKAGING

A package always consists of Two RIs that are terminals and Two RIs that are oppterm.

The terminals oppose either oppterm, one better than the other.


This is two packages 2-12 style, one pkg 2-12A style.

The Term-Oppterm of each pair must be of same order of magnitude.

The auditor has no business with the significances of Items. He *never* suggests an Item or goal. He never rejects one because of significance.

Here is an actual package. 1st RI found, Oppterm RELIGION; 2nd RI found, Terminal A CONQUEROR; 3rd RI found, Oppterm PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS; 4th RI found, Terminal A DISEMBODIED SPIRIT.

### PACKAGE



In a 2-12A package you have to have 2 terminals and two oppterm, opposing and cross opposing as above.

Otherwise you've goofed and will the pc hedge and ARC break! Oh, my!

The sequence may be (1)Oppterm RI, (2)Term RI, (3)Oppterm RI, (4)Term RI, or it may be (1) Represent Item, (2) Oppterm RI, (3 ) Term RI, (4) Oppterm RI, (5) Term RI. Or it may be (1) Term RI, (2) Oppterm RI, (3) Term RI, (4) Oppterm RI, or (1) Represent Item, (2) Term RI, (3) Oppterm RI, (4) Term RI, (5) Oppterm RI.

Always 4 RIs, always 2 Terms, always 2 Oppterm.

If they don't come out that way then one of the lists was wrong way to or incomplete or both.

## NULLING

R2-12A doesn't nul a full RSing list. Only a non-RS list to be represented gets nulled. And these are infrequently needed.

One completes the list to no TA action plus 50 or more Items and then 50 Items beyond the last RS seen on listing. The 50-50 rule is minimum, not maximum. It sometimes must be more.

One tells the pc that one is going to read him the next to last RS and does so. If it RSes, one adds to the list until a new RSing Item is seen and 50 Items beyond it. Then one reads the now next to last RSing Item again. (No Tiger Drill.) Auditor tells pc: "This is the next to the last RSing Item, not THE Item."

When the next to last RSing Item *does not* RS on reading it to the pc (no TD), one then tells the pc that his or her Item will now be read and reads the LAST RSing Item to the pc. It should RS without TD. If the next to the last Item did RS, one does *not* read the last RSing Item to the pc but just returns to listing. If the RS is off the last Item seen to RS read the non-RSing Items just before and just after it, always to be sure. The RS could have been noted for the wrong Item.

When one has read it to the pc and seen it RS, the auditor says, "That Rock Slams" and watches the pc. The auditor does *no* other action for a while, says nothing else. To speak or engage in new actions will rip the pc's attention to shreds. This is a critical moment. One watches the pc's face to see if it darkens or lightens. Darkness= wrong Item. Lightens = right Item. (Watch the area below the pc's eyes, the eye pouches.) Pc doesn't know if it's his Item or not = wrong Item. Pc knows it's his Item = Right Item. Pc ARC breaks shortly or gets critical of auditor = wrong Item. Pc happier = right Item. Pc doesn't cognite = wrong Item. Pc cognites = right Item.

While pc is cogniting auditor will see the Item continue to RS on the meter. The RS may fade out or narrow as pc cognites. This does not mean wrong Item necessarily.

Even if the RS vanishes after a good bit (5 minutes?) (no TD) it is still opposed. (3) is more likely to fade than (1) and (2) RIs. (2) is more likely to fade than (1) RI. (4) fades almost at once.

The Item must *always* be the last RS on the list and must always RS the first few times read without Tiger Drill (providing session rudiments are even vaguely in).

If you aren't sure of the RSeS while listing, nul for RS only from the one above the next to last Item to the end of list. Don't nul whole list ever.

If an added portion has an RS on it there is no need to nul earlier than it either as no earlier RS will exist. However always test next to last RS. If two RSeS appear before a list is added to (next to last and last) or if any two Items on a list RS before a list is added to, that list is incomplete and does *not* have the Item on it.

### WRONG ITEM SIGNS

A wrong Item given to the pc as his Item does the following:

1. Darkens pc's eye shadows and face;
2. Pc immediately has more mass than before pc was told Item;
3. TA tends to stay up and stuck;
4. Pc slightly or greatly ARC breaks;
5. Pc doesn't cognite at all or cognites briefly and stops (and ARC breaks);
6. Pc can't really understand how it is his Item, but sometimes is propitiatively agreeable with no cognitions;
7. Pc can't really see how it fits in package but may say so diffidently.

### RIGHT ITEM SIGNS

A right Item given to the pc as his Item does the following:

1. Lightens pc's eye shadows and face;
2. Pc has no more mass about him than before Item was read to him;
3. TA usually blows down;
4. Pc feels more cheerful;
5. Pc cognites, usually at length;
6. Pc sees just how it is his Item;
7. Pc sees how it fits against other Items in any package.

The auditor must check up on all 7 points above as well as the RS, making 8 points in all.

If the wrong indicators aren't present and neither are the right ones, list on further. Don't be a niggardly lister. Another hour's listing can save 50 hours case repair.

### DIRTY NEEDLE

Lists that never go clean needle are wrong way to.

You never end up a list with a Dirty needle if you run all the TA action out on a right way oppose list.

You don't have to have a clean needle anyway on this type of nulling.

### RS MATCHING

The RS you see on the first RI of any package exactly repeats itself in width and speed on each one of the other 3 RIs in a 4 RI package.

It is the same RS when listed and when called, also.

A package has a characteristic RS. If one of the Items doesn't match the RS, it's wrong. If none of the 4 RSes seen are similar, run don't walk to the nearest Academy and as soon as the pc gets out of the hospital send him to an HGC.

The RSes in one package all match exactly when first seen and first called to pc. Of course after a few cognitions RI (3) and RI (4) of the package may lose their RSes, but not for a while and usually only after being listed.

An RS is gone when it's listed against.

You only have one RS of a package of 4 RIs RSing at any one time.

RI (1) RSes until listed. Then RI (2) RSes until listed, etc.

RSes that grind out on packaging were wrong Items.

You never audit an RI in any way but listing for another RI.

Your memory and a note of width are your only tools in matching RSes on a package.

### USING ARC BREAKS

Use any ARC Break to determine that the R2 is wrong. There is *no* other reason for an ARC break, no matter *what* the pc says. The R2 is wrong. That's the reason for the ARC break.

*You use* ARC breaks to verify the R2. The pc will *not* ARC break on right R2 no matter what provocation exists in the auditing.

ARC Break *always* equals Wrong Routine 2.

Wrong Item, Item wrong way to in oppose. List Incomplete. These are what cause ARC breaks, not the auditing. Never forget that.

Never try to cure an R2 ARC break with Mid Ruds or missed W/Hs. Go back to work on the R2 line-up.

Example: "Your Item is 'A Cat'." Pc says ok, soon begins to chop auditor. Correct action, "Your Item is *not* 'A Cat'. I will examine this." That's the end of the ARC break just like that. Pc doesn't realize the wrong Item is it. He thought it was the auditor. The auditor now looks over his list to see if it's wrong source or wrong way to or incomplete and proceeds accordingly.

The Rule is ALWAYS GO BACK FROM AN ARC BREAK. NEVER UNDERTAKE A BRAND NEW ACTION such as changing the universe.

New lists do not cure ARC breaks. Only doing the old list right or finding the right Item cures them.

This is also the dominant rule in case repair: Find the earliest ARC break and remedy what was being done *just* before it.

*Use* ARC breaks to guide your R2. Don't ever Q and A with them or try to handle with auditing. Never stop the auditing on one. Just correct the R2 *fast*.

### CASE REPAIR

In repairing cases all you do is look over earlier reports until you find the session where the goals went sour and correct what was done in that or the immediate earlier session. Very simple. You'll also find the RS if it has vanished off the case.

Never start new actions on a case that needs repair. Only repair old ones. It's a screaming auditing goof, a major error to start a new action on such a case.

### DOPE OFF

All dope off and boil off while listing or nulling comes from ordinary garden variety missed withholds. Pull them rapidly and go on. In R2 you only pull missed W/Hs when you can't get pc into

session at all or when the pc dopes off. You don't pull missed W/Hs in case of an ARC break-you correct the R2.

Pc going into apathy is also an ARC break you know. Also propitiation.

#### NEVER REP AN RS ITEM

*Never* represent an RSing Item. But NEVER. Don't handle or use "RIs" that came from representing an RSing Item. Some were gotten this way in 3GAXX. They're wrong. Abandon them fast.

Always test a source you are going to use for a represent list for an RS. If it RSes don't represent it. Don't oppose it either as it's off some incomplete list. Find a non-RSing thing to represent instead.

There's another version of this also. A pc asked to extend a list (or seeing the auditor's paper as the auditor lists) will use Items that RS to try to get *the* RSing Item on the list. This is fatal and will increase the number of RSes on the list and make the pc ill, give him the wrong item and so on.

When you see a pc doing this tell him or her, "Just answer the auditing question. Please just answer it. The Item we're looking for probably isn't even related to any RS gotten so far."

Make the pc answer the auditing question only.

A pc may also seek to package when listing Items, not answer the auditing question. An educated pc knows that RI (4) must match RI (1). Get the pc off it. "Just answer the auditing question." And you'll be out of trouble.

Some pcs have listed 40 pages without once answering the auditing question.

#### SELF LISTING

Getting the pc to list out of session as in goals is a poor idea in R2.

Give the pc an Item wrong way to and he'll wrap himself around a telephone pole out of session.

List R2 processes in session only.

You would have to nul the whole list if it's listed out of session. Where's the time saved?

#### NEVER STEER ITEMS

Some eager beavers have started steering the pc to Items while listing, using the needle flicks.

Never do it.

You get Items that don't belong and all sorts of things.

Just be simple, huh?

Routine 2 is as good as you simply audit simply. So relax and start clearing.

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

15 January—7 February 1963

** 6301C15	SHSBC-230	R2-12 Dead Horses
** 6301C15	SHSBC-231	R2-12 Nevers
** 6301C16	SHSBC-232	TVD-16, TR 0 Demo
** 6301C16	SHSBC-233	TR 0 Lecture
** 6302C07	SHSBC-234	R-3 MX, Part I
** 6302C07	SHSBC-235	R-3 MX, Part II.

## CURRENT AUDITING

Current Auditing has been unsettled due to the sudden breakthrough on R3-MX.

What I was looking for was

1. A process that invariably cleared pcs easily;
2. That had very precise and invariable rules;
3. That could be taught by rote; and
4. Would not be subject to change.

This process turned out to be R3-MX. The X at this writing is dropped as the process has proven itself and it becomes Routine 3-M. The designation of “M” is simply its consecutive letter in the development series, but it could stand for “Mary Sue” as she did the actual auditing under my direction that proved its rules.

The rules of 3-MX were worked out in Routine 2-12 and 2-12A and then by examining Rocket Reading Item behaviour in 3-MX.

The first thing you should know about 3-M is that it is more precise in application than any process you have handled. When it says “List the Tone Arm Action out and then 25 Items more” it means exactly that. (Surges of the needle don’t count in TA action as you couldn’t follow them with the TA and back that fast.) When R3-M says “List 25 Items Beyond the last RR or RS on a list” it means 25, not 24.

In 3-M it says Rocket Reading Item and that’s what it means. And a Rocket Read *is* a Rocket Read not a fall.

R3-M is therefore a masterpiece of precision. Do it wrong—not *exactly* by the rules—and it becomes a real nightmare. So know it before you do it, and do what it says only.

In both R2-12A and R3-M an Item can appear *anywhere* on a *source* list so long as 2 Items do not RS or RR. One Item RSing and one RRing also means list is incomplete.

On the w/w wd goal opp list (the 3-M Source List) you have to make sure list is complete to 50 Items beyond last RSing or RRing Item and 50 beyond no TA action point (where TA stops moving). This is true for both 3-M and 2-12A. You read every RRing Item back to pc from the 3-M Source List (goal opp) and every RSing Item on the 2-1 2A source list.

A source list is of course the primary list from the goal from which you get the first RRing RI. In 2-1 2A the source list is what you choose to get your first list from or List One.

All other lists in 3-M are extended 25 Items beyond the last RR or RS and the Item is always the last RR on the list—if not you’ve goofed, didn’t get the TA action out of this or the just prior list. In 2-12A you go 50 Items beyond the last RS and 50 beyond the 1st still TA.

The 8 tests for mass increase, etc, must be done on every Item found in 3-M and 2- 12A.

The best coverages of R-3M are the HCO Bulletin of Feb 1, 1963, "Routine 3", and the two hours of lecture of Feb 7, 1963, where it is covered. HCO Bulletins and other lectures will be forthcoming.

R2-12A

If R3-M emerges so suddenly, then what of Routine 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A?

With the single caution that you must not try to package a small RS and only use a wide RS (1/3 of a dial or more) as your source list's RI, 2-12A is *very* successful just as laid down. It will continue to be taught, and used. In it you have some very precise Rules. A list is continued 50 Items beyond the last RS. Never represent an RSing Item. Always carry a wide RSing RI around to a package of 4. It is not important how you get your first RI so long as it didn't come from representing an RSing Item. The last RS on the list opposing an RI is the Right Item always unless you've goofed. There must not be 2 RSing Items on a list (except List One where you choose the biggest RS as your first RI). If two appear, your list is incomplete or you let the pc (as you must *never* do) Represent an RR or RS he's heard or seen on the list.

You don't nul in 2-12A (or 3-M), you just read the next to last, then the last RS or RR Item.

Tough cases, the RS grabbed off List One Issue 3, will change with 2-12A. Rockslammers sit back and get relaxed. The process is valuable. Therefore it must be taught and used.

But as R3-M is even easier than 2-12A, it also must be taught in Academies and used in HGCs.

Valid Processes, then, are

- |                         |                         |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. The CCHs.            | 5. Prepchecking.        |
| 2. Assists.             | 6. Problems Intensives. |
| 3. Ruds and Havingness. | 7. R2-12A.              |
| 4. Pulling Missed W/Hs. | 8. R3-M.                |

Know these and you can crack or handle any case and *clear*.

So know them. I'll do my best to make all the data available.

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

[ R3M and R3N as developments are not included in these volumes. They will be found on courses to which they apply.]

** 6302C12	SHSBC-236	Routine 3M
** 6302C13	SHSBC-237	TVD-16, Mid Rud. and Hav.
** 6302C13	SHSBC-238	Discussion by LRH of TVD
** 6302C14	SHSBC-239	Routine 3M



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 FEBRUARY 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**R2—R3**  
**LISTING RULES**

An idiocy of long long lists can creep into Routine 2 and Routine 3. This is not as harmful as under-listing but it can make pcs pretty green or black and certainly holds up auditing.

You must realize that “listing to a still Tone Arm” takes several things for granted:

1. That the auditor has his sensitivity at about 4 (Mark IV about 6) during listing.
2. That the auditor does not adjust the TA for surges (cognitions, etc).
3. That the TA is adjusted only when it has to be to get the needle into a readable position.
4. That the pc is answering the auditing question and not varying it or running havingness on himself.
5. That the rudiments are reasonably in, particularly SUPPRESS, INVALIDATE, PROTEST and DECIDE.
6. That the pc is capable of being in session.
7. That the pc isn't fiddling with the cans, yawning, stretching, etc.

In other words, if an auditor has his pc under calm control the TA rule applies. As the control of the pc diminishes the TA rule grows less workable.

But even so all is not lost.

TA shifts because of body motion, yawning, asking questions, and particularly because of PROTESTS! *do not count* in reading TA position. The TA position that must be steady is for the list. So if you read it “TA position *for the list* must be motionless” you have it absolutely correct. The TA will also read for other attention positions such as on the auditor, on the room, on the body. The pc shifts his attention from the list and you get TA motion. The thing we want to know is: did the TA go right back to List Position when the pc put his attention back on the List. Or, with the pc's attention on the list, did the TA *now* move. If so, that's TA motion for the list and the list is incomplete.

It's really very easy even if the pc is out of session, to find a motionless TA on the list. Understand this and you'll stop endless listing.

“TA action out” is, however, *not* the *first* rule of a complete list.

The rules of a complete list for R2 or R3 are:

1. TWO ITEMS (RR and RS) ARE NOT FIRING WHEN THE LIST RR AND RS ITEMS ARE READ BACK TO THE PC.
2. ONLY ONE ITEM RSeS or RRs ON THE LIST WHEN RRs AND RSs NOTED DURING LISTING ARE READ BACK TO THE PC. THE OTHERS DO NOT READ.

3. THE LIST HAS THE RELIABLE ITEM ON IT.

In Routine 2 these Rules apply:

4. ON A COMPLETED R2 SOURCE LIST, ONE RSing ITEM ONLY WILL RS WHEN READ BACK TO THE PC.
5. ON A COMPLETED R2 LIST TAKEN BY OPPOSING (EITHER WAY) A ROCKSLAMMING ITEM, THE RELIABLE ITEM WILL BE THE LAST ROCKSLAMMING ITEM ON THE LIST. IF IT IS NOT, THE ITEM BEING OPPOSED IS WRONG OR THE OPPOSITION WORDING IS WRONG WAY TO OR THE LIST IS INCOMPLETE.

In Routine 3 these Rules apply:

7. ON A COMPLETED R3 SOURCE LIST, ONE ROCKET READING ITEM ONLY WILL RR WHEN READ BACK TO THE PC. NO RS OR OTHER RR ON THE LIST SHOULD NOW READ.
8. ON A COMPLETED R3 LIST TAKEN BY OPPOSING (EITHER WAY) A ROCKSLAMMING ITEM, THE RELIABLE ITEM WILL BE THE LAST ROCKET READING ITEM ON THE LIST. IF IT IS NOT, THE ITEM BEING OPPOSED IS WRONG OR THE OPPOSITION WORDING IS WRONG WAY TO OR THE LIST IS INCOMPLETE.
9. AN ITEM OR GOAL WHICH WAS SEEN TO ROCKET READ WHEN BEING WRITTEN DOWN BUT WHICH RSeS WHEN READ BACK TO THE PC WILL ROCKET READ AGAIN IF GIVEN A BRIEF BIG MID RUDS PREPCHECK.

The above are the rules which *must* apply.

As some variability can result in various auditors' interpretation of a "still TA" and in how good a session the auditor can run, the TA rule is secondary. It still applies, it is still valid. But a pc on PROTEST! varies his TA all over the place and an auditor that can't handle a pc with a few deft mid ruds or get his question answered will get TA action when the list is flat. When you get the hang of it you will see that listing to a motionless TA is valid, but that of course is in an auditing *session*.

On one of these overlong lists, you can tell if it's overlong by seeing if you have gone 50 Items (25 Items opposing RR RIs) past the last RS or RR, making sure that you don't get two Items on the list that fire, and thus find your Reliable Item.

It's finding RIs that counts, not how long can we list.

Also, avoid buying a pc's "hard sell" on an Item or condition. If it follows the above *rules* buy it. If not, just ack and go on. Auditors with low sales resistance need not apply. Often the pc says "It's a terminal" when it's an Oppterm. Apply the tests and do a decent test list before you make up your mind. Pcs don't really know—RIs have an aberrative value you know—so why buy a dramatized sales talk. The auditor is necessary because an auditor *isn't* in the RI and can think. So an auditor who buys a sales talk isn't an auditor. Get it?

Audit R2 and R3 by the rules. If the rules don't seem to apply, take a walk and think over why. Don't just keep on in haggard hope.

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright (© 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 20 FEBRUARY AD13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 2 & 3 MODEL SESSION**

Here is a needed revision of Goal Finder's Model Session which is canceled herewith.

The changes are:

1. Omitting *Life or Livingness Goals* completely.
2. Running general O/W until PC comes back up to *PRESENT TIME* and not just until needle is smooth.
3. Added—Run "Since the last time I audited you" Mid Ruds if TA is in a higher position from the last session pc had.
4. Put Havingness after goals or gains for the session.
5. Added a note that suppress is always done repetitively, as is the Random Rud.

**SESSION PRELIMINARIES**

All auditing sessions have the following preliminaries done in this order.

1. Seat the pc and adjust his or her chair.
2. Clear the Auditing room with "Is it all right to audit in this room?" (not metered)
3. Can squeeze "Squeeze the cans, please." And note that pc registers, by the squeeze on the meter, and note the level of the pc's havingness. (Don't run hav here. )
4. Go into the session start.

**ROUTINE 2 & 3 MODEL SESSION**

Where the pc has been well Prepchecked and is well under auditor control, an Auditor in a Routine 2 or Routine 3 session may omit rudiments in Model Session, using only goals for session, and havingness, goals and gains at end and general O/W, Mid Ruds and Random Ruds where needed in the session. This salvages about an hour's auditing time per day. Start and end of session commands are used, just no rudiments; general O/W may be found necessary on some pcs at session start in lieu of rudiments to get a cleaner needle.

This does not apply to Rudiments and Havingness Sessions or Prepcheck Sessions and Problems Intensives.

For a pc who is well smoothed out by staff auditors, then, and who is well under the goal finder's control, the following may be used, particularly with a Mark V Meter.

**START OF SESSION:**

Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

START OF SESSION. (Tone 40)

Has this session started for you? If pc says, "No," say again, "START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No," say, "We will cover it in a moment."

### ***RUDIMENTS:***

What goals would you like to set for this session?

Please note that Life or Livingness goals have been omitted, as they tend to remind the pc of present time difficulties and tend to take his attention out of the session.

At this point in the session there are two actions which could be undertaken: the running of General O/W or the running of Mid Rudiments using "Since the last time I audited you".

One would run General O/W if the pc was emotionally upset at the beginning of the session or if the session did not start for the pc, the latter being simply another indication of the pc's being upset or ARC broken, but those symptoms must be present, as sometimes the session hasn't started merely because of poor Tone 40 or because the pc had something he wanted to say before the auditor started the session.

### ***RUNNING O/W:***

If it is alright with you, I am going to run a short, general process.  
The process is: "What have you done?" "What have you withheld?"  
(The process is run very permissively until the needle looks smooth and the pc is no longer emotionally disturbed.)

Where are you now on the time track?  
If it is alright with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process. (After each command, ask, "When?")  
That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?  
End of process.

### ***RUNNING THE MID RUDIMENTS:***

One would use the Middle Rudiments with, "Since the last time I audited you", if the needle was rough and if the Tone Arm was in a higher position than it was at the end of the last session.

Since the last time I audited you has anything been suppressed? (This is always done by the repetitive system.)  
Since the last time I audited you, has anything been invalidated? Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suggested?  
Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you failed to reveal?  
Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you have been careful of?  
(These latter four rudiments are done by fast check.)

The "In this session" Mid Ruds can be used to straighten up a session that has completely gone out of the Auditor's control, after he has gotten in the Random Rudiment. "On this list" Mid Ruds, particularly with suppressed or invalidated can be used to get a pc to continue listing.

### ***RUNNING THE RANDOM RUDIMENT:***

In this session have I missed a withhold on you? In this session is there anything I failed to find out about you?

In this session have you thought, said, or done anything I failed to find out? In this session have I nearly found out something about you?

Any of the above versions may be used. The Random Rudiment is always run repetitively.

**END OF SESSION:**

Is it alright with you if we end off .....now? Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I do so?  
End of .....

If the pc from the Auditor's observation is very agitated or upset, the Auditor would run General O/W as given above.

If the session has been an extremely difficult session with the pc having been ARC broken badly and frequently, one would get in the "In this session" Mid Ruds in order to clean up the auditing, even though the pc may now be alright.

Have you made any part of your goals for this session?  
Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?

(After adjusting the meter) Please squeeze the cans.  
(If the squeeze test was not alright, the Auditor would run the pc's Havingness process until the can squeeze gives an adequate response.)

Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session? Is it alright with you if I end this session now?  
Here it is: END OF SESSION (Tone 40). Has this session ended for you?  
(If the pc says, "No," repeat, "END OF SESSION." If the session still has not ended, say, "You will be getting more auditing. END OF SESSION.") "Tell me I am no longer auditing you."

Please note that Havingness is run after Goals and Gains as this tends to bring the pc more into present time and to take his attention to a degree out of the session.

(Bulletin done by Mary Sue Hubbard after we worked it out)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.bh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
20—28 February 1963

** 6302C20	SHSBC-241	Talk on TV Demo—Finding RRs
** 6302C21	SHSBC-242	R-2 and R-3 Current Auditing Rundown
** 6302C26	SHSBC-243	R-3M Current Rundown by Steps
6302C27	SHSBC-246	TVD-17 Case Repair (Aud: LRH)
6302C27	SHSBC-246A	TVD-17A Case Repair (Aud: LRH)
6302C28	SHSBC-244	Goals Problems Mass

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 FEBRUARY AD13

CenOCon

*URGENT*

**GOALS CHECK**

Issue as Secretarial Executive Director:

All Goals and Reliable Items found on students, staff or HGC pcs must be checked out and seen to rocket read by a qualified executive or staff Class IV before being run.

Only Routine 3M is permitted as a clearing procedure and exactly as given in bulletins and tapes.

All Clears must be checked out by a qualified executive before being pronounced Clear by the Organization or reported to me as such.

No auditor may be permitted to audit staff members or HGC pcs or students who is not a regular staff member.

No auditor may use Routine Three unless qualified by the Staff Training Officer or the Academy.

No auditors not staff members may frequent the premises of the Organization for the purposes of obtaining private preclears.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 MARCH 1963

Central Orgs

*URGENT*

**ROUTINE 2-10, 2-12, 2-12A**

Cease to use Routine 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A in the HGC and Academy and on staff clearing except as follows:

Cases that RS on List One and whose goal cannot be found.

Cases that need R2- 10, 2-12 or 2-12A completed or repaired.

Why?

3M suddenly emerged and is simpler than R2-10, 2-12 or 2-12A.

An auditor can turn off somebody's RS and RR by using Routine 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A wrongly, thus making it harder to find the goal and do 3M.

Routine 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A can help find a goal. It can also submerge a goal when packages are not completed.

R2-10, 2-12, 2-12A Case Repair consists of completing any obvious package from *Existing* RIs.

3M, I repeat, emerged after Routine 2 and is easier to teach and use.

Do not leave a Routine 2 package of 4 from already found RIs incomplete because of this HCO Bulletin. Complete it. Avoid Long, Protested Listing as only this can mess up a pc's RR or RS.

Routine 2-12 may be taught in an Academy but not used on students' cases.

I am working on easily done Routine 2-GX which is a Goal Finding Routine consisting of the nearly exact pattern of a Problems Intensive but asking a different question, which adds up to listing times in the pc's life when his purpose was balked and assessing and running as in a Problems Intensive.

More goals are being delivered by ordinary Problems Intensives than by Routine 2- 12.

R2-12 is a highly successful process but fails in some hands.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH gl.bh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 MARCH AD 13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**USE OF THE BIG MIDDLE RUDIMENTS**

The Big Mid Ruds can be used in the following places:

At the start of any session. Examples:

“Since the last time I audited you \_\_\_\_\_”

“Since the last time you were audited \_\_\_\_\_”

“Since you decided to be audited \_\_\_\_\_”

In or at the end of any session. Example:

“In this session \_\_\_\_\_”

On a list. Examples:

“On this list \_\_\_\_\_”

“On (say list question) \_\_\_\_\_”

On a goal or item. Example:

“On (say goal or item) \_\_\_\_\_”

*Never say*

“On the goal, to catch catfish \_\_\_\_\_” or

“On the item, a catfish \_\_\_\_\_”

Say simply the goal itself or the item itself.

**ORDER OF BUTTONS**

Here is the correct wording and order of use for the Big Mid Ruds.

“ \_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suppressed?”

“ \_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been careful of?”

“ \_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have failed to reveal?”

“ \_\_\_\_\_ has anything been invalidated?”

“ \_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suggested?”

“ \_\_\_\_\_ has any mistake been made?”

“ \_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been anxious about?”

“ \_\_\_\_\_ has anything been protested?”

“ \_\_\_\_\_ has anything been decided?”

In using the first three buttons (Suppressed, Careful of and Failed to Reveal), the rudiment question should be asked directly of the pc off the meter (repetitive). When the pc has no more answers, check the question on the meter. If the question reads, stick with it on the meter like in Fast Rud checking until it is clean.

The last six buttons are cleaned directly on the meter as in Fast Ruds.

LRH:dr.bh  
Copyright ©1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 MARCH 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*URGENT*

**ROUTINE 2-10 2-12 2-12A**  
*(Also applies to Routine 3-M)*

**VANISHED RS OR RR**

A preclear whose Items while listing or whose Items when found Rockslam, can be said to be “capable of Rocket Reading or Rockslamming”.

If no RRs or RSes are seen on a preclear’s list or any list while listing and also if no Items RS when called back, the preclear can be said to be “incapable of Rocket Reading or Rockslamming”.

Some preclears are incapable of producing an RS or RR except on the first GPM goal when found. No matter how much Item listing is done, no matter from what source, no RR or RS is seen while listing and none is found when the list is complete. No technique to turn on a pc’s RS or RR will ever be found except one: *Find the pc’s goal for the 1st GPM.*

**WHAT MAKES RRs & RSes VANISH**

The thing which turns off a pc’s RR or RS is TOO MANY RELIABLE ITEMS FOUND WITHOUT FINDING THE PC’S GOAL.

This can be done by life or by Auditing. As it can be done by life, some raw meat pcs will not RR or RS. It can be surmised that they have been set about in life by too many Reliable Items in full view. For instance a pc has an RI, FATHER, an RI, POLITICIAN, an RI, CITY. His father is *politician* who insists on living in a *city*. These and others in his bank, although undisclosed, are yet restimulated, and this pc will *not* be seen to RS or RR on listing, and no RS or RR is likely to be seen even if an actual RI is found.

There is no use here for a more forceful way to get RIs. The rules are very plain, unvaried and uncompromising:

**RULE.** WHEN A PC’S RS OR RR IS OFF, STOP TRYING TO FIND MORE RIs.

No matter if you *could* find them, the RR or RS would just go more thoroughly off if you did.

**RULE:** FINDING MORE RIs WILL NOT TURN AN RR OR RS BACK ON.

There is a danger signal in this. The pc’s RR or RS starts getting smaller, Item by Item, RI by RI, get off fast. Let the last RI be the last one looked for. If just one more is found, bang, no RR or RS on this pc no matter what is “found” in the way of RIs.

**RULE:** COMPLETING R2 OR R3 PACKAGE WILL NOT TURN ON THE RR OR RS.

However don’t let the pc ARC Break on an incomplete list by starting one.

It may be possible to find one more RI that gives a feeble slam, but then you’ve had it.

However the picture is not all black. Pcs who were “incapable of RR or RS” have been subjected to 26 lists after with no RR or RS seen and still have recovered.

**RESTORING THE RR & RS**

The Rockslam and Rocket Read are brothers. A pc will Rockslam and yet not Rocket Read because the Rocket Read is the frailer brother. A pc going down hill toward no RR or RS first loses his RR. It now shows only as an RS. Then the RS vanishes too.

You can’t Prepcheck an RS into an RR on some pcs if the pc is on the way down toward no RR or RS. Ordinarily, however, a lot of RSes can be Prepchecked into RRing if there is an RR there to fire.

An RR as it expires may become an RS.

The ability to RR, then, goes out first. There is only one thing that restores the pc's ability to RR or RS.

**RULE: THE ONLY THING THAT WILL RESTORE THE ABILITY OF A PC TO RR OR RS IS TO FIND THE PC'S FIRST (or next) GPM GOAL.**

Naturally it is far easier to find a Rocket Read on a goal before the pc loses his ability to Rocket Read. It is far from impossible however to find a goal on a pc that is "incapable of RRing or RSing" and far from impossible to get it to RR by Prepcheck as the pc will always RR again on the right goal. Just listing goals eases the condition of "no RR or RS". And once an RR or RS that has been shut off is found again on the goal, the pc's RR or RS is "on again" on everything.

On some pcs, the goal is so charged that you will find an immediate Rocket Firing Blow Down of the TA. You get long Rocket Reads one after another as the pc realizes it is *the* goal. This is particularly true on some pcs who have had a lot of RIs found. In such a case you no more find *the* goal and Prepcheck it than you have to find another for the next GPM.

#### ALL ITEMS COUNT

ANY ITEM found by 3DXX, 3GA, 3GAXX, or even earlier "for running processes on" are ALL part of the GPM and must be put on the pc's Line Plot. It doesn't matter *how* they were found or by whom, or if they were checked out or not. They belong on the Line Plot and can be used to find goals.

**RULE: PUT ANY ITEM EVER FOUND ON THE PC BY ANY PROCESS ON THE LINE PLOT. EVERY ONE WILL ADD UP TO A GOAL.**

Therefore even "bad Items", Items that were found from representing RSing Items, backwards oppose Items, all belong on the Line Plot. It is understood here that there was some kind of an assessment. Whatever was found by any kind of an assessment since 1954 belongs on the Line Plot and can be used to help find goals.

#### FOUR RIs

In R2- 10, 2-12 and 2-12A you are allowed only four RIs before the pc's goal must be found.

If the RS or RR is seen to get smaller from one Item to the next, abandon 2-12 and begin 3-M goal finding *at once*. When you find the pc's goal, and when you are adding up and Prepchecking the first GPM, you will discover that everything found on the pc for the last nine years was part of his first or another GPM. So, old auditing paid off!

In view of this, on old pcs, it's safest to go for the goal as your first auditing action. You can use any Item ever found to help get that goal.

On raw meat pcs get a couple RIs if you can by R2-12 and use that to help find the goal. With luck one will even RR. But find the goal before opposing it.

#### SUMMARY

This discovery of *what* monitors the RS and RR of a pc is a very important one. I've worked ceaselessly on this since the first of the year and finally isolated it.

Even a 3rd goal clear isn't immune to losing his RS and RR if you keep finding scores of Items with no goal or a wrong goal.

So treat the RS and RR with respect when found, and find the pc's goal when he won't RS or RR and you've got it made. You don't need a better meter. Only the pc's goal.

This rules out unlimited R2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A on a pc. But these give you the two or four RIs necessary for easy goal finding so R2 is of value after all!

And I've a Prepcheck coming up that helps loosen up the pc's goal, so we're still all right.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 MARCH 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*URGENT*

**ROUTINE 2—ROUTINE 3**  
**ARC BREAKS, HANDLING OF**

(HCO Secs: Check this out thoroughly on all students and staff. D of T: Use this drill early in Practical, add to all Check Sheets.)

Some day you will be awfully glad you read and learned this HCO Bulletin.

The only things that can ruin the future of R2 and R3 are:

1. ARC Breaks because of bad R2 and R3; and
2. The Sad Effect.

**THE ARC BREAK**

There is nothing more nerve-racking to an auditor than an R2 or R3 ARC Break. They are not like other ARC Breaks from a common missed withhold. They are nerve-shattering and far reaching in consequence.

If you can't handle an R2 or R3 ARC Break you have no business using the techniques as you'll wrap more than one pc around a telephone pole. The only real damage R2 and R3 can do to a case is when one fails to handle an R2 or R3 ARC Break. Good R2 or R3 repairs bad R2 or R3, but one sometimes has to be awfully clever to repair a case once the auditor has let an ARC Break go by.

Indeed, so important is the ARC Break in R2 and R3 that it is actually used as one means of testing the correctness of the R2 or R3.

**CAUSE OF ARC BREAKS**

The untried auditor is always sure the R2 or R3 ARC Break happens because of *auditing* blunders (Mid Ruds, etc), failure to pull ordinary missed withholds or auditor auditing goofs. This is not true.

The truth is that R2 and R3 ARC Breaks are caused by a mistake in Goals, Items or GPMs, and that's the whole cause.

The pc, however, unable to grasp this, turns his reasoning upon the auditor and blames the auditing. Therefore, this rule must be thoroughly learned and experienced by the auditor before he or she is "safe" in auditing R2 and R3.

**ARC BREAK RULE**

IN R2 AND R3 WHEN THE PC CRITICIZES OR ATTACKS THE AUDITOR OR GOES INTO GRIEF OR APATHY, AN R2 OR R3 ERROR HAS *JUST* OCCURRED. THE AUDITOR MUST IGNORE THE PC'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE CAUSE OF THE ARC BREAK AND QUICKLY REMEDY THE R2 OR R3 AND DO *NOTHING ELSE*.

There are no exceptions to this rule in R2 and R3. The auditor, having goofed in some other way, is liable to see reason in what the pc is saying, do something like missed withholds or Mid Ruds and drive the ARC Break into heights that can make the pc much more upset.

**MID RUD RULE**

IN AN R2 OR R3 ARC BREAK, MISSED WITHHOLDS AND MID RUDS ARE USED, IF AT ALL, ONLY *AFTER* THE ARC BREAK HAS BEEN *HEALED* BY CORRECTING THE R2 AND R3.

If an auditor tries to get in his Mid Ruds or pull missed withholds in the face of an ARC Break in an R2 or R3 session the pc is likely to be driven down to the Sad Effect which is harder to salvage.

## THE SAD EFFECT

We could call this Tearaculi Apathia Magnus and everyone would be in great awe of it. But I see no reason to follow the Latinated nonsense of yesterday's failed sciences. Call it something simple and the auditor will feel he can do something about it and even the pc will cheer up a bit. So it's "the Sad Effect".

This is a state of great sadness, apathy, misery and desire for suicide and death.

I have been on the trail of the causes of this condition for about 20 years. Like nearly everything else in Scientology this is a new high point in achievement. We have the highest state, OT, and we have the lowest states of being recognized and know the roads to them.

### RULE

NEGLECT OR OVERWHELM AN R2 OR R3 ARC BREAK (PC ANGER OR ANTAGONISM) AND YOU WILL CAUSE THE PC TO DROP INTO THE SAD EFFECT.

THE SAD EFFECT IS CAUSED BY NEGLECTING OR OVERWHELMING AN R2 OR R3 ARC BREAK AND THE STATE WILL CONTINUE UNTIL REMEDIED BY CORRECTING THE R2 OR R3.

ALL PCS WHO ARE SAD, HOPELESS, ETC HAVE HAD THEIR R2 OR R3 MISHANDLED BY LIFE OR AUDITING.

### ARC BREAK CAUSE RULE

ALL R2 OR R3 ARC BREAKS STEM FROM WRONG ITEMS OR GOALS, INCOMPLETE LISTS, WRONG WAY TO OPPOSE OR NO AUDITING.

ALL THESE ARE IN ESSENCE MISSED WITHHOLDS OF THE GREATEST POSSIBLE MAGNITUDE AND THEREFORE CAUSE ARC BREAKS OF THE GREATEST POSSIBLE MAGNITUDE.

Bad *auditing* only serves to key in an existing R2 or R3 Error.

In actual fact, a missed withhold can amount to a whole section of the GPM (goal error or leaving the GPM section before it is clean), a wrong goal, a wrong Item, a wrong way to Item or, of lesser degree, not finding an Item.

THE COMMON DENOMINATOR OF ALL R2 R3 ARC BREAKS CONSISTS OF A MISSED OR WRONGLY DESIGNATED GPM, GOAL OR RELIABLE ITEM. THERE ARE NO OTHER SOURCES OF R2 OR R3 ARC BREAK.

Bad sessioning, poor auditing, ordinary life missed withholds are only contributive to R2 and R3 ARC Breaks and are incapable of doing more than keying in and intensifying the magnitude of the ARC Break which has already been caused by errors in R2 and R3.

## THE FIFTEEN PRINCIPAL CAUSES

The fifteen principal causes of ARC Break in R2 and R3 are:

1. Failure to complete a list;
2. By-passing an Item;
3. Giving the pc a wrong Item;
- 3a. Opposing an Item wrong way to;
4. Giving the pc an Item with altered wording;
5. Giving the pc no Item;
6. Failure to complete a goals list;
7. By-passing the pc's goal;
8. Giving the pc a wrong goal;
9. Giving the pc a goal with altered wording;
10. Giving the pc no goal;
11. Failure to complete a GPM before going to the next;
12. By-passing a GPM;
13. Getting the pc into the wrong GPM;
14. Going too far into a GPM without finding a goal;
15. No auditing.

The fifteen apply to *both* R2 and R3, all of them.

They can be made up into an assessment list (shortly to be issued), which list, assessed by elimination, will give you the exact cause of the ARC Break (which I think is pretty clever of me) and permit you to heal it *rapidly*. While you will feel on occasion that the assessment result is no more easily interpreted than fortune telling, you will find that it is always right. It spots the missed R2-R3 missed withhold. If it comes up “By-Passed Item” you’ll have a scramble trying to find it, but you at least know *why* the pc ARC Broke and the pc will permit you to look (even while screaming at you).

### THE CYCLE OF THE ARC BREAK

#### STAGE ONE:

The ARC Break starts always in the same way. The pc finds something wrong with the auditor, the subject, or tools of auditing or the auditing room. He does this in varying intensity, ARC Break to ARC Break.

#### STAGE TWO:

This is followed by misemotion, also directed at the auditor, subject, tools or room.

#### STAGE THREE:

If the auditor continues on with auditing the pc will drop into grief, sadness or apathy.

This is an inevitable cycle and may be followed by the pc with greater or lesser intensity of emotion, or loudness or lack of response.

A skilled auditor will recognize and stop it at Stage One above. It is sometimes not possible to stop the cycle because it enters the stages and completes them too swiftly, but it must be cared for, and no further R2 or R3 may be done until the R2 or R3 is corrected.

### THE AUDITOR’S VIEW

The auditor must realize that the ARC Break is caused by an error which has *just* occurred—within seconds or minutes, and must not go back a half a dozen sessions unless the pc has been pretty upset all along. Something has *just* happened, usually, that is wrong R2 or R3.

The auditor *must* stop all forward action and must not do *anything* except correct what has already happened. Do not continue on, do not get in Mid Ruds, do not pull missed withholds or do anything else but correct the R2 and R3. Do not do new lists or new approaches or new actions until the old action is straightened up.

To continue is to produce the Sad Effect. If the pc is already in the Sad Effect at session start, treat it as an ARC Break with the Drill given.

The pc does not realize that anything has been missed. He or she thinks it’s the auditor, the subject or the tools and will target only these. The fact of the ARC Break *must* be noted and the substance of the criticism *must* be ignored by the auditor.

If the pc knew what had been missed there would be no ARC Break. The missed withhold of the Item or whatever is not only missed by the auditor but by the pc. The pc won’t ever spot it, left on his own. It’s up to the auditor.

The auditor *only* must make up his or her mind as to what’s wrong. The directions of the pc (even a skilled Scientologist as a pc) are *nearly always wrong*. The auditor is there to listen and compute. As it’s the pc’s bank, the pc *can’t* compute on his or her own case. Taking the pc’s directions will always involve and prolong the ARC Break. What *really* caused it will be occluded to the pc. Don’t always do something *different* than what the pc says. By averages the pc might have accidentally hit on it. Just do what is necessary to straighten out the R2 and R3. Just don’t depend on the pc to tell you. Know your R2 and R3. You, the auditor, are the only one present who can think clearly. That’s what you’re for.

### THE D OF P’S VIEW

The D of P has a different view of an ARC Break. It is by sessions according to auditors’ reports.

To get a case going again that has gone into Stage Three, examine yesterday’s reports. Look for a change in pc’s goals and gains and correct the session before the one in which they changed.

When an auditing supervisor becomes an auditor he or she carries this habit forward into auditing and presented with an ARC Breaking pc in session, tends to look to yesterday. But in a session, the ARC Breaking action usually occurs only seconds or minutes before the ARC Break. Look there when auditing.

### THE DRILL

This drill is to be used in all Practical Sections before the student is turned loose on R2 or R3.

Designation: R2 and R3 Drill One.

Purpose: To prevent errors in R2 and R3 and to prevent upsets in the pc's case.

Theory: The effort of a pc at the start of an ARC Break is to stop the auditor. The pc's effort is aimed at the auditor's skill, person, the subject, auditing tools or the room. The comments are critical, whether jocular or misemotional. When this effort fails to stop the auditor, and the auditor presses on with auditing, the pc is overwhelmed and goes rapidly down tone scale. In a severe R2 or R3 ARC Break the pc will stay down scale for minutes, hours, days, weeks or months until the ARC Break is repaired by correcting the R2 or R3 error made immediately before the ARC Break. The correct action is to prevent all possibility of the auditor becoming too enturbulated to think, prevent all engagement in refutation of the pc's accusations, give the auditor time and calm to correct the R2 or R3, test the correction by seeing if it stops the ARC Break, and only then re-commence the session. The key is that even the most startled auditor, seeing an ARC Break begin, can associate it with the word "Break".

The drill is always used in actual sessions even when the auditor thinks he knows the reason for it.

*Drill:*

Auditor: List the Items in this room.

Coach: Privately makes up his mind which of the ARC Break points is wrong. Does auditing command briefly and then unexpectedly criticizes (with greater or lesser violence) auditor, room, tools, subject or self or drops into simulated tears or apathy.

Auditor: Thank you. We will now take a short break. (Gathers papers and leaves room. Shuffles papers and returns into room.)

Auditor: I would like to do a short assessment on you.

(Auditor does actual E-Meter assessment from a standard HCO Bulletin question list which will be provided from time to time, based on the Principal Causes of R2-R3 ARC Breaks. Finds the one the coach was hiding by actual meter reaction.)

Auditor: I find we have (gives cause found) and we will now locate it. Is that all right with you?

Coach: Okay.

Auditor: The session is resumed.

Coach: That's it.

In actual practice the auditor would have examined the papers of the pc to come to some conclusion about the case in private and seen what was wrong or seen the D of P or somebody else for help. And then would have confirmed it by assessment.

History: Developed at Saint Hill by L. Ron Hubbard in March AD 13, to prevent severe upsets in R2 and R3.

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 18 MARCH 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**R2—R3**

**IMPORTANT DATA  
DON'T FORCE THE PC**

*Never force a pc to list when doing R2- 12 or 3-M, especially 3-M.*

If the pc has difficulty listing, three things may be wrong:

1. The Item being listed is wrong way to;
2. It may be a Wrong Item (even from another GPM);
3. It may be an Item from some other GPM.

A pc actually can't help but list easily if it's the right Item that the list is coming from.

In the usual case, listing from a right Item requires only the most occasional giving of the auditing question by the auditor. Once at the start of the list, once after each interruption to check something. Between, the pc just gives Items in a steady flow. Occasionally the pc asks for the question.

If the auditor has to give a question for each Item he gets, Man there's one of the above 3 *wrong*.

**WRONG WAY TO**

Mass moves *in* on a wrong way to list question. It's being given, "Who or what would loud voices oppose" and it should be "Who or what would oppose loud voices".

If it's wrong: (1) the mass moves in; (2) the pc starts to discolor; (3) the pc has to continuously repeat the question to himself; (4) the pc can't wrap his mind around the question; (5) the pc discolours or darkens; (6) the tone arm goes unreasonably high (above 5 in some cases); (7) the pc may ARC Break.

If in the presence of such symptoms the *auditor forces* the pc to go on listing, real trouble can then develop, as the mass caves in on the body.

**BODY VS THETAN**

To understand this trouble we have to review what we have known for years about bodies and thetans. The thetan is not the body.

The bank belongs to the thetan, not to the body.

You are running a thetan and his bank while helped and hindered by the body.

The body helps the auditor because it provides a communication relay to a thetan who cannot yet speak, hear or act without a body. The E-Meter cans are held by the body's hands, the body's voice box magnifies the thetan's speech and body lips, larynx, etc, add diction. The ears magnify the auditor's voice. The body relays various senses and somatics to the thetan. The body discolours when mass from the bank is brought in on it.

Further, because he is in a body you can tell if the pc is sitting in the pc's chair (joke).

The body hinders the auditor by being fragile.

Life, long before auditing, has been keying the thetan's masses in on this body.

In auditing, masses are released off the body and out of the thetan's bank.

The body, accustomed after all to masses keying in on it in life, can still survive a lot of bad auditing. But why?

As you go earlier and earlier in the bank the "power" of the thetan's mock-ups increases. Earlier on the track the thetan was more powerful and made more formidable mock-ups.

Thus the earlier the GPM you are addressing (certainly beyond the 3rd), the more care you have to use not to pull masses in on the body, which is to say the more accurate you have to be.

Now, as the thetan, by clearing GPMs, becomes more and more able to handle and recognize goals and Items, the auditor tends to more and more abandon the safety points of R3-M. These are, testing the goal, making the oppterm-terminal test for each RI, watching the tendency of the needle to tighten, watching for pc's darkening. Abandoning these, the auditor tends to race on, finding more GPMs, goals and RIs, cleaning up nothing behind him. This is wrong.

Test the goal after every RI you find; test every RI you find for terminal or oppterm; really stay alert for the tightening needle and high TA that shows an error; watch carefully for pc darkening. The more advanced the GPM, the more careful you have to be of the body.

Don't go plunging on after an ARC Break. Find why by the ARC Break assessment and straighten it up.

When you complete a GPM, go about 2 Items deep into the next one, find its goal and then go back and put in the BMRs on every Item in the former line plot. and give the gone goal an 18 button prepcheck. Only then, proceed on into the next GPM whose goal has been found.

Items get easier to find as you advance into new GPMs, lists get shorter, but the RIs are harder and harder on the body when done wrong.

So be sure and *then* proceed.

And if the pc won't list for *any* reason (even his own balkiness) find out what's wrong *before* the current action and be sure that was it before proceeding. It's easier to lose session time in looking for former errors than in trying to revive a pc or heal a screaming ARC Break.

Even the most accurate auditing gives the pc heavy somatics. That's ok. Just don't force the pc beyond where he can easily go. The real howling ARC Breaks *only* come after you have forced the pc onward after something has gone wrong.

If you have howling ARC Breaks with a pc you have forced the pc into a channel where the pc cannot easily go.

### WRONG ITEM

Listing a completely wrong Item (which did not fire or which did) can happen in a number of ways:

If you list an RI wrong way to you will get a high TA and fewer RRs on the list. Further, you may just run out of RRs on the next list or one or two lists down.

And, a real catastrophe, you can find, on a wrong way oppose, an Item out of an adjacent GPM for which you have no found goal. The Item you find won't fit the goal of the GPM you are supposed to be running. Best thing to do is abandon it (but put on the plot) and go back and find which RI behind you was wrong way oppose (it will tick or fire), put in the BMRs on it and list it the other way to.

On later GPMs the pc will easily overlist and list beyond the one you are trying for and get the next in line. The way to tell is test the listing question for clean every five Items the pc gives. The moment it's clean, stop listing.



For instance, in the 4th GPM, you are listing “Somebody Who Can’t Whisper” (Line plot HCO Bulletin of March 13) and you overlist. You will get “Loud Voices” on the list but you will find “A Whisperer” as the last RRing Item which will read. Then, if you omit the term-oppterm test and assume “A Whisperer” is an oppterm, you will do a wrong way oppose and may get into another GPM entirely.

However, especially after BMR on it, “A Whisperer”, wrong way opposed, will now fire again with an RR.

But the pc still ARC Breaks. Why? You overshoot on the “Somebody Who Can’t Whisper” oppose list and you have a by-passed RI, “Loud Voices”.

BMR the RRs earlier on the “Somebody Who Can’t Whisper” oppose list and you’ll find “Loud Voices” probably fires now. Or do it by pc’s recognition (but the Item recognized has to fire with an RR). Or when you do “A Whisperer” right way oppose, you’ll also get “Loud Voices”.

Auditing on 3-M is like threading through a mine field with the pc ready to explode if you stray.

Experience will let you relax.

### TRAVELLING RR

In Listing the RR travels down the list. It comes from the goal charge. Therefore it can travel. You can sometimes bring it back up a list with enough BMR to an earlier RR seen on listing.

The most weird thing in 3-M is the Goal as an RI behaviour (on Mar 13 HCO Bulletin, “To Scream” as an RI, bottom of plot, page 2).

As you list it, as an RI in its proper sequence on the plot, not as a goal oppose, it behaves as an RI oppose list, not as a source list.

On it the pc will put, usually, the goal of the next GPM. On it will usually be found, as the last RR Item on the list, “Happy People”. But the goal of the next GPM on that list will not RR when said to pc! Not until you take all the goals off the RI oppose list and nul them as a *goals* list. *Then* the goal of the next GPM will fire and prove out.

In short, only the last RR seen on nulling on an RI oppose list, will fire with an RR.

This does not mean the remaining Items seen to RR while listing are not RIs in their own right. It only means that on any list, the RR travels to the last RRing Item seen on listing when the list is complete.

Items which RRed on listing will not fire as part of the list but, taken off the list and known by the pc to be *off* the list and called as themselves will RR.

When you get a pc into the 5th GPM this becomes very invariable and gets vastly in your road, as you can by-pass the next RI you should get and find the one after that, or you can lose the next GPM’s goal as it doesn’t RR on the RI oppose list from the last goal while still on that list.

It’s okay if you know it can happen. It will help you cure an ailing line plot or goals list in a hurry.

RRs travel on 3-M lists down to the last RR. And if it has travelled, the earlier RRs (Items or Goals on an RI List) seen on listing will not RR until they have been taken off that list and are called in their own right.

### WRONG WORDING

Always be sure you have the right wording for an Item or a goal.

A slightly wrong wording for a goal will cause it to RS and fizzle out.

Get the pc to change the wording on it and it may RR on and on.

If a pc ARC Breaks on a goals list, you had and passed the goal *or you* had the goal with a slightly wrong wording. The pc still ARC Breaks on a wrong wording as it's a missed withhold.

Pcs usually put down varied wordings on goals lists. Encourage it, even though it's representing an RRing Item. If a goal fires, RSeS, fizzles, vanishes, get other wordings for it. And it may RR beautifully.

Example: To Succeed. On checking, RRed six times, blew TA down, RSed madly. RSed, dwindled and then ticked. Auditor went on. Pc ARC broke. Auditor went back over list, got wording for To Succeed as "To be successful". Goal RRed beautifully. No ARC Break. Onward bound into next GPM.

Items with the article "A" or "The" omitted or added, or plural for singular, will not fire well or at all.

Example: Item listed "A Sensation". Checked out as "Sensation". No fire. Pc recalls it should be "A Sensation". Item fires and is an RI.

Accuracy of listing exactly what the pc said is important. He usually said it right the first time. Say it back and check it out the same way.

Sometimes a pc wants to change a word in an Item being called. Always let him but check both versions, the one listed and the one changed. The one listed is usually right if recorded right by the auditor.

#### ITEM FROM ANOTHER GPM

A *STRAY RI* is an RI from a GPM of another goal than the one being worked.

*You can* get a goal or Item from another GPM by backwards oppose or overlisting.

In finding the goal of another GPM than the one you want to enter, this is easy. It fires *very* badly, ticks and fools around.

An RI from another GPM on the other hand fires well. When you do the "How does the goal relate to " step and the pc can't relate it, or mass appears when he tries, watch it. You probably have a backwards oppose behind you or have by-passed an RI by overlisting or underlisting, or, more probably, both.

What to do? Put the stray RI on the plot marked as a "Stray" and locate the wrong way oppose or by-pass on your Line Plot and correct.

It will do no harm to 4 way package the STRAY RI. But it probably won't do any good either. Two GPMs later you suddenly find it as a new RI.

The pc will probably ARC Break at this time. *But* the reason for the ARC Break lies in an earlier wrong way oppose or a by-passed RI or RIs.

Use the STRAY RI as a signal that a wrong way oppose exists behind you or an RI has been by-passed.

The proper order of actions, if the above happens, is to

1. Locate the By-Passed Item;
2. Use *it* to continue your RI oppose (spiral staircase);
3. Ignore the wrong way oppose Item (don't instantly right way oppose it) and any stray RI, letting them come up in their proper sequence, no matter how much later that is.

#### MINIMIZE GOAL OPPOSE LISTS

Only do a goal oppose list at the start of the first GPM and that's it. You don't

need any more if you go right. You'll go into GPMs in proper sequence on the spiral staircase with no further goal oppose lists for any goal.

You will find, however, that the goal as an RI (see "To Scream" as an RI, page 2, HCO Bulletin March 13, 1963) operates as an RI oppose list and will be done in its proper time and place. This is *not* a source list and behaves as an RI oppose list.

Take the goals *off it* to another list and nul them for the next GPM.

Only one Goal Oppose List is needed for a case.

After that, always use the last RI that still fires with an RR as your source for RI oppose lists.

#### CLEAR TEST

You don't need to do a Clear Test. It might mess up the bank.

A natural free needle without prepcheck begins to appear around the fifth GPM.

Check out a first goal clear by his or her Line Plot. If it compares in all respects to that of HCO Bulletin March 13, and the goal is clean saying it to the pc, call it a first goal clear.

A bracelet clear would be, actually, a theta clear, and would emerge after the 5th to 8th GPM had been cleaned up.

By present calculation a free needle, totally stable theta clear emerges after the 8th GPM has been run.

No calculation on Operating Thetan exists at this moment, but at a guess, it's *well* beyond the 8th GPM.

Up to the 6th GPM a clear test is liable to foul up the case a little. So save it for later and really send up rockets in celebration.

Thetans have done a lot of living.

-----

Routine 3-M is complex and, unless the auditor is well trained, has pitfalls.

But we have years to learn it.

Clearing is the real thing.

It's worth it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 19—21 March 1963

** 6303C19	SHSBC-250	R-3M How to Find Goals
** 6303C20	SH TVD-18	Rudiments and Havingness Session and Short Lecture (Aud: LRH)
** 6303C21	SHSBC-251	R-2G Series

Franchise

## CLEAR & OT

DON'T TRY TO MAKE AN OT BEFORE YOU MAKE A CLEAR.

One of the enduring observations which has arisen in clearing and which will always remain true is summed up in this line:

DON'T TRY TO MAKE AN OT BEFORE YOU MAKE A CLEAR.

Stressing this conclusion is vitally important and will always be important. Why?

In their understandable enthusiasm to do "the most for the pc" and obtain the "highest gain" auditors tend to get as many RIs and goals as possible. The "face" acquired in making a "third goal clear" also operates.

On the part of the pc there is always some pc pressure to "get on with it", find more RIs, find more goals. There is also "face". "I'm a 3rd goal clear."

The auditor, in his own enthusiasm for more GPMs, heeds the pc's protest against case repair and prepchecks and commits the following crime:

WITHOUT MAKING A FIRST GOAL, ATTEMPTS TO MAKE AN OT.

He does this in gradients. Without making an actual first goal clear, the auditor, with the pc's full insistence, makes a "Third Goal Clear".

This law takes over in the face of such "press on" tactics:

**RULE: YOU CANNOT HAVE AN ANY GOAL CLEAR WITHOUT CLEARING THE GOAL AND ALL ITS GPM.**

To do this it is necessary to observe this rule:

**RULE. A GOAL IS NOT CLEAR UNTIL ALL ROCKET READING ITEMS IN THAT GOAL HAVE BEEN FOUND, PROPERLY ALIGNED AND DISCHARGED, AND THE GOAL HAS BEEN FULLY PREPCHECKED.**

The next Goal is available and easily found, RIs in the next GPM are readily found, there seems to be no reason to waste auditing time by cleaning up the last GPM. This is true of *any* next GPM.

However, just going on and on carries its penalties.

IF WE PERSIST IN FAILING TO FULLY CLEAR EACH GPM, WE CAN EXPECT A GENERAL BOG DOWN IN ALL OF SCIENTOLOGY.

Why? Because we will all become subject to the very real penalties of failing to clear GPMs before going on.

It is alright to find 2 RIs into the next GPM and to find its goal. That is as it should be. But it is *not* alright not to go back and fully polish up the GPM just left. This is true for all GPMs.

You haven't *got* a first goal clear if you haven't cleared the first GPM and Goal.

So don't announce first goal clears if you haven't cleared fully the first goal. Having the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, etc, goals and some RIs in each *still* doesn't make a *first* goal clear.

The following liabilities occur when the GPM just left is not fully cleaned up:

1. The pc drags mass from the last GPM into the next GPM;
2. Accuracy of RI finding in the next GPM is diminished;
3. The pc, being more subject to errors in auditing, is far more likely to heavily ARC Break;
4. Body mass (weight) does not diminish;
5. Pc's reality on the next GPM RIs is diminished;
6. A feeling of lassitude (a shadow of the Sad Effect) comes over the pc and he or she does his own work in life with less enthusiasm;
7. The pc's health and actions are better but one does not see what one expects from clearing. Therefore clearing is downgraded by the auditor and pc and others;
8. The actual soaring gains of clearing are not observed, since the GPM and its goal are not actually cleared but only de-intensified.

Clear tests, which will be issued from time to time, should be scrupulously passed before going on to the actual running of the next bank.

If these simple precautions are observed, clearing is formidable to behold. If they are not observed, then clearing won't be observed-because it hasn't been done.

Don't try to make an Operating Thetan before you make a clear. The results will be far, far below that of just first goal clear.

A lot of time and agony went into discovering these things. I hope you will benefit by them.

L. RON HUBBARD

LREl:dr.bh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

26 March—4 April 1963

** 6303C26	SHSBC-252	Case Repair
** 6303C27	SHSBC-254	TVD-19 Sec Checking, Talk by LRH
6303C28	SHSBC-253	The GPM
** 6304C02	SHSBC-256	Line Plot, Items
** 6304C04	SHSBC-255	Anatomy of the GPM

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 13 APRIL AD13

Franchise

**ROUTINE 2-G**  
**ORIGINAL ROUTINE 2, 3GA, 2-10, 2-12,**  
**2-12A AND OTHERS SPECIALLY ADAPTED**

**GOALS FINDING**  
**DESIGNATION OF ROUTINES**

Now that Class II Auditors may find goals, a great deal of material about goals finding can be released to them.

Goal finding activities are now designated as follows:

**ROUTINE 2-G1**

Special Goals Prepcheck administered before a goal is found. This is a refined version of the Problems Intensive, slanted directly at goals.

**ROUTINE 2-GPH**

Special Goals Prepcheck done by Pre-Hav levels with a new assessment for each button. This is a refined use of the original Routine 2.

**ROUTINE 2-G2**

Listing and nulling goals lists, using Left-Hand Buttons on last ones in and Big Mid Ruds on the final goal left in. Done in short lists, a couple pages listed and nulled at a time. This is a refined version of the oldest goals finding process.

**ROUTINE 2-G3**

Using any Items ever found on pc to list goals against, and using the method of R2-G2 to find the goal. This is a refined version of 3-GA and 3-GAXX and also uses all 2-10, 2-12 RIs ever found.

**ROUTINE 2-G4**

Listing special lists for RSing or RRing Items without nulling and using the RSing or RRing Items seen on listing to list goals against. This is a new use of 3D, 3GA, 2-10, 2-12.

**ROUTINE 2-G5**

This is Routine 2-10, 2-12, 2-12A wherein everything known about or gained by those processes is used to find RIs and list goals against all RIs found.

It can be seen from the above that everything known about the original Routine 2 and goals finding is now reworked into these Routine 2-Gs for rapid and positive goal finding by Class II Auditors.

Subsequent HCO Bulletins will detail each of these routines in turn. They are quite stable as processes and have been in use for some time.

Note: Everything released or known about Routines 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A is valid, and the results of these on preclears and any RI ever found on a preclear is used for the purpose of listing goals and finding the preclear's goal. None of this material or study of it has been wasted. Any RI ever found on a pc is useful in goals listing.

Further, every Problems Intensive brought the pc closer to his or her goal and an easier run on Routine 3 processes.

Whereas R2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A worked in their own right, they are even more useful in finding goals. The only danger of 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A was: If too many RIs were found without finding the pc's goal for that GPM, the ability of the pc to RR and RS would shut off. The RR and RS turn back on the moment the goal for that GPM is found.

A close study of the R2-Gs is necessary to their workability. And needless to remark, the only reason any Scientology process works lies in adherence to the highly specialized auditing skill of Scientology with its TRs and complete attention to the precise form of the session itself.

Without this pure auditing form, Scientology processes will not work. Scientology processes do not work when administered outside the Auditor's Code and without skillfully practised TRs. The loose "disciplines" of psychoanalysis, psychiatry, medicine and psychology are completely inadequate in the administration of Scientology processes. Completely aside from the fact that Scientology does not address healing, no psychologist, psychiatrist, psychoanalyst or medical doctor is authorized to use Scientology by reason of a medical or philosophical degree. Only a fully qualified auditor, properly certificated by an authorized Academy may lawfully use Scientology processes or data.

Only auditors trained to the level of Class II may use Routine 2 processes.

Routine 2 and Routine 3 processes are designed for use in clearing the human spirit and are not to be used in healing or physical treatment.

HGCs may only clear and may not otherwise apply Scientology processes.

The public is warned not to accept Scientology processing except from Academy trained auditors and is additionally warned not to embark on being cleared except by a properly certified auditor in consultation with a Class IV clearing consultant. The rewards of clearing are enormous. The perils of clearing in unskilled hands are too numerous to mention.

It is with these understandings that the Routine 2-Gs are released to Class II Auditors.

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

6304C16	SHSBC-257	Top of GPM
** 6304C18	SHSBC-258	Directive Listing
6304C20	PAC- 1	Clearing
6304C20	PAC-2	Clearing
** 6304C23	SHSBC-259	Goals Problems Mass
** 6304C25	SHSBC-260	Finding Goals
** 6304C30	SHSBC-261	Directive Listing

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 APRIL 1963

Central Orgs  
Academies

## **METER READING TRS**

### ***DEFINITIONS***

#### ***An Instant Read***

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.

HCO B May 25, 1962

#### ***An Instant Rudiment Read***

On Rudiments, repetitive or fast, the instant read can occur anywhere within the last word of the question or when the thought major has been anticipated by the preclear, and must be taken up by the auditor. This is not a prior read. Preclears poorly in session, being handled by auditors with indifferent TR One, anticipate the instant read reactively as they are under their own control. Such a read occurs into the body of the last meaningful word in the question. It never occurs latent.

HCO B July 21, 1962

#### ***A Needle Reaction***

Rise, fall, speeded rise, speeded fall, double tick (dirty needle), theta bop or any other action.

HCO B May 25, 1962

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".

HCO B May 25, 1962

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.

HCO B May 25, 1962

## **E-METER TR 20**

### ***PURPOSE.***

To familiarise student with an E-Meter.

### ***POSITION:***

Coach and student sit facing each other with an E-Meter in front of the student, either on a table or a chair.

### ***COMMANDS:***

"Reach for the meter" "Withdraw from the meter". Questions given alternately.

### ***TRAINING STRESS:***

Coach to see that student does command each time. Coach asks from time to



time, “How are you doing?” Coach also takes up any comm lag or physical manifestation with a “What happened?”

*HISTORY:*

Developed by L. Ron Hubbard, September 1962, at Saint Hill. Recompiled by Reg Sharpe, Course Secretary Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, April 1963.

E-METER TR 21

*PURPOSE:*

To train student to read an E-Meter accurately, speedily and with certainty.

*POSITION:*

Coach and student sit facing each other. Student has an E-Meter (switched on) and coach holds the cans.

*PATTER:*

*Coach:* “Define a needle reaction.”

*Coach:* “Define an instant read.”

*Coach:* “Define a rudiment instant read.”

Student should give with a high degree of accuracy the definitions in this bulletin. If it is not so, coach reads definition and has student repeat it.

*Coach:* “Take a phrase from the bulletin, say it to me and observe the meter.”

When the student has done this coach asks the following questions:

1. “Did you get a needle reaction?” “What was it?” “Where was it?”
2. “Did you get a rudiment instant read?” “What was it?”
3. “Did you get an instant read?” “What was it?”

*TRAINING STRESS:*

Coach needs to keep control of the coaching session. He should not depart from the above questions. If student is in any doubt at any time coach asks for a definition of whatever is being handled. Example: Student: “I’m not sure if I had a reaction.” Coach: “Define a needle reaction.” When student has done so, coach repeats question, “Did you get a needle reaction?” and continues thus until student gives a definite answer.

Any hesitancy or any failure on the part of the student to observe a read is queried with a “What happened?” Occasionally ask student, “How are you doing?”

This drill needs to be coached exactly as outlined above. Student is very likely to start blowing confusion. Don’t Q & A with it. No flunks, no evaluation or invalidation.

*HISTORY:*

Developed by Reg Sharpe from the materials of L. Ron Hubbard at Saint Hill, April 1963, to improve E-Meter reading rapidly and without student being invalidated by another student who does not know how to read a meter.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 APRIL 1963

Central Orgs  
Academies

## **MODERNIZED TRAINING DRILLS USING PERMISSIVE COACHING**

Much of the difficulty experienced in teaching the TRs and getting students proficient in the TRs is due to bad coaching. This bulletin is issued to overcome this difficulty. It is in fact an amendment of HCO Bulletin of April 17, 1961, which as itself remains valid.

The essence of this bulletin is that the drills do not permit the coach to “flunk” a student, instead an exact patter is laid down for the coach and instructors should ensure that the coach keeps to the patter.

TR 0 has been subdivided into 4 parts.

One new drill is introduced—“The Coaches’ Drill”.

The TRs are important because:

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.
2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.
3. If the TRs are not well learned early in the HPA/HCA BScn/HCS Courses, THE BALANCE OF THE COURSE WILL FAIL AND INSTRUCTORS AT UPPER LEVELS WILL BE TEACHING NOT THEIR SUBJECTS BUT TRS.
4. Almost all confusions on Meter, Model Sessions and SOP Goals stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. SOP Goals will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

Academies were tough on TRs up to 1958 and have since tended to soften. Comm Courses are not a tea party.

These TRs given here should be put in use at once in all auditor training, in Academy and HGC and in the future should never be relaxed. Seven weeks on a Comm Course until he does the TRs perfectly lets the student receive at least one week’s training in the eight. A poor Comm Course in one week can wipe out the whole eight weeks.

**NUMBER: TR 0. Revised 1961 and 1963.**

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart— about three feet. Student has an E-Meter.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to *hold* a position three feet in front of a preclear, to BE there and not do anything else but BE there.

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten. It will be found the student tends to confront WITH a body part, rather than just confront, or to use a system of confronting rather than just BE there. The drill is misnamed if Confront means to DO something to the pc. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to BEING THERE three feet in front of a preclear without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. After a student has become able to just sit there for two hours “bull baiting” can begin. Anything added to being there is queried by the coach with a “What happened?” Twitches, blinks, sighs, fidgets, anything except just being there is promptly queried with the reason why, if necessary. TR 0 has been divided into four parts. Each part is drilled for about 15 minutes in turn and then begun over again and again.

#### TR 0 (A)

This is exactly as given above except that “bull baiting” is omitted. Whenever student speaks, fidgets, giggles, is embarrassed or goes anaten coach says, “That’s it, what happened?” Coach listens carefully to what student has to say, acknowledges and says, “Start.” In fact, coach will do the foregoing whenever he sees any physical action or change, however small, manifested by the student. It is also desirable from time to time that the coach says, “That’s it, how are you doing?”, listens carefully to what student says, acknowledges and then says start.

No flunks, no invalidation or validation other than giving a win from time to time as merited.

#### TR 0 (B)

Exactly as TR 0 (A) with the addition that student is required by coach to answer the following questions which are given alternately:

“What can you see about me that you like?”

“What can you see about me that you don’t like?”

Coach acknowledges each answer without invalidation, validation or evaluation. Coach asks “What happened?” whenever there is any physical manifestation on the part of the student or whenever there is an overlong comm lag. Coach also asks from time to time “How are you doing?”

#### TR 0 (C)

In this part bull baiting is introduced, otherwise it is exactly as TR 0 (A). Patter as a confronted subject: The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The students’ “buttons” can be found and tromped on hard. Any words not coaching words may receive *no* response from the student. If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above).

Instructors should have coaches let students have some wins (coach does not mention these) and then, by gradient stress, get the coaches to start in on the student to invite flunks. This is “bull baiting”. The student is queried each time he or she reacts, no matter how minutely, to being baited.

#### TR 0 (D)

This drill has been designed to put the finishing touches to a TR 0. It needs to be done very thoroughly and with plenty of interest on the part of the coach. It is run as follows:

1. Coach says to student, “Define a good auditing attitude.” He accepts student’s definition.
2. Coach says, “Show me a good auditing attitude.”

3. After a few minutes coach asks the following questions:
  - (a) “Did you show me a good auditing attitude?”
  - (b) “What did you do?”
  - (c) “What happened?”
4. Actions 2 and 3 are repeated two or three times, then start over again at 1.
5. When the “Good auditing attitude” is being done well substitute “an interested attitude” or “a professional attitude” or “an understanding attitude”. All these “attitudes” should be drilled thoroughly. Further, coach should take any attitude the student presents, e.g. if student uses in his definition the words “It’s being there” coach makes a mental note to use it later. Example: “Define a ‘being there’ attitude.” “Show me a ‘being there’ attitude. “

The whole of TR 0 should be taught rough-rough-rough and not left until the student can do it. Training is considered satisfactory at this level only if the student can BE three feet in front of a person without flinching, concentrating or confronting with, regardless of what the confronted person says or does.

**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be “interesting”. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised 1963 by Reg Sharpe.

**NUMBER: TR 1. Revised 1961 and 1963.**

**NAME:** Dear Alice.

**PURPOSE:** To train the student to deliver a command newly and in a new unit of time to a preclear without flinching or trying to overwhelm or using a via.

**COMMANDS:** A phrase (with the “he says” omitted) is picked out of the book “Alice in Wonderland” and read to the coach.

**POSITION:** Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart. Student has an E-Meter.

**TRAINING STRESS:** The command goes from the book to the student and, as his own, to the coach. It must not go from book to coach. It must sound natural not artificial. Diction and elocution have no part in it. Loudness may have.

(A) When student has delivered a phrase coach asks student the following:

1. “Did you own the phrase?”
2. “Did you deliver it in a new unit of time?”
3. “Where did the communication start from?”
4. “Where did the communication land?”

If student is in difficulty or confused by the drill, coach reads the purpose of the drill and the training stress and has student clear the purpose and the training stress.

(B) After a short while the following is introduced.

Coach tells student, “Create the space of the coaching session by locating 4 points in front of you and four points behind you.” This is done on a gradient scale until student is doing the drill comfortably. Coach just asks, “Did you do that?”

Then “A” above is reintroduced and the coach asking from time to time, “Did you create the space?” If student has difficulty coach goes back to getting student to locate the four points in front and the four points behind.

This drill is passed only when the student can put across a command naturally, without strain or artificiality or elocutionary bobs and gestures, and when the student can do it easily and relaxedly.

**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard 1961 to increase auditing ability. Revised 1963 by Reg Sharpe with the advices of L. Ron Hubbard.

**NUMBER: TR 2. Revised 1961 and 1963.**

**NAME:** Acknowledgments.

**PURPOSE:** To teach student that an acknowledgment is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgment is a full stop. Also that an acknowledgment lets a pc know that he has answered an auditing command.

**COMMANDS:** The coach reads lines from “Alice in Wonderland” omitting “He saids” and the student thoroughly acknowledges them.

**POSITION:** Student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart. Student with an E-Meter.

**TRAINING STRESS:** To teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so preclear knows it was heard. To ask student from time to time what *was* said. To curb over and under acknowledgment. To teach him that an acknowledgment is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on.

To teach further that one can fail to get an acknowledgment across or can fail to stop a pc with an acknowledgment or can take a pc’s head off with an acknowledgment. Patter: The coach says, “Start,” reads a line and says after student has acknowledged:

1. “What did I say?”
2. “Did you understand it?”
3. “Did your acknowledgment let me know I had originated something?”
4. “Did it end cycle?”
5. “Where did the acknowledgment start from?”
6. “Where did the acknowledgment land?”
7. “Did you own the space?”

In questions 5 and 6 student must indicate as in TR 1. Ask “What happened?” as required in previous TRs. Coach checks carefully, “Are you really satisfied that you are giving good acknowledgments?” He reads the purpose of the TR and the Training Stress for the student to check over.

**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgment ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. Revised 1963 by Reg Sharpe with the advices of L. Ron Hubbard.

**NUMBER: TR 3. Revised 1961 and 1963.**

**NAME:** Duplicative Question.

**PURPOSE:** To teach a student to duplicate without variation an auditing question, each time newly, in its own unit of time, not as a blur with other questions, and to acknowledge it. To teach that one never asks a second question until he has received an answer to the one asked.

**COMMANDS:** “Do fish swim?” or “Do birds fly?”

**POSITION:** Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart. Student has an E-Meter.

**TRAINING STRESS:** One question and student acknowledgment of its answer in one unit of time which is then finished. To keep student from straying into variations of command. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before.

The student must learn to give and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time.

The student should not fail to get an answer to the question asked, or fail to repeat the exact question.

Coach instructs student to run the command “Do birds fly?” or “Do fish swim?” etc. Student is required to acknowledge in such a way that the coach knows he has answered the command and if he doesn’t answer the command to repeat the command, letting the coach know it is a repeat. Coach just answers the command to start. Patter is as follows:

- S. “Do birds fly?”
- C. “Yes.”
- S. “Good.”
- C. “Did I answer the command?”
- S. “Yes.”
- C. “Did you feel that you had let me know that I had answered the command?”
- S. “No” or “Yes.”
- C. “OK, start again.”

This patter is repeated over and over until student has a certainty that he is doing the drill.

Then coach starts giving commands which are not answers. These communications must all be directed at the student, i.e., something to do with the pc’s attitude, appearance, private life (real or imaginary).

Example of patter:

- S. “Do birds fly?”
- C. “Your breath stinks.”
- S. “I’ll repeat the question. Do birds fly?”
- C. “That’s it. Did I answer the question?”
- S. “No.”
- C. “Did you let me know I hadn’t?”
- S. “By not acknowledging, repeating the command.”
- C. “OK, start.” And so on.

Coach continues until student is easily doing the drill and with great certainty. Coach can use such originations always directly concerned with the student personally and if he finds a button he continues until the student is tolerating it quite happily. If student breaks up or becomes misemotional coach merely asks “What happened?”

No flunks. No evaluation, invalidation or validation.

Ask “What happened?” as required. When the question is not answered, the student must say gently, “I’ll repeat the auditing question,” and do so until he gets an answer. Anything except commands, acknowledgment and, as needed, the repeat statement is queried. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is queried. A poor command is queried. A poor acknowledgment is queried. Student misemotion or confusion is queried. Student failure to utter the next command without a long comm lag is queried. A choppy or premature acknowledgment is queried. Lack of an acknowledgment (or with a distinct comm lag) is queried. “Start”, “Flunk”, “Good” and “That’s it” may not be used to fluster or trap the student. Any other statement under the sun may be. The coach may try to leave his chair in this TR. If he succeeds it is queried.

The coach should not use introverted statements such as “I just had a cognition.” “Coach divertive” statements should all concern the student, and should be designed to throw the student off and cause the student to lose session control or track of what the student is doing.

The student’s job is to keep a session going in spite of anything, using only command, the repeat statement or the acknowledgment.

The student may use his or her hands to prevent a “blow” (leaving) of the coach.

If the student does anything else than the above, it is queried. By queried is meant coach asks student “What happened?”

**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 and 1963 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR had a comm bridge as part of its training but this is now part of and is taught in Model Session and is no longer needed at this level. Auditors have been frail in getting their questions answered. This TR was redesigned to improve that frailty.

**NUMBER: TR 4. Revised 1961 and 1963.**

**NAME:** Preclear Originations.

**PURPOSE:** To teach a student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

**COMMANDS:** The student runs “Do fish swim?” or “Do birds fly?” on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by Instructor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

**POSITION:** Student and coach sit facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

**TRAINING STRESS:** The student is taught to hear originations and do three things: (1) Understand it; (2) Acknowledge it; and (3) Return preclear to session. If the coach feels abruptness or too much time consumed or lack of comprehension, he corrects the coach into better handling.

**Patter:** All originations concern the coach, his ideas, reactions or difficulties, none concern the auditor. Otherwise the patter is the same as in earlier TRs. The student’s patter is governed by:

1. Clarifying and understanding the origin.
2. Acknowledging the origin.
3. Giving the repeat statement “I’ll repeat the auditing command,” and then giving it.

Anything else is queried. The auditor must be taught to prevent ARC breaks and differentiate between a vital problem that concerns the pc and a mere effort to blow session. (TR 3 Revised.) If the student does more than (1) Understand, (2) Acknowledge, (3) Return pc to session, he is in error.

Coach may throw in remarks personal to student as on TR 3. Student’s failure to differentiate between these (by trying to handle them) and remarks aimed only at the student is queried.

Student’s failure to persist is always queried in any TR but here more so. Coach should not always read from list to originate, and not always look at student when about to comment.

By Originate is meant a statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or fancied case.

By Comment is meant a statement or remark aimed only at student or room. Originations are handled, Comments are disregarded by the student.

TR 4 and anti-Q & A is what bothers auditors the most. Q & Aing is a fault which causes ARC breaks and therefore throws the pc out of session. The reason is that when you Q & A the pc is not permitted to let go of an origination and is therefore left with a *Missed Withhold*. Q & A = Missed Withholds = ARC Breaks.

Coach starts by asking student to define TR 4. If student doesn’t know it then coach gives the definition as follows: TR 4 is to hear an origination, to understand it, to acknowledge it and return pc to session. Similarly coach asks for a definition of Q & A, which is: Double questioning, changing because pc changed, following pc’s instruction.

Coach then tells student to run the process “Do birds fly?” or “Do fish swim?” Coach frequently introduces an origination. When student has dealt with origination or has tried to deal with it, coach asks searchingly the following questions:

1. “Were you tongue-tied? startled? thrown off session?”
2. “Did you hear origination?”
3. “Did you understand it?”
4. “Did you acknowledge it?”
5. “Did you return me to session?”
6. “Did you double question me?”
7. “Did you change because I had changed?”
8. “Did you follow my instruction?”
9. “What did you do?”
10. “What happened?”

Question 10 can be asked randomly throughout the drill whenever coach sees or hears something that indicates student is in trouble of any sort.

Coach is permitted to “lead student up the garden path” for a little while before asking the above question.

This drill needs to be done very thoroughly. If coach notices that student is using a method or pattern, coach can add in the question “Are you using a method or pattern in this drill?”

The drill is continued over and over until student is doing it comfortably and happily. HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1961 to teach an auditor more about handling origins and preventing ARC breaks. Revised 1963 by Reg Sharpe with the advices of L. Ron Hubbard.

### ***Coaches’ Drill***

Coach and student (who is in this case the student coach) seated as in the normal TR drills.

Coach has the copy of the drill in front of him. He tells student to coach a TR. Whenever student departs from the script coach says, “That’s it. The correct question there should be\_\_\_\_\_.” “The correct action there should be\_\_\_\_\_.” “This is continued until student coach is thoroughly conversant with the script.

Coach keeps student on the drill and at the end of each cycle asks student, “Did you notice any physical changes on my part?” “What were they?” “Did you ask me ‘What happened?’ each time?”

Drill is continued with each TR in turn until student is administering all the TRs efficiently, interestedly and competently.

Ask “What happened?” as required.

HISTORY: Developed by Reg Sharpe with the advices of L. Ron Hubbard in April 1963 at Saint Hill to teach students how to coach the TRs.

### ***Training Note***

It is better to go through these TRs several times getting tougher each time than to hang up on one TR forever or to be so tough at start student goes into a decline.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

6305C02	SHSBC-262	Running the GPM
** 6305C14	SHSBC-263	Implant GPMs



HCO BULLETIN OF 15 MAY AD13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**THE TIME TRACK  
AND  
ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS  
BULLETIN 1**

It has been so many years since engram running was a familiar tool of the auditor that it is hard to know where to begin to teach this skill all over again. Actually, millions of words have been written or spoken on the subject of running engrams. However, oddly enough there was not one condensed, summary HCO Bulletin on the subject. Engram running, developed, was never then summated. I will therefore attempt to remedy the matter.

**ENGRAM RUNNING SIMPLIFIED**

No recapitulation or summation of materials was ever done on engram running. Therefore while all lectures and books on it are true, not one contains a final survey of engram running including everything vital to this skill and the laws which govern it. The material in books and tapes should be reviewed. But the material in these HCO Bulletins should be learned thoroughly as it takes precedence over all earlier material.

**WHY PEOPLE HAVE TROUBLE RUNNING ENGRAMS**

I have gotten very impatient with the constant plea for a rote set of commands to run engrams. The need for such commands is a *testimony to the Auditor's lack of knowledge* of the mechanics of the Time Track and the pc's behavior during an engram running session.

An auditor *must* know the basic laws and mechanics of the Time Track in order to run engrams. There *is no rote* procedure and never will be that will be successful on all cases in absence of a knowledge of what a Time Track is.

There is no substitute for knowing what engrams are and what they do. Knowing that, you can run engrams. Not knowing that, there is nothing that will take the place of such knowledge. You have to know the behavior of and data about engrams. There is no royal road that avoids such knowledge. If you know all about engrams you can run them. If you don't, you'll make a mess regardless of the commands given for use.

Therefore the essence of engram *running* is a knowledge of the character and behavior of engrams. This is not a vast subject.

However, these three things stand in the way of learning about engrams:

1. Engrams contain pain and unconsciousness; fear of pain or inflicting pain causes the auditor not to confront the pc's engrams and unconsciousness is after all a not knowing condition; and
2. The auditor is so accustomed to projectionists reeling off movies and TV programs for him or her that the auditor tends to just sit while the action rolls forward, acting like a spectator, not the projectionist.
3. Failure to handle Time in Incidents.

On (1) you can remedy this just by knowing about it and realizing it and surmounting it, and on (2) you can remedy the attitude by realizing that the auditor,

not the pc (or some installed movie projectionist), is operating the pc's bank. (3) is covered later.

Take a pocket movie projector and any bit of a reel of film and wind it back and forth for a while and you'll see you are moving it. Then give a command and move the film and you'll have what you're doing as an auditor. Many drills can be developed using such equipment and (2) will be overcome. (1) requires just understanding and the will to rise superior to it.

### THE TIME TRACK

The endless record, called the TIME TRACK, complete with 52 perceptions, of the pc's entire past, is available to the auditor and his or her auditing commands.

The rules are: THE TIME TRACK OBEYS THE AUDITOR; THE TIME TRACK DOES NOT OBEY A PRECLEAR (early in auditing).

The Time Track is a very accurate record of the pc's past, very accurately timed, very obedient to the auditor. If motion picture film were 3D, had 52 perceptions and could fully react upon the observer, the Time Track could be called a motion picture film. It is at least 350,000,000,000,000 years long, probably much longer, with a scene about every 1/25 of a second.

### DEFINITIONS

That part of the Time Track that is free of pain and misadventure is called simply the Free Track, in that the pc doesn't freeze up on it.

*Any* mental picture that is unknowingly created and part of the Time Track is called a FACSIMILE, whether an engram, secondary, lock or pleasure moment.

*Any knowingly created* mental picture that is not part of a Time Track is called a MOCK-UP.

Any unknowingly created mental picture that appears to have been a record of the physical universe but is in fact only an altered copy of the Time Track is called a DUB-IN.

Those parts of the Time Track that contain moments of pain and unconsciousness are called ENGRAMS.

Those parts of the Time Track which contain misemotion based on earlier engramic experience are called SECONDARIES.

Those parts of the Time Track which contain the first moment an earlier engram is restimulated are called KEY-INS.

Those parts of the Time Track which contain moments the pc associates with Key-ins are called LOCKS.

A series of similar engrams, or of similar locks, are called CHAINS.

A BASIC is the first incident (engram, lock, overt act) on any chain.

BASIC BASIC is the first engram on the whole Time Track.

Incidents are not in piles or files. They are simply a part of the consecutive Time Track.

By INCIDENT is meant the recording of an experience, simple or complex, related by the same subject, location or people, understood to take place in a short and finite time period such as minutes or hours or days.

A CHAIN OF INCIDENTS makes up a whole adventure or activity related by the same subject, general location or people, understood to take place in a long time period, weeks, months, years or even billions or trillions of years.

An incident can be an engram, secondary, key-in or lock. A chain of incidents can therefore be a chain of experiences which are engrams, secondaries, key-ins and locks.

A chain of incidents has only one BASIC. Its BASIC is the earliest engram received from or overt act committed against the subject, location or beings which make it a chain.

### THE INFLUENCE OF THE TIME TRACK

Shakespeare said all life was a play. He was right in so far as the Time Track is a 3D, 52 perception movie which is a whole series of plays concerning the preclear. But the influence of it upon the preclear removes it from the class of pretense and play. It is not only very real, it is what contains whatever it is that depresses the pc to what he is today. Its savageness relieved, the preclear can recover, and only then. There is no other valid workable road.

There are valences, circuits and machinery in the reactive mind, as well as Reliable Items and Goals. But these all have their place on the Time Track and are part of the Time Track.

The preclear, as a thetan, is the effect of all this recorded experience. Almost all of it is unknown to him.

There are no other influencing agencies for the preclear than the Time Track and Present Time. And Present Time, a moment later, is part of the Time Track.

### THE CREATION OF THE TIME TRACK

The preclear makes the Time Track as time rolls forward. He does this as an obsessive create on a sub-awareness level. It is done by an INVOLUNTARY INTENTION, not under the pc's awareness or control.

The road to clear by making the preclear take over the creating of the Time Track was long explored and proved completely valueless and chancy.

The road to clear by making the preclear leave the Time Track (exteriorization) lasts only for minutes, hours or days and has proven valueless.

The road to clear, proven over 13 years of intense research and vast numbers of auditing hours and cases, lies only in an auditor handling the Time Track and removing from it, by means governed by the Auditor's Code, the material, both motivators and overts, which, recorded on it, is out of the control of the pc and holds the pc at effect. Listing for goals and reliable items, engram running, Prepchecking, Sec Checking, recall processes and assists all handle the Time Track successfully and are therefore the basis of all modern processing.

### APPARENT FAULTS IN THE TIME TRACK

There are no faults in the recording of the Time Track. There are only snarls caused by groupers, and unavailability and lack of perception of the Time Track.

A Grouper is anything which pulls the Time Track into a bunch at one or more points. When the grouper is gone the Time Track is perceived to be straight.

Unavailability is caused by the pc's inability to confront or BOUNCERS and DENYERS. A BOUNCER throws the pc backward, forward, up or down from the track and so makes it apparently unavailable. A DENYER obscures a part of track by implying it is not there or elsewhere (a mis-director) or should not be viewed.

Groupers, bouncers and deniers are material (matter, energy, space and time in the form of effort, force, mass, delusion, etc) or command phrases (statements that group, bounce or deny). When a grouper, bouncer or denier are enforced by both material *and* command phrases they become most effective, making the Time Track unavailable to the pc.

Unless the Time Track is made available it cannot be as-ised by the pc and so remains aberrative.

The Time Track is actual in that it is made of matter, energy, space and time as well as thought. Those who cannot confront Mest think it is composed only of thought. A grouper can make a pc fat and a bouncer thin if the pc is chronically stuck in them or if the track is grouped or made unavailable through bad auditing.

## THE ORIGIN OF THE TIME TRACK

Through a great deal of study, not entirely complete, the following surmises can be made about the Time Track, the physical universe and the pc.

The tendency of the physical universe is condensation and solidification. At least this is the effect produced on the thetan. Continued dwelling in it without rehabilitation causes the thetan to become less reaching (“smaller”) and more solid. A thetan, being a static, may become convinced he cannot duplicate matter, energy, space, or time or certain intentions and so succumbs to the influence of this universe. This influence in itself would be negligible unless recorded by the thetan, stored and made reactive upon the thetan as a Time Track, and then maliciously used to trap the thetan.

Recent researches I have done in the field of aesthetics tend to indicate that rhythm is the source of present time. The thetan is carried along both by his own desire to have, do or be and by having been overwhelmed in the distant past by a continuous minute rhythm. This is a possible explanation of a thetan’s continuous presence in Present Time. Present Time, then, can be defined as a response to the continuous rhythm of the physical universe, resulting in a hereness in nowness.

In response to this rhythm, undoubtedly assisted by overts and implants and convictions of the need of recording, the thetan began to respond to the physical universe in his creations and eventually obsessively created (by means of restimulatable involuntary intentions) the passing moments of the physical universe. But only when he began to consider these pictures important could they be used to aberrate him.

These are only partly permanently created. Other moments of the past become re-created only when the thetan’s intention is directed to them, on which these parts spontaneously appear, the thetan not voluntarily creating them.

This forms the Time Track. Some parts of it, then, are “permanently” in a state of creation and the majority of it becoming created when the thetan’s attention is directed to them.

The “permanently created” portions are those times of overwhelm and indecision which almost entirely submerged the thetan’s own will and awareness.

Such parts are found in implants and great stresses. These parts are in permanent restimulation.

The mechanism of permanent restimulation consists of opposing forces of comparable magnitude which cause a balance which does not respond to current time and remains “timeless”.

Such phenomena as the overt act-motivator sequence, the problem (postulate counter-postulate), tend to hold certain portions of the Time Track in “permanent creation” and cause them to continue to exist in present time as unresolved masses, energies, spaces, times and significances.

The intention of the physical universe (and those who have become degraded enough to further only its ends) is to make a thetan solid, immobile and decisionless.

The fight of the thetan is to remain unsolid, mobile or immobile at will, and capable of decision.

This in itself is the principal unresolved problem and it itself creates timeless mass which accomplishes the basic purpose of a trap.

The mechanism of the Time Track can then be said to be the primary action in making a thetan solid, immobile and decisionless. For without a record of the past accumulating and forming a gradient of solidification of the thetan, the entrapment potential of the physical universe would be negligible and the havingness which it offers might be quite therapeutic. It probably requires more than just living in the physical universe to become aberrated. The main method of causing aberration and entrapment is therefore found in actions which create or confuse the Time Track.

A thetan has things beyond Matter, Energy, Space and Time which can deteriorate. His power of choice, his ability to keep two locations separate, his belief in self and his ethical standards are independent of material things. But these can be recorded in the Time Track as well and one sees them recover when no longer influenced by the Time Track.

As the thetan himself makes his own Time Track, even if under compulsion, and commits his own overts, even on provocation, it can be said, then, that the thetan aberrates himself. But he is assisted by mammoth betrayals and his necessity to combat them. And he is guilty of aberrating his fellows.

It is doubtful if another type of being built the physical universe and still lurks within it to trap further. But older beings, already degraded, have continuously been about to help newer beings to go downhill.

Each Thetan had his own “Home Universe” and these colliding or made to collide, probably are the physical universe. But of this origin and these intentions we are not at this time certain.

It is enough for us to resolve the problem of the aberrative nature of this universe and provide a technology which assuages that aberration and keeps one abreast of it. This is practical and we can already do it. Further insight into the problem will be a further bonus. And further data is already in view.

(Bulletin 2 on The Time Track and Engram Running will follow.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

** 6305C15	SHSBC-264	TVD-20, Blocking Out and Dating Items and Incidents Prior to Implants
** 6305C16	SHSBC-265	The Time Track
** 6305C21	SHSBC-266	The Helatrobus Implants
** 6305C22	SHSBC-267 (Aud: LRH)	TVD-21, Engram Running—Helatrobus Implant
** 6305C23	SHSBC-268	State of O.T.
** 6305C28	SHSBC-269	Handling ARC Breaks

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MAY AD13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 3**  
**R-3 MODEL SESSION**

Here is the new Routine 3 Model Session as outlined in HCO Bulletin May 13, AD13. All other Model Sessions are canceled herewith. This form is to be used in all auditing in the future.

**SESSION PRELIMINARIES**

All auditing sessions have the following preliminaries done in this order.

1. Seat the pc and adjust his or her chair.
2. Clear the Auditing room with "Is it all right to audit in this room?" (not metered).
3. Can squeeze "Squeeze the cans, please." And note that pc registers, by the squeeze, on the meter, and note the level of the pc's havingness. (Don't run hav here.)
4. Put in R Factor by telling pc briefly what you are going to do in the session.

*START OF SESSION.*

5. "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"

"START OF SESSION." (Tone 40)

"Has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No," say again, "START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No," say, "We will cover it in a moment."

*RUDIMENTS:*

6. "What goals would you like to set for this session?"

Please note that Life or Livingness goals have been omitted, as they tend to remind the pc of present time difficulties and tend to take his attention out of the session.

7. At this point in the session there are actions which could be undertaken: the running of General O/W or the running of Mid Rudiments using "Since the last time I audited you", or pull missed W/Hs as indicated. But if pc cheerful and needle smooth, just get down to work.

One would run General O/W if the pc was emotionally upset at the beginning of the session or if the session did not start for the pc, the latter being simply another indication of the pc's being upset or ARC broken, but these symptoms must be present, as sometimes the session hasn't started merely because of poor Tone 40 or because the pc had something he wanted to say before the auditor started the session.

### *RUNNING O/W:*

“If it is all right with you, I am going to run a short, general process. The process is: ‘What have you done?’, ‘What have you withheld?’ “ (The process is run very permissively until the needle looks smooth and the pc is no longer emotionally disturbed. )

“Where are you now on the time track?”

“If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process.” (After each command, ask, “When?”)

“That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?”

“End of process.”

### *RUNNING THE MID RUDIMENTS:*

One would use the Middle Rudiments with, “Since the last time I audited you”, if the needle was rough and if the Tone Arm was in a higher position than it was at the end of the last session.

#### ORDER OF BUTTONS

Here is the correct wording and order of use for the big Mid Ruds.

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suppressed?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been careful of?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have failed to reveal?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been invalidated?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suggested?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has any mistake been made?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been anxious about?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been protested?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been decided?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been asserted?”

In using the first three buttons (Suppressed, Careful of and Failed to Reveal), the rudiment question should be asked directly of the pc off the meter (repetitive). When the pc has no more answers, check the question on the meter. If the question reads, stick with it on the meter like in Fast Rud checking until it is clean.

The last six buttons are cleaned directly on the meter as in Fast Ruds.

### *PULLING MISSED WITHHOLDS*

Use: “Since the last time you were audited has a withhold been missed on you’?”

“Since the last time you were audited is there anything someone failed to find out about you?”

“Since the last time you were audited has someone nearly found out something about you?”

Any of the above versions may be used. They are always run repetitively. They

can also be used without the time limiter, e.g. "Is there anything someone failed to find out about you?"

*BODY OF SESSION.*

8. Now go into the body of the session.

*END BODY OF SESSION:*

9. "Is it all right with you if we end off .....now?" "Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I do so?" "End of ....."

*SMOOTH OUT SESSION:*

10. Smooth out any roughness in the session if there has been any, favouring Suppress, Failed to Reveal, Protest, Decide, Overts, Assert, using prefix "In this session ....."?

*GOALS & GAINS.*

11. "Have you made any part of your goals for this session?"  
"Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?"

*HAVINGNESS:*

12. (After adjusting the meter) "Please squeeze the cans." (If the squeeze test was not all right, the Auditor would run the pc's Havingness process until the can squeeze gives an adequate response.)

*ENDING SESSION:*

13. "Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?"
14. "Is it all right with you if I end this session now?"
15. "Here it is: END OF SESSION (Tone 40). Has this session ended for you?" (If the pc says, "No," repeat, "END OF SESSION." If the session still has not ended, say, "You will be getting more auditing. END OF SESSION.") "Tell me I am no longer auditing you."

Please note that Havingness is run after Goals and Gains as this tends to bring the pc more into present time and to take his attention to a degree out of the session.

Wording for the above follows the tradition of earlier model sessions.

Adhere severely to this session form. It is nearly an irreducible minimum and is very fast, but it is all necessary.

The Random Rudiment here is "What happened?"

Session Mid Ruds are simply "Protest, Assert and Decide".

RI rudiments are "Suppress and Invalidate".

ARC Break handling is in accordance with HCO Bulletin of March 14, 1963. Don't continue a session until you find out why the ARC Break.

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD



HCO BULLETIN OF 27 MAY 1963

CenOCon  
Franchise

*ALL AUDITING*  
*STAR RATING HCO BULLETIN FOR ACADEMIES AND SHSBC*

**CAUSE OF ARC BREAKS**

LUCKY IS THE PC WHOSE AUDITOR HAS UNDERSTOOD THIS HCO BULLETIN AND LUCKY IS THE AUDITOR, MAY HIS OWN CASE RUN WELL.

I have just narrowed the reason for ARC Breaks in auditing actions down to only one source.

RULE: ALL ARC BREAKS ARE CAUSED BY BY-PASSED CHARGE.

RULE: TO TURN OFF AN ARC BREAK FIND AND INDICATE THE CORRECT BY-PASSED CHARGE.

Charge can be By-Passed by:

1. Going later than basic on any chain without further *search* for basic.

Example: Looking for the pc's first automobile accident, finding the fifth instead and trying to run the fifth accident as the first accident, which it isn't. The By-Passed Charge here is the first accident and all succeeding accidents up to the one selected by the auditor as the first one or the one to run. To a greater or lesser degree depending on the amount the earlier material was restimulated, the pc will then ARC Break (or feel low or in "low morale"). One can run a later incident on a chain briefly but only to unburden earlier incidents, and the pc must know this.

2. Unknowingly ignoring the possibility of a more basic or earlier incident of the same nature as that being run after the pc has been restimulated on it. Or bluntly refusing to admit the existence of or let the pc "at" an earlier incident.
3. Cleanly missing a GPM, as one between two goals run consecutively in the belief they are consecutive.
4. Missing an earlier GPM and settling down to the assertion there are no earlier ones.
5. Cleanly missing one or more RIs, not even calling them.
6. Failing to discharge an RI and going on past it.
7. Accidentally missing a whole block of RIs, as in resuming session and not noticing pc has skipped (commoner than you'd think).
8. Accepting a wrong goal, missing the right one similarly worded.
9. Accepting a wrong RI, not getting the plot RI to fire.
10. Misinterpreting or not understanding data given to you by the pc and/or acting on wrong data.
11. Misinforming the pc as to what has or has not fired and discharged.
12. Locating the wrong By-Passed Charge and saying it is the source of the ARC Break.

13. Failing to follow the cycle of communication in auditing.

These and any other way charge can be restimulated and left *prior* to where the auditor is working can cause an ARC Break.

Charge left after (later) (nearer pt) than where the auditor is working hardly ever causes an ARC Break.

The burden of skilled auditing then, is to get RIs (and GPMs and incidents) discharged as close to basic (first incident) as possible. And always be prowling for something earlier.

In contradiction of this is that any GPM fairly well discharged by RRs unburdens the case, ARC Break or no ARC Breaks. And any incident partially discharged lets one go earlier.

The pc *never* knows why the ARC Break. He may think he does and disclaim about it. *But* the moment the actual reason is spotted (the real missed area) the ARC Break ceases.

If you know you've missed a goal or RI, just saying so prevents any ARC Break.

An ARC Breaky pc can always be told what has been missed and will almost always settle down at once.

Example: Pc refuses to come to session. Auditor on telephone says there's a more basic incident or RI or GPM. Pc comes to session.

The auditor who is most likely to develop ARC Breaks in the pc will have greater difficulty putting this HCO Bulletin into practice. Perhaps I can help this. Such an auditor Qs and As by *action* responses, not acknowledgments after understanding. Action can be on an automaticity in the session. So this HCO Bulletin may erroneously be interpreted to mean, "If the pc ARC Breaks DO something earlier."

If this were true then the only thing left to run would be Basic Basic—without the pc being unburdened enough to have any reality on it.

A drill (and many drills can be compiled on this) would be to have a lineal picture of a Time Track. The coach indicates a late incident on it with a pointer and says, "Pc ARC Break." The student must give a competent and informative statement that indicates the earlier charge without pointing (since you can't point inside the reactive bank of a pc with a pointer).

Drawn Time Tracks showing a GPM, a series of engrams along free track, a series of GPMs, all plotted against time, would serve the purpose of the drill and give the student graphic ARC Break experience.

The trick is TO FIND AND INDICATE the RIGHT By-Passed Charge to the pc and to handle it when possible but never fail to indicate it.

It is not DO that heals the ARC Break but pointing toward the correct charge.

**RULE: FINDING AND INDICATING AN INCORRECT BY-PASSED CHARGE WILL NOT TURN OFF AN ARC BREAK.**

An automaticity (as covered later in this HCO Bulletin) is rendered discharged by indicating the area of charge only.

This is an elementary example: Pc says, "I suppressed that." Auditor says, "On this incident has anything been suppressed?" Pc ARC Breaks. Auditor indicates Charge by saying, "I'm sorry. A moment ago I didn't acknowledge your suppression." ARC Break ceases. Why? Because the source of its charge that triggered an automaticity of above the pc's tone, was itself discharged by being indicated.

Example: Auditor asks for a Joburg overt. Pc gives it. Auditor consults meter at once asking question again, which is protested giving a new read. Pc ARC Breaks. Auditor says, "I did not acknowledge the overt you gave me. I acknowledge it." ARC Break ceases.

Example: Auditor asks for RI No. 173 on First Series Line Plot. Pc ARC Breaks, giving various reasons why, such as auditor's personality. Auditor asks meter, "Have I missed an Item on you?" Gets read. Says to pc, "I've missed an Item." ARC Break ceases. Whether the missing item is looked for or not is immaterial to this HCO Bulletin which concerns handling ARC Breaks.

If an auditor always *does* in response to an ARC Break, such as instantly looking for specific earlier Items, that auditor has missed the point of this HCO Bulletin and will just pile up more ARC Breaks, not heal them.

Don't be driven by ARC Breaks into unwise actions, as all you have to do is find and *indicate* the missing charge that was By-Passed. *That is* what takes care of an ARC Break, not taking the pc's orders.

If the ARC Break does *not* cease, the wrong By-Passed Charge has been indicated.

The sweetest running pc in the world can be turned into a tiger by an auditor who always Qs and As, never indicates charge and goes on with the session plan.

Some Qs and As would be a source of laughter if not so deadly.

Here is a Q and A artist at work (and an ARC Breaky pc will soon develop) (and this auditor will soon cease to audit because it's "so unpleasant").

Example: Auditor: "Have you ever shot anyone?" Pc: "Yes, I shot a dog." Auditor: "What about a dog?" Pc: "It was my mother's." Auditor: "What about your mother?" Pc: "I hated her." Auditor: "What about hating people?" Pc: "I think I'm aberrated." Auditor: "Have you worried about being aberrated?" Pc: @!!\*?!!.

Why did the pc ARC Break? Because the charge has never been permitted to come off shooting a dog, his mother, hating people, and being aberrated and that's enough By-Passed Charge to blow a house apart.

This pc will become, as this keeps up, unauditably by reason of charge missed in sessions and his resulting session dramatizations as overts.

Find and indicate the actual charge By-Passed. Sometimes you can't miss it, it has just happened. Sometimes you need a simple meter question since what you are doing is obvious. Sometimes you need a dress parade assessment from a list. But however you get it, find out the exact By-Passed Charge and then INDICATE IT TO THE PC.

The violence of an ARC Break makes it seem incredible that a simple statement will vanquish it, but it will. You don't have to run another earlier engram to cure an ARC Break. You merely have to say it is there—and if it *is* the By-Passed Charge, that ARC Break will vanish.

Example: Pc: "I think there's an incident earlier that turned off my emotion." Auditor: "We'd better run this one again." Pc ARC Breaks. Auditor: (Consults meter) "Is there an earlier incident that turns off emotion? (Gets read) Say, what you just said is correct. Thank you. There is an earlier incident that turns off emotion. Thank you. Now let's run this one a few more times." Pc's ARC Break ends at once.

Don't go around shivering in terror of ARC Breaks. That's like the modern systems of government which tear up their whole constitution and honor just because some hired demonstrators howl. Soon they won't be a government at all. They bend to every ARC Break.

ARC Breaks are inevitable. They will happen. The crime is not: to have a pc ARC Break. The crime is: not to be able to handle one *fast* when it happens. You must be

able to handle an ARC Break since they are inevitable. Which means you must know the mechanism of one as given here, how to find By-Passed Charge and how to smoothly indicate it.

To leave a pc in an ARC Break more than two or three minutes, is just inept.

And be well-drilled enough that your own responding rancor and surprise doesn't take charge. And you'll have pleasant auditing.

### ARC BREAK PROCESSES

We had several ARC Break processes. These were repetitive processes.

The most effective ARC Break process is locating and indicating the By-Passed Charge. *That* really cures ARC Breaks.

A repetitive command ARC Break process based on this discovery I just made would possibly be "What communication was not received?"

Expanding this we get a new ARC Straight Wire:

"What attitude was not received?"

"What reality was not perceived (seen)?"

"What communication was not acknowledged?"

This process IS NOT USED to handle SESSION ARC BREAKS but only to clean up auditing or the track. If the pc ARC Breaks don't use a process, find the missed charge.

Indeed this process may be more valuable than at first believed, as one could put "In auditing ....." on the front of each one and straighten up sessions. And perhaps you could even run an engram with it. (The last has not been tested. "In auditing" + the three questions was wonderful on test. 2 div TA in each 10 mins on a very high TA case.)

"ARC Break Straight Wire" of 1958 laid open implants like a band saw, which is what attracted my attention to it again. Many routine prefixes such as "In an organization" or "On engrams" or "On past lives" could be used to clear up past attitudes and overts.

We need some repetitive processes today. Cases too queasy to face the past, cases messed up by offbeat processes. Cases who have overts on Auditing or Scientology or orgs. Cases pinned by session overts. The BMRs run inside an engram tend to make it go mushy. And Class I Auditors are without an effective repetitive process on modern technology. This is it.

A Repetitive Process, even though not looking for basic, implies that the process will be run until the charge is off and therefore creates no ARC Breaks unless left unflat. Therefore the process is safe if flattened.

### RUDIMENTS

Nothing is more detested by some pcs than rudiments on a session or GPM or RI. Why?

The same rule about ARC Breaks applies.

The Charge has been By-Passed. How?

Consider the session is later than the incident (naturally). Ask for the suppress in the session. You miss the suppress in the incident (earlier by far). Result: Pc ARC Breaks.

That's all there is to ARC Breaks caused by *Session* BMRs or Mid Ruds.

Example: “Scrambleable Eggs” won’t RR. Auditor says, “On this Item has anything been suppressed?” Pc eventually gets anxious or ARC Breaks. Why? Suppress read. Yes, but where was the suppress? It was in the Incident containing the RI, the pc looked for it in the session and thereby missed the suppress charge in the incident of the RI which, being By-Passed Charge unseen by pc and auditor, caused the ARC Break. Remedy? Get the suppress in the incident, not the session. The RI RRs.

Also, the more ruds you use, the more you restimulate when doing Routine 3, because the suppress in the incident is not basic on Suppress, and if you clean just one clean, even to test, bang, there goes the charge being missed on Suppress and bang, bang, ARC Break. Lightly, auditor, lightly.

### Q AND A ARC BREAKS

Q and A causes ARC Breaks by BY-PASSING CHARGE.

How? The pc says something. The auditor does not understand or Acknowledge. Therefore the pc’s utterance becomes a By-Passed Charge generated by whatever he or she is trying to release. As the auditor ignores it and the pc re-asserts it, the original utterance’s charge is built up and up.

Finally the pc will start issuing orders in a frantic effort to get rid of the missed charge. This is the source of pc orders to the auditor.

Understand and Acknowledge the pc. Take the pc’s data. Don’t pester the pc for more data when the pc is offering data.

When the pc goes to where the auditor commands, don’t say, “Are you there now?” as his going is thereby not acknowledged and the going built up charge. Always assume the pc obeyed until it’s obvious the pc did not.

### ECHO METERING

The pc says, “You missed a suppress. It’s .....” and the auditor reconsults the meter asking for a suppress. That leaves the pc’s offering an undischarged charge.

NEVER ASK THE METER AFTER A PC VOLUNTEERS A BUTTON.

Example: You’ve declared suppress clean, pc gives you another suppress. Take it and don’t ask suppress again. That’s *Echo Metering*.

If a pc puts his own ruds in, don’t at once jump to the meter to put his ruds in. That makes all his offerings missed charge. *Echo Metering* is miserable auditing.

### MISSED WITHHOLDS

Needless to say, this matter of By-Passed Charge is the explanation for the violence of missed withholds.

The auditor is *capable* of finding out. So the pc’s undisclosed overts react solely because the auditor doesn’t ask for them.

This doesn’t wipe out all technology about missed withholds. It explains why they exist and how they operate.

Indication is almost as good as disclosure. Have you ever had somebody calm down when you said, “You’ve got missed withholds”? Well it’s crude but it has worked. Better is, “Some auditor failed to locate some charge on your case.” Or, “We must have missed your goal.” But only a meter assessment and a statement of what has been found would operate short of actually pulling the missed withholds.

### APPARENT BAD MORALE

There is one other factor on “Bad Morale” that should be remarked.

We know so much we often discard what we know in Scientology. But way back in Book One and several times after, notably 8-80, we had a tone scale up which the pc climbed as he was processed.

We meet up with this again running the Helatrobis Implants as a whole track fact.

The pc rises in tone up to the lower levels of the tone scale. He or she comes up to degradation, up to apathy.

And it often feels horrible and, unlike an ARC Break and the Sad Effect, is not cured except by more of the same processing.

People complain of their emotionlessness. Well, they come up a long ways before they even reach emotion.

Then suddenly they realize that they have come up to being *able* to feel bad. They even come up to feeling pain. And all that is a *gain*. They don't confuse this too much with ARC Breaks but they blame processing. And then one day they realize that they can feel apathy! And it's a win amongst wins. Before it was just wood.

And this has an important bearing on ARC Breaks.

Everything on the whole Know to Mystery Scale that still lies *above* the pc finds the pc at effect. These are all on Automatic.

Therefore the pc in an ARC Break is in the grip of the reaction which was in the incident, now fully on automatic.

The pc's anger in the incident is not even seen or felt by the pc. But the moment something slips the pc is in the grip of that emotion as an automaticity and becomes furious or apathetic or whatever toward the auditor.

None is more amazed at himself or herself than the pc in the grip of the ARC Break emotion. The pc is a helpless rag, being shaken furiously by the emotions he or she felt in the incident.

Therefore, never discipline or Q and A with an ARC Broken pc. Don't join hands with his bank to punish him. Just find the By-Passed Charge and the automaticity will shut off at once to everyone's relief.

Running Routine 3 is only unpleasant and unhappy to the degree that the auditor fails to quickly spot and announce By-Passed Charge. If he fails to understand this and recognize this, his pcs will ARC Break as surely as a ball falls when dropped.

If an auditor has ARC Breaky pcs only one thing is basically wrong—that auditor consistently misses charge or consistently fails to anticipate missed charge.

One doesn't always have to run the earliest. But one had better not ignore the consequences of not pointing it out. One doesn't have to discharge every erg from an RI always but one had better not hide the fact from the pc.

The adroit auditor is one who can spot earlier charge or anticipate ARC Breaks by seeing where charge is getting missed and taking it up with the pc. That auditor's pcs have only the discomfort of the gradually rising tone and not the mess of ARC Breaks.

It is possible to run almost wholly without ARC Breaks and possible to stop them in seconds, all by following the rule: DON'T BY-PASS CHARGE UNKNOWN TO THE PC.

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

\*\* 6305C29 SHSBC-270

Programming Cases, Part 1

\*\* 6305C30 SHSBC-271

Programming Cases, Part 2

**THE TIME TRACK  
AND  
ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS  
BULLETIN 2  
HANDLING THE TIME TRACK**

Although finding and curtailing the development of the Time Track at genus is not improbable, the ability of the preclear to attain it early on is questionable without reducing the charge on the existing track. Therefore, any system which reduces the charged condition of the Time Track without reducing but increasing the awareness and decisionability of the preclear is valid processing. Any system which seeks to handle the charge but reduces the preclear's awareness and decisionability is not valid processing but is degrading.

According to early axioms, the single source of aberration is Time. Therefore any system which further confuses or overwhelms the preclear's sense of time will not be beneficial.

Thus the first task of the student of engram running is to master the handling of Time on the preclear's Time Track. It must be handled without question, uncertainty or confusion.

Failing to handle the Time in the pc's Time Track with confidence, certainty and without error will result in grouping or denying the Time Track to the pc.

The prime source of ARC break in engram running sessions is by-passing charge by Time mishandling by the auditor. As a subhead under this, taking and trying to run incidents which are not basic on a chain constitute an error in Time and react on the pc like By-Passed RIs or GPMs.

An ARC break-less session requires gentle accurate time scouting, the selection of the earliest Timed incident available and the accurate Time handling of the incident as it is run.

There are only a few reasons why some cannot run engrams on pcs. These are:

1. Q and A with the pain and unconsciousness of incidents;
2. Failing to handle the Time Track of the pc for the pc;
3. Failure to understand and handle Time.

2 and 3 are much the same. However, there are three ways to move a Time Track about:

- (a) By Significance (the moment something was considered);
- (b) By Location (the moment the pc was located somewhere);
- (c) By Time alone (the date or years before an event or years ago).

You will see all three have time in common. "The moment when you thought \_\_\_\_\_" "The moment you were on the cliff \_\_\_\_\_" "Two years before you

put your foot on the bottom step of the scaffold” are all dependent on Time. Each designates an instant on the Time Track of which there can be no mistake by either auditor or pc.

The whole handling of the Time Track can be done by any one of these three methods, Significance, Location, Time.

Therefore all projectionist work is done by the Time of Significance, the Time of Location or Time alone.

The track responds. Those auditors who have trouble cannot grasp the totality and accuracy and speed of that response. The idiotic and wonderful precision of the Time Track defeats the sloppy and careless. They wonder if it went. They question the pc’s being there. They fumble about until they destroy their command over the Time Track.

“Go to 47,983,678,283,736 years 2 months, 4 days 1 hour and six minutes ago.” Well, a clear statement of it, unfumbled, will cause just that to happen. The tiniest quiver of doubt, a fumble over the millions and nothing happens.

Fumbled dating gets no dates. One must date boldly with no throat catches or hesitations. “More than 40,000? Less than 40,000?” Get it the first read. Don’t go on peering myopically at the meter asking the same question the rest of the session. Accurate, Bold, Rapid. Those are the watchwords of dating and Time Track handling.

In moving a Time Track about, move only the track. Don’t mix it and also move the pc. You can say “Move to \_\_\_\_.” You don’t have to say (but you can) “The somatic strip will move to \_\_\_\_.” But never say “You will move to \_\_\_\_.” And this also applies to Present Time. The pc won’t come to Present Time. He’s here. But the Time Track will move to the date of present time unless the pc is really stuck. In getting a pc to Present Time (unimportant in modern engram running) say “Move to (date month and year of PT).”

In *scouting* you always use *To*. “Move To\_\_\_\_\_.” In *running* an engram or whatever, you always use *THROUGH*. “Move through the incident\_\_\_\_\_.”

If an auditor hasn’t a ruddy clue about the Time Track and its composition, he or she won’t ever be able to run engrams. So, obviously, the first thing to teach and have passed in engram running is Time Track Composition. When the auditor learns that, he or she will be able to run engrams. If the auditor does not know the subject of the Time Track well, then he or she can’t be taught to run engrams, for no rote commands that cover all cases can exist. You couldn’t teach the handling of a motion picture projector by rote commands if the operator had never imagined the existence of film. An auditor sitting there thinking the pc is doing this or that and being in a general fuddle about it will soon have film all over the floor and wrapped about his ears. His plea for a rote command will just tangle up more film so long as he doesn’t know it *is* film and that *he*, not the preclear, is handling it.

If an auditor can learn this, he will *then* be able to learn to run those small parts of the Time Track called engrams. If an auditor can’t run a pc through some pleasant Time Track flawlessly, he or she sure can’t run a pc through the living lightning parts of that Track called Engrams.

An auditor who cannot handle the Time Track smoothly can scarcely call himself an auditor as that’s all there is to audit besides postulates, no matter what process you are using, no matter what process you invent and even if you tried what is laughingly called a “biochemical approach” to the mind. There’s only a Time Track for the bios to affect.

There’s a thetan, there’s a Time Track. The thetan gets caught in the Time Track. The job of the auditor is to free the thetan by digging him out of his Time Track. So if you can’t handle what you’re digging a thetan out of, you’re going to have an awful lot of landslides and a lot of auditing loses for both you and preclears.



Invent games, devices, charts and training aids galore and teach with them and you'll have auditors who can handle the Time Track and run engrams.

### CHARGE AND THE TIME TRACK

Charge, the stored quantities of energy in the Time Track, is the sole thing that is being relieved or removed by the auditor from the Time Track.

When this charge is present in huge amounts the Time Track overwhelms the pc and the pc is thrust below observation of the actual Track.

This is the State of Case Scale. (All levels given are major levels. Minor levels exist between them.)

Level ( 1 ) NO TRACK	—	No Charge.
Level (2) FULL VISIBLE TIME TRACK	—	Some Charge.
Level (3) SPORADIC VISIBILITY OF TRACK	—	Some heavily charged areas.
Level (4) INVISIBLE TRACK (Black or Invisible Field)	—	Very heavily charged areas exist.
Level (5) DUB-IN	—	Some areas of Track so heavily charged pc is below consciousness in them.
Level (6) DUB-IN OF DUB-IN	—	Many areas of Track so heavily charged, the Dub-in is submerged.
Level (7) ONLY AWARE OF OWN EVALUATIONS	—	Track too heavily charged to be viewed at all.
Level (8) UNAWARE	—	Pc dull, often in a coma.

On this new scale the very good, easy to run cases are at Level (3). Skilled engram running can handle down to Level (4). Engram running is useless from Level (4) down. Level (4) is questionable.

Level ( 1 ) is of course an OT. Level (2) is the clearest clear anybody ever heard of. Level (3) can run engrams. Level (4) can run early track engrams if the running is skilled. (Level (4) includes the Black V case.) Level (5) has to be run on general ARC processes. Level (6) has to be run carefully on special ARC processes with lots of havingness. Level (7) responds to the CCHs. Level (8) responds only to reach and withdraw CCHs.

Pre-Dianetic and Pre-Scientology mental studies were observations from Level (7) which considered Levels (5) and (6) and (8) the only states of case and oddly enough overlooked Level (7) entirely, all states of case were considered either neurotic or insane, with sanity either slightly glimpsed or decried.

In actuality on some portion of every Time Track in every case you will find each of the Levels except (1) momentarily expressed. The above scale is devoted to *chronic* case level and is useful in Programming a case. But any case for brief moments or longer will hit these levels in being processed. This is the Temporary Case Level found only in sessions on chronically higher level cases when they go through a tough bit.

Thus engram running can be seen to be limited to higher level cases. Other processing, notably modern ARC processes, moves the case up to engram running.

Now what makes these levels of case?

It is entirely *charge*. The more heavily charged the case, the lower it falls on the above scale. It is charge that prevents the pc from confronting the Time Track and submerges the Time Track from view.

Charge is stored energy or stored or recreatable potentials of energy.

The E-Meter registers charge. A very high or low tone arm, a sticky or dirty needle, all are registrations of this charge. The “chronic meter of a case” is an index of chronic charge. The fluctuations of a meter during a session are registering relative charge in different portions of the pc’s Time Track.

More valuably the meter registers *released* charge. You can see it blowing on the meter. The disintegrating RR, the blowing down of the TA, the heavy falls, the loosening needle all show charge being released.

The meter registers charge found and then charge released. It registers charge found but not yet released by the needle getting tight, by DN, by a climbing TA or a TA going far below the clear read. Then as this cleans up, the charge is seen to “blow”.

Charge that is restimulated but not released causes the case to “charge up”, in that charge already on the Time Track is triggered but is not yet viewed by the pc. The whole cycle of restimulated charge that is then blown gives us the action of auditing. When *prior* charge is restimulated but not located so that it can be blown, we get “ARC Breaks”.

The State of Case, the Chronic Level, as given on the above scale, is the totality of charge on the case. Level (I) has *no* charge on it. Level (8) is total charge. The day to day condition of a case, its temper, reaction to things, brightness, depends upon two factors, (a) the totality of charge on the case and (b) the amount of charge in restimulation. Thus a case being processed varies in tone by (a) the totality of charge remaining on the case (b) the amount of charge in restimulation and (c) the amount of charge blown by processing.

Charge is held in place by the basic on a chain. When only later than basic incidents are run charge can be restimulated and then bottled up again with a very small amount blown. This is known as “grinding out” an incident. An engram is getting run, but as it is not basic on a chain, no adequate amount of charge is being released.

Later than basic incidents are run either (a) to uncover more basic (earlier) incidents or (b) to clean up the chain after basic has been found and erased.

No full erasure of incidents later than basic is possible, but charge can be removed from them *providing they are not ground out* but only run lightly a time or two and then an earlier incident on the chain found and similarly run. When *the* basic is found it is erased by *many* passes over it. Basic is the only one which can be run many times. The later the incident is (the further from basic) the more lightly it is run.

There is no difference in the technology required to run a basic or a later incident. It is only the number of times THROUGH that differs. Basic is run through many times. A somewhat later engram is run through a couple of times. An engram very late on the chain is gone through once. Otherwise all engrams whether basic or not are run exactly the same.

Engrams are run to release Charge from a case. Charge is not released to cure the body or to cure anything physical and the meter cures nothing. Charge is released entirely to return to a thetan his causation over the Time Track, to restore his power of choice, and to free him of his most intimate trap, his own Time Track. You cannot have decent, honest or capable beings as long as they are trapped and overwhelmed. While this philosophy may be contrary to the intentions of a slavemaster or a degrader it is nevertheless demonstrably true. The universe is not itself a trap capable only of degradation. But beings exist who, beaten and overwhelmed themselves, can utilize this universe to degrade others.

The mission of engram running is to free the charge which has accumulated in a being and so restore that being to appreciated life.

All cases, sooner or later, have to be run on engrams, no matter what else has to be done. For it is in engrams that the bulk of the charge on the Time Track lies. And it is therefore those parts of the Time Track called engrams which overwhelm the thetan. These contain pain and unconsciousness and are therefore the record of moments when a thetan was most at effect and least at cause. In these moments then the thetan is least able to confront or to be causative.

The engram also contains moments when it was necessary to have moved and most degrading to have held a position in space.

And the engram contains the heaviest ARC Break with a thetan's environment and other beings.

And all these things add up to charge, an impulse to withdraw from that which can't be withdrawn from or to approach that which can't be approached, and this, like a two pole battery, generates current. This constantly generated current is chronic charge. The principal actions are:

- (a) When the attention of the thetan is directed broadly in the direction of such a track record the current increases.
- (b) When the attention is more closely (but not forcefully) and accurately directed, the current is discharged.
- (c) When the basic on the chain is found and erased, that which composes the poles themselves is erased and later incidents eased, for no further generation is possible by that chain and it becomes incapable of producing further charge to be restimulated. The above are the actions which occur during auditing. If these actions do not occur despite auditing, then there is no case betterment, so it is the auditor's responsibility to make sure they do occur.

As the Time Track is created by an involuntary response of the thetan, it is and exists as a real thing, composed of space, matter, energy, time and significance. On a Level (8) Case the Time Track is completely submerged by charge even down to a total unawareness of thought itself. At Level (7) awareness of the track is confined by extant charge to opinions about it. At Level (6) charge on the track is such that pictures of pictures of the track are gratuitously furnished, causing delusive copies of inaccurate copies of the track. At Level (5) charge is sufficient to cause only inaccurate copies of the track to be viewable. At Level (4) charge is sufficient to obscure the track. At Level (3) charge is sufficient to wipe out portions of the track. At Level (2) there is only enough charge to maintain the existence of the track. At Level (1) there is no charge and no track to create it. All charge from Level (1) and up into higher states that is generated is knowingly generated by the thetan, whose ability to hold locations in space and poles apart results in charge as needful. This would degenerate again as he put such matters on automatic or began once more to make a Time Track, but these actions alone are not capable of aberrating a thetan until he encounters further violent degradation and entrapment in the form of implants. Aberration itself must be calculated to occur. The existence of a Time Track only makes it possible for it to occur and be retained. Thus a thetan's first real mistake is to consider his own pictures and their recorded events important, and his second mistake is in not obliterating entrapment activities in such a way as not to become entrapped or aberrated in doing so, all of which can be done and should be.

Engram running is a step necessary to get at the more fundamental causes of a Time Track and handle them.

So it is a skill which must be done and done *well*.

LRH: dr jh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 3**  
**ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS**  
**BULLETIN 3**  
**ROUTINE 3-R**  
**ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS**

Given a knowledge of the Composition and Behaviour of the Time Track, engram running by chains is so simple that any auditor begins by overcomplication. You almost can't get uncomplicated enough in engram running.

In teaching people to run engrams in 1949, my chief despair was summed up in one sentence to the group I was instructing: "All auditors talk too much." And that's the first lesson.

The second lesson is: "All auditors acknowledge too little." Instead of cheerily acknowledging what the pc said and saying "continue", auditors are always asking for more data, and usually for more data than the pc ever could give. Example: Pc: "I see a house here." Auditor: "Okay. How big is it?"

That's not engram running, that's just a lousy Q and A.

The proper action is: Pc: "I see a house here." Auditor: "Okay. Continue."

The exceptions to this rule are non-existent. This isn't a special brand of engram running. It is modern engram running. It was the first engram running and is the last and you can put aside any complications in between.

The auditor is permitted ONE question per each new point of track and that is ALL. Example: Auditor: "Move to the beginning of the 88 plus trillion year incident. (Waits a moment.) What do you see?" Pc: "It's all murky." Auditor: "Good. Move through the incident."

*Wrong* Example: Auditor: "Move to the beginning of the 88 plus trillion year incident. (Waits a moment.) What do you see?" Pc: "It's all murky." Auditor: "Can you see anything in the murk?" FLUNK! FLUNK! FLUNK!

The rule is ACKNOWLEDGE WHAT THE PC SAYS AND TELL HIM TO CONTINUE.

Then there's the matter of being doubtful of control. *Wrong* Example: Auditor: "Move to yesterday. Are you there? How do you know it's yesterday? What do you see that makes you think ...." FLUNK FLUNK FLUNK.

*Right* Example: Auditor: "Move to yesterday. (Waits a moment.) What do you see? .....Good."

Another error is a failure to take the pc's data. You take the pc's data. Never take his orders.

*Right* Example: Auditor (meter dating): "Is it greater than eighteen trillion, less than eighteen trillion (gets contradictory reads or a DN). (Off meter.) Are you thinking of something?" Pc: "It's less than 18 trillion." Auditor: "Thank you. (On meter.) Is it greater than seventeen trillion five hundred billion. Less than ...." Pc: "It's seventeen trillion, nine hundred and eight billion, four hundred and six million, ninety-five thousand, seven hundred and six years ago." Auditor (having alertly written it all down): "Thank you." (Ends dating.)

Wrong Example: Auditor: "Is it greater than eighteen trillion, less than eighteen tr...." Pc: "It's less than eighteen trillion." Auditor: "OK. Is it greater than eighteen trillion, less than eighteen ...." FLUNK FLUNK FLUNK.

In dating, the pc's contrary data unspoken and untaken can give you a completely wrong date. Your data comes from the pc and the meter always for anything. And if the pc's data is invalidated you won't get a meter's data. If the pc says he has a PTP and the meter says he doesn't, you take the pc's data that he does. In dating, an argument with the pc can group the track.

So take the pc's data. And if the pc is a dub-in, you should be running the ARC processes not engrams anyway as the case is over-charged for engrams. If the pc isn't a dubin then the pc's data is quite reliable.

Also, minimize a pc's dependency on a meter. Don't keep confirming a pc's data by meter read with, "That reads. Yes, that's there. Yes, there's a rocket read ...." Just let the pc find his own reality in running an engram. "All auditors talk too much." You can date on a meter but only so long as the pc doesn't cognite on the date. You can help a pc identify or choose an area of track but *only* if he specifically asks you to. Example: Pc: "I've got two pictures here. Can you find out which one is the earlier? One is of a freight engine, the other is a whole train." Auditor: (on meter) "Is the freight engine earlier than the whole train? Is the whole train earlier than the freight engine? (To pc) The whole train reads as earlier."

Now, however, if the pc has two facsimiles, your problem is only that you've missed something.

**RULE: WHENEVER CHARGE IS MISSED THE TIME TRACK TENDS TO GROUP.**

This does not mean the Auditor has to do something about it unless the pc gets confused and *asks for help*, at which time the *only* action is to spot on the meter what charge has been missed and tell the pc.

### ARC BREAKS

All Routine 3 ARC Breaks, including R3-N and R3-R, are handled the same way, an exact way. There is *no* deviation from this.

If the pc becomes critical of anything outside the engram (room, auditor, Scientology, the technology) it is an ARC Break. ARC Breaks are of greater and lesser magnitude ranging throughout the misemotional band of the tone scale.

The handling of ARC Breaks *always* follows this rule:

**ARC BREAK RULE 1: IF THE PC ARC BREAKS, ISSUE NO FURTHER AUDITING COMMANDS UNTIL BOTH PC AND AUDITOR ARE SATISFIED THAT THE CAUSE OF THE ARC BREAK HAS BEEN LOCATED AND INDICATED.**

Do not issue more orders, do not run a process, do not offer to run a process, do not sit idly letting the pc ARC Break. Follow this rule.

**ARC BREAK RULE 2: WHEN A PC ARC BREAKS OR CAN'T GO ON FOR ANY REASON, DO AN R3-R ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT AND LOCATE AND INDICATE TO THE PC THE BY-PASSED CHARGE.**

The only harm that can be done in R3-R (or R3-N) is issuing further orders to the pc or trying to run something before the by-passed charge has been located and indicated.

Given this handling of ARC Breaks and an *exact* adherence to the rote of R3-R, *all* former problems of engram running vanish!

### EARLY ENGRAM RUNNING

No auditor who knew earlier than June 1963 engram running should consider he or she knows how to run engrams.

Routine 3-R is itself. It has *no* dependence on earlier methods of running engrams. Failure to study and learn R3-R “because one knows about engram running” will cause a lot of case failure.

Early engram running was often attempted on cases below Case Level 4. The technology, further, was too varied. Too much was demanded of the pc. Too little effort was put into finding the basic on a chain. Too many forcing techniques were used. Too often the auditor ran just any engram he could get. These and other faults prevented engrams from being run.

R3-R is a rote procedure. That is a victory in itself. But it is a *better* procedure.

If you know old-time engram running, there is no attempt here to invalidate you or that knowledge or make you wrong in any way. Those are all ways to run engrams and gave you a better grasp on it. I only wish to call to your attention that R3-R is not old-time engram running but is a Scientology Routine designed to achieve the state of OT and is not designed for any other use than freeing the spirit of man.

Therefore, study and use R3-R and *don't* mix it with any earlier data on engram running. Anything you know about engram running will help you understand R3-R. But it won't help your pc if mixed in with R3-R. I couldn't put this too strongly. You'll trace any failure in the auditor with R3-R to:

1. Inability to execute the auditing cycle;
2. Inability to run a session;
3. Failure to study and understand the Time Track;
4. Failure to follow R3-R *exactly* without deviation;
5. Failure to handle ARC Breaks as above;
6. Using R3-R on lower level cases not prepared by pre-engram running processes.

#### ROUTINE 3-R

Engram Running by Chains is designated “Routine 3-R” to fit in with other modern processes.

It is a triumph of simplicity. It does not demand visio, sonic or other perception at once by the pc. It develops them.

The ordinary programming of the lowest level case would be Reach and Withdraw Processes, CCHs, Repetitive Processes, R3-R, R3-N, R3-R.

Routine 3-R is the process that leads to Case Level 2. Only some additional exercises are needed, then, to attain the next level, OT.

So R3-R is the fundamental bridge step to OT. And we're going only for OT now for various reasons including political. We have by-passed clear which remains only as a courtesy title denoting one or more GPMs run.

Many cases, even the Black V, can begin at once on R3-R.

#### R3-R BY STEPS

R3-R is run in the 3N model session.

#### *PRELIMINARY STEP.*

Establish the type of chain the pc is to run by assessment.

#### *STEP ONE.*

Locate the first incident by dating.

*STEP TWO:*

Move pc to the incident with the exact command, “Move to (date).”

*STEP THREE:*

Establish duration (length of time) of incident.

(An incident may be anything from a split *second* long to 15 trillion trillion years or more long.)

*STEP FOUR:*

Move pc to beginning of incident with the exact command, “Move to the beginning of the incident at (date).” Wait until meter flicks.

*STEP FIVE.*

Ask pc what he or she is looking at with the exact command, “What do you see?” (If pc’s eyes are open, tell pc first, “Close your eyes.”)

Acknowledge *whatever* pc says.

Do *not* ask a second question, ever.

*STEP SIX:*

Send the pc through the incident with the exact command, “Move through the incident to a point (duration—) later.”

*STEP SEVEN:*

Ask nothing, say nothing, do nothing (except observe meter or make *quiet* notes) while pc is going through the incident. If the pc says anything at all, just acknowledge and let him continue, using this exact command softly, “Okay, Continue. “

Do not coax, distract, or question pc during this period.

Exception: only if the pc ARC Breaks, take action and then only do the R3-R ARC Break Assessment.

If the pc gets stuck, bounces, gets into another incident or if the somatic strip sticks or refuses to obey the auditor, only do an ARC Break Assessment. Do *not* force the pc onward by any command or question.

*STEP EIGHT:*

When the pc reaches the end of the incident (usually pc moves or looks up) say *only*, “What happened?”

Take whatever pc says, acknowledge only as needful. Say *nothing* else, ask *nothing* else. When pc has told little or much and has finished talking, give a final acknowledgement.

*STEP NINE:*

Repeat exactly and only Steps Two to Eight.

Continue to do so until pc either

- (a) Spots an earlier incident or
- (b) Gets no change on a run through the incident from the run just before.

In event of either (a) or (b) do Steps One to Eight exactly and only on the new incident.

#### *STEP TEN:*

At the end of any session of R3-R leave the pc where he is on the time track. Do not attempt to bring the pc to present time or take the pc to a rest point, as these actions may very well by-pass charge. End any R3-R session with *very* careful goals, gains (as the pc is usually rather anaten) and any *needed* havingness, but keep the havingness very brief, only enough to restore can squeeze. Do not end a session on a boil-off or ARC Break.

#### *STEP ELEVEN:*

At the beginning of any new R3-R session, if you finished the last engram you were working on, begin precisely and anew with Step One. If you are still working on an engram already found, begin precisely with Step Four and carry on.

#### *STEP TWELVE:*

If the pc gets into trouble in the session do not use Mid Ruds or ask for missed withholds. Mid Ruds will mush an engram. Missed withholds, unless found as part of the ARC Break Assessment, may move the pc violently about through recently found engrams.

Do only the ARC Break Assessment, and locate and indicate charge accordingly if the session goes wrong.

(Since the last time I audited you Mid Ruds and missed withholds are permissible at session start before any R3-R action is taken in that session.)

#### *STEP THIRTEEN:*

When encountering a goals engram such as the Helatrobus Implants lay aside R3-R and use R3-N.

When encountering a goals engram prior to the Helatrobus Implants or subsequent to them use R3-M2 but only when such an engram has RIs.

#### *STEP FOURTEEN.*

When Basic on any chain is found flatten it fully and permit it to be stripped of any lock engrams or earlier incidents that appear. (In finding basics remember that the Time Track by my most recent measurements considerably exceeds a trillion, trillion, trillion years.

Basics may occur as early as they occur but seldom nearer PT than 200 trillion years ago, and quite ordinarily at 15 trillion, trillion years ago.)

#### *END OF STEPS*

There is no variation of these steps for any reason. This is the most exact procedure known. And there you have it, rote engram running, superior to any engram running ever done and giving superior and faster results.

Future HCO Bulletins will expand the reasons for these steps, give exact methods of dating, give the ARC Break Assessment for R3-R, the assessment for types of chains, and the administration.

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6306C12	SHSBC-273	ARC Straightwire
** 6306C13	SHSBC-274	Levels of Case
** 6306C18	SHSBC-275	Beingness
** 6306C19	SHSBC-276	Summary of Modern Auditing



## **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.

LRH:dr.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6306C20	SHSBC-277	History of Psychotherapy
** 6306C25	SHSBC-278	Routine 2H
** 6306C26	SHSBC-279	TVD-22, Listing Assessment for Engram Running, 1
** 6306C27	SHSBC-280	TVD-23, Listing Assessment for Engram Running, 2

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 JULY AD 13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 3R**  
**BULLETIN 4**  
**PRELIMINARY STEP**

The R3R Preliminary Step is done to assure that the correct incident chain is run on the pc for that pc.

Many chains, locks, secondaries and engrams, are available on any pc. But some of them are beyond the pc's reality and ability and some of them are too featherweight to get any case gain.

The basic problem in starting a case on R3R is to run the pc on a chain that will (a) improve the case, (b) hold the pc's interest, (c) be within the pc's current ability to handle.

The establishing of the correct chain was a missing element in all earlier engram running. Almost any pc from Level 7 upwards could have run engrams if the exact *chain* necessary to resolve the case could have been established. This is accomplished now by an accurate assessment using a sensitive E-Meter and the following form and procedure.

It does not matter if the pc begins on a chain of locks, secondaries or engrams so long as running it does (a), (b) and (c) above. You do not have to specify in R3R whether you are running engrams, secondaries or locks. The word "Incident" covers all.

Also, it does not matter if the pc stays within this lifetime or goes whole track so long as the assessed chain is followed and a basic eventually discovered for it. The chain leads where the chain leads.

But once having found the proper chain the auditor must follow that chain, not skip about. To do this, the auditor, when asking for an earlier incident in later R3R steps *always* specifies the proper chain found in this assessment by the Level + Item result of this Preliminary Step Assessment. For example, if the chain found here in the Preliminary Step is "Decisions to die" (Level found = Decided + Item Found = To die), one obtains earlier incidents by always saying, "Is the next earlier decision to die more than .....years ago? Less than .....years ago?"

Thus the result obtained in the Preliminary Step is used on and on until an actual basic is reached. This may be fifty or more engrams run and perhaps even some R3N in the middle of the chain if the chain leads into a GPM by normal rote use of R3R.

When a basic is reached and discharged and the chain being run now gives little or no TA action (or even free needle), a *new Preliminary Step is done*. But until that happens, this Preliminary Step is not repeated with the other steps. Once it *has* happened (a basic found and run), however, a new Preliminary Step is done exactly as given here for the first chain assessment.

You find the chain.

You run engram after engram on that chain (or lock after lock or secondary after secondary) .

You find a basic.

You run the basic thoroughly.

With TA action now gone on the chain found you do a new Preliminary Step.

RULE: TA ACTION EXISTS ON THE CORRECT CHAIN.

RULE: A CHAIN ONCE ASSESSED MUST BE FULLY RUN.

RULE: TA ACTION CEASES ON A DISCHARGED CHAIN.

RULE: A NEW ASSESSMENT IS DONE ONLY WHEN A CHAIN IS DISCHARGED.

RULE: ANY PROPERLY ASSESSED CHAIN WILL PRODUCE TA ACTION.

RULE: IF A CHAIN ASSESSED DOES NOT PRODUCE IMMEDIATE TA ACTION WITH SKILLED R3R THE ASSESSMENT (OR THE RESULTING QUESTION FORMED) IS INCORRECT.

The exact procedure of assessment is:

1. Assess pc by elimination as below for a R3R Form Level.
2. List the Form Level found to a completed List.
3. Nul the completed list to a single subject.
4. Use the Form Level plus subject to designate the character of the incident to be found *every* time an incident is looked for.

*All rules of listing as developed in R2-12 apply to this Preliminary Step.* They are not repeated here.

One is not looking for RRs or RSeS in the Preliminary Step Assessment. Any type of read is valid.

#### ARC BREAKS

When doing this step of R3R use the ARC Break Assessment for Listing Form, not the R3R ARC Break Assessment Form. The main sources of ARC Breaks in the Preliminary Step are:

1. Wrong level assessed.
2. The listed list incomplete.
3. The wrong Item taken from the list.
4. A former chain or engram abandoned to do a new assessment.
5. Earlier levels restimulated (old Pre-Hav auditing).
6. Earlier listing restimulated.

Such forms will be published from time to time as they tend to change and improve.

#### EARLIER ASSESSMENTS DONE

The very earliest assessment (1948) used was “What the pc could see” when he closed his or her eyes. This was then run.

This was followed by an arbitrary method of assigning necessary incidents to be run such as birth and prenatals.

The next earliest assessment ( 1949) was to ask each time for “the incident necessary to resolve the case”. An automaticity known as the “File Clerk” was depended upon, impinged into action by finger snapping.

The next period ( 1951) concerned whole track exploration running whatever you could get to read on a meter.

The next period (1952) concerned overt engrams located by what the pc seemed to be doing physically.

This ended the Dianetic period where engrams were run to clear but mainly to cure psychosomatic illnesses.

Variations of these assessments were revived from time to time in Dianetic uses culminating in the 5th London ACC where overt engrams were run with confront and

great stress was laid on getting the postulates out of them. The meter and shrewd guesses played their part in assessments.

Up to this time there was a great dependence on “insight” and judgment. We were barred to some degree by my own ability to see other people’s pictures which made engram running very easy for me to do, along with my general knowledge of the whole track and the mind. This led me to be very hard to convince that engram assessment was a subject at all or that most auditors couldn’t do it.

With the advent of Scientology with its complete shift from Dianetic goals, healing went out as a reason for running engrams and concern about the body vanished as an auditing target. This led to stresses on exteriorization of the spirit, moving it away from the body. As the reactive bank was thought to be part of the body, its engrams received no further attention.

Eventually I discovered that the thetan had engrams and that these were being automatically (involuntarily) created by him.

Engram running has vanished as a healing process. Engram handling by chains has emerged as an entirely reoriented subject, not even vaguely connected with the body and with the target not of a human clear but of Operating Thetan.

The assessment for engram chains (or any kind of chain) emerges finally in Routine 3R. This assessment technology from beginning to end is Scientology. None of it was ever heard of in Dianetics. Therefore we have crossed a bridge. I have finally understood that precise assessment is vital for an auditor and that an auditor can learn the exact chain to be run on the pc without any intuition or second sight and that even my own auditing is bettered thereby, and that the thetan cannot be freed and re-empowered without an assessment and rote technology for engram running. This is R3R.

The earliest R3R assessment for chains was done by pc interest and the button Protested. The pc was merely asked, “In this Lifetime what have you protested?” and with no listing, whatever the pc said and seemed interested in was taken.

This however did not often produce adequate TA action when the chain was then run.

The next improvement was using the 18 Prepcheck buttons. This drew a blank on some pcs, no level reacting.

Accordingly, I then developed a new Pre-Hav Scale, based mainly on flows. It is Protest that is basically responsible for making a mental image picture. However, very few cases are up to this level. In order to bring more levels of case under engram running and to get more TA action for any case, I developed this Preliminary Step Scale.

The present scale takes some account of (1) The old Pre-Hav Scale, (2) The Know-to-Mystery Scale, (3) The Chart of Attitudes, (4) The 18 Buttons and (5) The Flows Scale, as well as some old well-known buttons.

Several possible levels (such as Create) have been left out because they would go at once into the GPM or Implant Goals. It may not be important that they do. Indeed, with experience we may even come to guide the pc at them. But for the moment they are left out.

There would be nothing wrong in borrowing further from these sources to draw up a longer Preliminary Step Scale, but I think this should cover most pcs.

The three most important visible factors in R3R are:

- (a) Pc’s interest.
- (b) Tone Arm Action.
- (c) The ability of the pc to run the incidents.

If the auditor can see these he knows his Preliminary Assessment was right.

Interest does not mean happiness and joy. Interest is only absorbed attention and a desire to talk about it. Tears, terror or agony may be present without the Interest factor

being absent. A chain of engrams is expected to produce pain and anaten. A chain of secondaries is expected to produce misemotion. These have nothing in them to head an auditor off a chain.

Equally, significance and story content have no bearing on the rightness or wrongness of a chain selected. They are entirely incidental to judging the correctness of a chain.

All the auditor is interested in is whether (a) the pc is interested; (b) the TA action is good and (c) can the pc run the incidents on the chain with *correct* and *exact* R3 R.

That careless auditing and bad R3R can influence (c), leaves us with only two exact criteria for a correct assessment:

- (a) Pc's Interest and
- (b) TA Action while running incidents.

Only these two things tell us the assessment was right. The assessment can be right and unskilled R3R can wreck both in the later steps, a fact which has to be taken into account in reviewing cases in progress.

### R3R ASSESSMENT

This is the Assessment for R3R Preliminary Step.

In this form will be recognized the old Pre-Hav Scales and others, but improved for the purpose of engram chain assessment.

This assessment *must* be done accurately. It is hard to do if the pc doesn't *understand* a level during assessment, is *startled* by one or *disagrees*. These will make the assessment inaccurate. If the assessment is inaccurately done, the pc will ARC Break or the resulting engram chain will not give TA action when being run.

The final level assessed will probably give TA action at once when found if right.

The key sentence in assessing is "In this lifetime have you mainly .....(level)." This is repeated for each level called. Levels are called once, as in ordinary elimination.

Those that stayed in are reassessed the same way. The one form can be used for many additional assessments on the same pc as chains are run out.

The use of this form brings R3R down to Case Level 7 in workability. A chain of engrams being run must give TA action. If none is present in running engrams and the TA stays high or low the assessment was wrong.

The level found here is used to make and complete a list with the question, "In this lifetime what have you .....(level found)?" "In this lifetime" is used not because we only want chains in this lifetime but to keep pc from going all over the track during the preliminary assessment, this making it too long. The chain you want comes into this lifetime. All rules of listing apply as in R2-12A in doing this list.

In event of an ARC Break while doing the Preliminary Step, use the ARC Break Assessment for Listing.

If needle dirties up in assessing this form, give form to pc and ask "What happened?" and if that fails, get in BMRs "On this Assessment".

SUPPRESSED  
FAILED TO SUPPRESS  
NOT SUPPRESSED

WITHHELD  
FAILED TO WITHHOLD  
NOT WITHHELD

INVALIDATED  
FAILED TO INVALIDATE  
NOT INVALIDATED

PROTESTED  
FAILED TO PROTEST  
NOT PROTESTED

BEEN CAREFUL  
FAILED TO BE CAREFUL  
NOT BEEN CAREFUL

SUGGESTED  
FAILED TO SUGGEST  
NOT SUGGESTED

PROVEN  
FAILED TO PROVE  
NOT PROVEN

HIDDEN  
FAILED TO HIDE  
NOT HIDDEN

REVEALED  
FAILED TO REVEAL  
NOT REVEALED

MADE MISTAKES  
FAILED TO MISTAKE  
NOT MADE MISTAKES

ASSERTED  
FAILED TO ASSERT  
NOT ASSERTED

CHANGED  
FAILED TO CHANGE  
NOT CHANGED

DAMAGED  
FAILED TO DAMAGE  
NOT DAMAGED

REMAINED  
FAILED TO REMAIN  
NOT REMAINED

PREVENTED  
FAILED TO PREVENT  
NOT PREVENTED

PRESSED ON  
FAILED TO PRESS ON  
NOT PRESSED ON

BEEN RIGHT  
FAILED TO BE RIGHT  
NOT BEEN RIGHT

BEEN WRONG  
FAILED TO BE WRONG  
NOT BEEN WRONG

WON  
FAILED TO WIN  
NOT WON

LOST  
FAILED TO LOSE

WITHDRAWN  
FAILED TO WITHDRAW  
NOT WITHDRAWN

CONVINCED  
FAILED TO CONVINCE  
NOT CONVINCED

AGREED  
FAILED TO AGREE  
NOT AGREED

DISAGREED  
FAILED TO DISAGREE  
NOT DISAGREED

IGNORED  
FAILED TO IGNORE  
NOT IGNORED

DECIDED  
FAILED TO DECIDE  
NOT DECIDED

PROPITIATED  
FAILED TO PROPITiate  
NOT PROPITIATED

HELD OFF  
FAILED TO HOLD OFF  
NOT HELD OFF

PULLED IN  
FAILED TO PULL IN  
NOT PULLED IN

HELPED  
FAILED TO HELP  
NOT HELPED

KNOWN  
FAILED TO KNOW  
NOT KNOWN

CAUSED  
FAILED TO CAUSE  
NOT CAUSED

BELIEVED  
FAILED TO BELIEVE  
NOT BELIEVED

CURED  
FAILED TO CURE  
NOT CURED

LIKED  
FAILED TO LIKE  
NOT LIKED

AVOIDED  
FAILED TO AVOID

NOT LOST

BLOCKED  
FAILED TO BLOCK  
NOT BLOCKED

RETREATED  
FAILED TO RETREAT  
NOT RETREATED

REACHED  
FAILED TO REACH  
NOT REACHED

ATTACKED  
FAILED TO ATTACK  
NOT ATTACKED

STOPPED  
FAILED TO STOP  
NOT STOPPED

CONFRONTED  
FAILED TO CONFRONT  
NOT CONFRONTED

COMMUNICATED  
FAILED TO COMMUNICATE  
NOT COMMUNICATED

BEEN PRIDEFUL  
FAILED TO BE PROUD  
NOT BEEN PRIDEFUL

SYMPATHIZED  
FAILED TO SYMPATHIZE  
NOT SYMPATHIZED

RECOVERED  
FAILED TO RECOVER  
NOT RECOVERED

HAD  
FAILED TO HAVE  
NOT HAD

LOOKED  
FAILED TO LOOK  
NOT LOOKED

BEEN SERENE  
FAILED TO BE SERENE

BEEN ENTHUSIASTIC  
FAILED TO BE ENTHUSIASTIC

BEEN CONSERVATIVE  
FAILED TO BE CONSERVATIVE

INFLOWED  
FAILED TO INFLOW  
STOPPED INFLOW

NOT AVOIDED

BEEN BORED  
NOT BEEN BORED

BEEN ANTAGONISTIC  
NOT BEEN ANTAGONISTIC

ENDURED  
FAILED TO ENDURE  
NOT ENDURED

ABANDONED

FAILED TO ABANDON  
NOT ABANDONED

GIVEN UP  
FAILED TO GIVE UP  
NOT GIVEN UP

BEEN SANE  
FAILED TO BE SANE  
NOT BEEN SANE

BEEN CURIOUS  
FAILED TO BE CURIOUS  
NOT BEEN CURIOUS

DESIRED  
FAILED TO DESIRE  
NOT DESIRED

ENFORCED  
FAILED TO ENFORCE  
NOT ENFORCED

INHIBITED  
FAILED TO INHIBIT  
NOT INHIBITED

BEEN ANGRY  
FAILED TO BE ANGRY  
RESENTED

FAILED TO RESENT  
NOT RESENTED  
FEARED

FAILED TO FEAR  
NOT FEARED

BEEN IN GRIEF  
FAILED TO CRY

BEEN APATHETIC  
FAILED TO BE APATHETIC

THOUGHT  
FAILED TO THINK  
NOT THOUGHT



OUTFLOWED  
FAILED TO OUTFLOW  
STOPPED OUTFLOW

EVALUATED  
FAILED TO EVALUATE  
NOT EVALUATED

HAD OPINIONS ABOUT  
FAILED TO HAVE OPINIONS ABOUT  
NOT HAD OPINIONS ABOUT

In nulling this scale the pc may suddenly break down emotionally or get an *overpowering* reaction. (Not just a twinge or an interest in a level, since the pc will *not* know the real level until it is found.) If so, STOP, don't go on. Go back to above the point where pc was all right and then carefully null back down to where you stopped. Go over this area getting in suppress and invalidate if needful and you'll have the pc's level found. You may lead into ARC Breaks if you persist in going on as you have by-passed charge. But the pc's reaction must be large for you to use this mechanism. Beware of a "sell" by the pc. A pc doesn't know the level until it is actually found. Some pcs will decide on a level and it will then read. In such a case get in Protested and Decided with "On this scale have you ....." by fast check. Don't let your pc mess up an assessment by a "sell" or decision. But don't keep on down a long assessment of this scale with the pc shattered by pain or emotion as the pc will suppress the right level.

When you have found the pc's level on the above scale by elimination, then list the following question, using that level found: "In this lifetime what have you ..... (level found)?"

List the list to a clean needle so that it nuls very easily, leaving a very few in on the first nulling, only two or three in on the second nulling of what has been left in. Put mid ruds in on these if necessary. Nul out to the final Item.

Combine the Level found and the Item found. This is a very simple step. The wording may have to be altered in tense but not in sense. "Decided" may become "Decision". "Failed to think" may become "Failure to think". In the Item found some shift of the pc's wording may be needful. But be very careful that you get a combination of Level and Item that makes sense to the pc and reads on the meter without protest reading too. These reads are often not very large and at best assume steep falls with TA action. So be careful to add up the Level and the Item found to a sensible statement that does *not* alter the sense. For instance you can err greatly if the Level was "Fear" and the Item was "Entrapment" if you vary it to "Fear of Traps". That won't give you the same chain at all. The correct one is "Fear of Entrapment" of course.

You can have a correct Level, a correct Item and then fail to combine the two sensibly. If so you will get (a) A confused pc and (b) A wrong chain. Either way you'll get little TA action and no R3R done.

The Level "Failed to Convince" and the Item "Father" had better be left just that way. It gives a short chain, this lifetime, soon done. By changing the Item "Father" to "Fathers" you would go whole track but the significance is wildly altered and might not run at all. The less alteration the better. And never alter the *sense* of it.

Use the question: "Is the first available (Level) (Item) incident earlier than five years ago? Later than five years ago?" And using times to suit, go on with Step One of R3R.

(Note: The above scale is in random order of arrangement at this time and positions of levels on the scale have no significance.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 JULY AD13

Franchise  
Academies  
CenOCon  
BPI

*ALL ROUTINES*

(HCO Secs: Check out all ARC Break  
Assessment HCO Bulletins on all  
executives including registrars and on  
all staff auditors and Instructors)

**ARC BREAK ASSESSMENTS**

These lists are valuable. Intelligently used they put an auditor or Scientology staff or executive at cause over *all* session ARC Breaks and Scientology upsets.

The following Assessments are for use in finding by-passed charge in various auditing activities.

The source of all ARC Breaks is by-passed charge. There is no other source of ARC Breaks. The type of charge that can be by-passed varies from one auditing activity to another (R3R, 3N, etc). Therefore different lists for assessment are necessary for different Routines in auditing. Another list for general auditing is also necessary.

Everything that has been written about by-passed charge is valid. All by-passed charge is in some degree a missed withhold, missed by both auditor and pc.

Having these lists for assessment, there is no excuse for an ARC Break to long continue in a session or for anyone to remain ARC Broken with Scientology.

The following assessments find what kind of charge has been missed. It is then up to the auditor to *locate* it more precisely as to character and time and *indicate* it to the pc. The pc will feel better the moment the right type of by-passed charge is identified by assessment and indicated by the auditor. If the pc does *not* feel better but further ARC Breaks then the assessment is either incomplete or incorrect.

Many complicated ways exist for a charge to be by-passed. There is no reason to go into these. You will find it is always by-passed charge and that it could have been located and indicated in any ARC Break.

R2H is the training process for use of these lists. In R2H devoted to "In auditing" or when an ARC Break is found in a *past* auditing session during an R2H session the type of list that applied *to that session* is used.

There are four ways of using these lists. The first is to assess by elimination and come up with one list line still reading on the meter and indicate it as the charge to the pc. The second is to go down a list taking each one that reads and clearing it up with the pc, finishing the whole list and then finally indicate what read the most. The third way is like the second except that the pc is required to help find what made the type of charge read and actually identify it as a particular thing. The fourth way is to assess only for biggest read or one line and have the pc help spot it.

The third way is the one most commonly used at the end of a session where it is just cleaning up the session, and each question is completely cleaned on the needle in turn. The first way is most used on violent ARC Breaks. The second or the fourth ways are used in R2H.

Assessment often has to be done through a dirty needle. No effort is made to clean it up before assessment. And just because the needle is dirty is no reason to call them all "in". Learn to read through a DN for both ARC Break Assessments and

dating. It is rather easy to do with a Mark V meter as the characteristic of the DN shifts when one is “in”.

No effort has been made here to convert the words to non-Scientology language, as the sense would be lost to a Scientologist.

These lists are all bare-bone and contain only the usual types of by-passed charge. They may be added to as experience with them increases. They become too unwieldy when they are too long. The only way you can get confused as to how to locate and indicate charge is by finding the wrong charge.

## GENERAL ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT

Used in general sessions of all kinds where an ARC Break has occurred, or at session end in all routines and for R2H.

The prefix sentence “In this session has???” is used when cleaning up a session at its end or during the session. “At that time had???” is used for R2H. The actual date may be occasionally substituted for “time” to keep the pc oriented but only if necessary.

### LIST L—1

a withhold been missed?  
some emotion been rejected?  
some affinity been rejected?  
a reality been refused?  
a communication been cut short?  
a communication been ignored?  
an earlier rejection of emotion been restimulated?  
an earlier rejection of affinity been restimulated?  
an earlier refusal of reality been restimulated?  
an earlier ignored communication been restimulated’?  
a wrong reason for an upset been given?  
a similar incident occurred before’?  
something been done other than what was said?  
a goal been disappointed?  
some help been rejected?  
a decision been made?  
an engram been restimulated?  
an earlier incident been restimulated?  
there been a sudden shift of attention?  
something startled you? a perception been prevented?  
a willingness not been acknowledged?  
there been no auditing?

(Note: If “overt” is added to this list or any BMR buttons, the scale cannot be used in an R3R or 3N session as these “mush” up engrams.)

(Note: If this list is used do not also use any other end rudiments except goals, gains and pc’s havingness.)

## ASSESSMENT SESSIONS LISTING SESSIONS PRELIMINARY STEP R3R THE ARC BREAK FOR ASSESSMENTS LIST

When doing any listing step or type of auditing use the following list for ARC Break Assessment in event of an ARC Break in the session or at session end.

The prefix “In this session has ...” is used for a listing session, and “In that session had . . .” if a listing session ARC Break is recalled by the pc doing R2H.

#### LIST L—2

an incorrect level been found?  
an incorrect item been found?  
a list not been completed?  
a level abandoned? an item abandoned?  
you not given items you thought of?  
a goal been restimulated?  
an implant been restimulated?  
an engram been restimulated?  
a withhold been missed?  
earlier listing been restimulated?  
earlier wrong levels been restimulated?  
earlier wrong items been restimulated?  
earlier listing ARC Breaks been restimulated?

#### ROUTINE R3R ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS

In all engram running sessions, and those combined with 3N in that session, use the following list.

Prefix each question with “In this session have . . .” in event of an ARC Break or at session end. For R2H where an ARC Break is discovered in an earlier engram running session (clear back to 1950), prefix with “In that session had the auditor . . .” and omit “I” and “we”.

#### LIST L—3

I found an incorrect date?  
I found an incorrect duration?  
I demanded more than you could see?  
two or more engrams been found on the same date?  
you skidded to another incident?  
we moved to another chain?  
we gotten to a goals implant?  
we scanned through a GPM?  
we restimulated an earlier incident?  
we restimulated an earlier implant?  
we restimulated an earlier ARC Break on engrams?  
we failed to find the real beginning of the incident?  
we by-passed important data?  
we skipped an incident?  
two or more incidents been confused?  
I missed a withhold on you?  
we left an incident too heavily charged?  
we scanned through one or more series of goal implants?  
we abandoned a chain? we abandoned an incident?  
I prevented you from running an incident?  
I changed processes on you?

(Note: Do NOT use any BMR buttons during engram running or add overts to this list as they will “mush” engrams.)

ROUTINE 3N  
GPMs, ALL GOALS SESSIONS

When a session is being run on GPMs or goals no matter with what routine, use the following ARC Break assessment when *any* ARC Break, great or small, occurs (or when pc becomes critical of the auditor even “playfully”). If R3R and R3N are both run in the same session, do both L—3 and L—4.

Prefix the lines with “In this session have . . .”, or for R2H ARC Breaks found in goals sessions “In that session had the auditor . . .” and omit “I” or “we”. In event that the current pc was the auditor in that session and ARC Broke (applies also to List L—3 above) use List L—1.

LIST L—4

I given you an incorrect item?  
I given you a wrongly worded goal?  
I given you a wrong goal?  
I left an Item charged?  
I skipped an Item?  
I skipped more than one Item?  
I skipped a goal?  
I skipped more than one goal?  
we restimulated an earlier wrong goal?  
we restimulated an earlier wrong item?  
we restimulated an earlier implant?  
I failed to give you a goal?  
I failed to give you an item?  
I misdaded a goal?  
you run items out of different GPMs (or goals)?  
we run more than one series of goals?  
we restimulated an earlier goals series?  
we restimulated an earlier engram?  
you skidded on the time track?  
we gone over an engram inside this GPM?  
we restimulated another GPM?  
we missed part of the incident?  
I given you no auditing?  
I missed a withhold on you?  
we missed some other kind of charge?  
we abandoned a goal?  
we abandoned an item?  
I given you more Items than are here?  
I given you more goals than are here?  
we listed an item wrong way to?  
I restimulated earlier errors in running GPMs?  
we slipped into a later goals series?  
I changed processes on you?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[The above lists have been later revised by HCO Bs 19 March 1971, *List-I-C*, Volume VII, page 203; 11 April 1971RA, Revised 8 March 1974, *L3RD Dianetics and Int RD Repair List*, Volume VIII, page 265; and 15 December 1968R, Revised 2 June 1972, *L4BR-For Assessment of All Listing Errors*, Volume VIII, page 138.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 JULY 1963

CenOCon  
Franchise

**CCHs REWRITTEN**

(Replaces HCO Bulletin of 2 November 1961, "Training CCHs"  
and HCO Policy Letter of 15 May 1962, "CCHs Rewritten")

The following revised rundown on the CCHs is to be used by all Students in Scientology Orgs.

**CONTROL—COMMUNICATION—HAVINGNESS PROCESSES**

The following rundown of CCH 1, 2, 3 and 4 has been slightly amended. They are for use in training. CCHs are run as follows:

CCH I to a flat point then CCH 2 to a flat point then CCH 3 to a flat point then CCH 4 to a flat point then CCH 1 to a flat point, etc.

To bring the CCH training into line with current methods of teaching TRs, etc, at the end of each drill a list of Coach's questions is given. In addition Coach should take instructions from the "Commands" and "Training Stress" and frame them in the form of questions. For example, in CCH I Coach could ask, "Did you make every command and cycle separate?"

Coach must avoid invalidating Student and not ask questions on what Coach *thinks* the Student has done wrong. The correct method is to ask a few questions at a time choosing and forming questions at random. On the other hand Coach should not ask a question about something that has not happened in the drill. For example, in CCH 3, if Coach has not manifested a "dope-off", Coach would *not* ask, "When I doped off did you take my hand and execute the command one hand at a time?"

**No. CCH 1.**

**NAME.** GIVE ME THAT HAND. Tone 40.

**COMMANDS.** GIVE ME THAT HAND.

Physical action of taking hand when not given and then replacing it in the Coach's lap. Making physical contact with the Coach's hand if Coach resists. THANK YOU ending each cycle.

All Tone 40 with clear intention, one command in one unit of time. Take up *each new physical* change manifested *as though it were an origin* by the Coach, when it happens, and querying it by asking "What's happening?" This two-way comm is *not* Tone 40. Run only on the right hand.

**POSITION:** Student and Coach seated in chairs without arms. Student's knees on outside of both Coach's knees.

**PURPOSE.** To demonstrate to pc that control of pc's body is possible, despite revolt of circuits, and inviting pc to directly control it. Absolute control by auditor then passes over towards absolute control of his own body by pc.

**TRAINING STRESS.** Never stop process until a flat place is reached. Freezes may be introduced at end of cycle, this being after the THANK YOU and before the next command, maintaining a solid comm line, to ascertain information from the Coach or to bridge from the process. This is done between two commands, holding the Coach's hand after acknowledgement. Coach's hand should be clasped with exactly correct pressure. Make every command and cycle separate. Maintain Tone 40, stress on intention from Student to Coach with each command. To leave an instant for Coach to do it by own will before Student decides to take hand or make contact with it. Stress

Tone 40 precision; can be coached for some time silently with Coach looking for silent Student intention. Student indicates hand by nod of head.

*COACH'S QUESTIONS.*

- CCH 1.*
1. What is a Tone 40 Command?  
(Intention without reservation)
  2. Did you give me a Tone 40 Command?
  3. Was the command executed?
  4. What is a change?  
(Any physical observed manifestation)
  5. Did you notice any change?
  6. What was it?
  7. Did you take it up with me?
  8. Did you introduce a freeze at end of cycle to ascertain information from me or to bridge from the process?

*HISTORY.* Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in the 17th ACC Washington DC, 1957.

*No. CCH 2.*

*NAME.* TONE 40 8C.

*COMMANDS.* YOU LOOK AT THAT WALL. THANK YOU.  
YOU WALK OVER TO THAT WALL. THANK YOU.  
YOU TOUCH THAT WALL. THANK YOU.  
TURN AROUND. THANK YOU.

Take up *each new physical* change manifested *as though it were an origin* by the Coach, when it happens, and querying it by asking "What's happening?" This two-way comm is *not* Tone 40. Commands smoothly enforced physically when necessary. Tone 40, full intention.

*POSITION:* Student and Coach ambulant, Student in physical contact with Coach as needed.

*PURPOSE:* To demonstrate to pc that his body can be controlled and thus inviting him to control it. To orient him in his present time Environment. To increase his ability to duplicate and thusly increase his Havingness.

*TRAINING STRESS:* Absolute Student precision. No drops from Tone 40. No flubs. Total present time. Student on Coach's right side. Student's body acts as block to forward motion when Coach turns. Student gives command, gives Coach a moment to obey, then enforces command with physical contact of exactly correct force to get command executed. Student does not block Coach from executing commands. Method of introduction as in CCH 1. Freezes may be introduced at the end of cycle, this being after the THANK YOU and before the next command, maintaining a solid comm line, to ascertain information from the Coach or to bridge from the process, this being the acknowledgement "THANK YOU" after the command "TURN AROUND".

*COACH'S QUESTIONS.*

- CCH 2:*
1. What is a Tone 40 Command?  
(Intention without reservation)
  2. Did you give me a Tone 40 Command?
  3. Was the command executed?
  4. What is a change?  
(Any physical observed manifestation)
  5. Did you notice any change?
  6. What was it?
  7. Did you take it up with me?
  8. Did you introduce a freeze at end of cycle to ascertain information from me or to bridge from the process?

*HISTORY.* Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington DC, in 1957 for the 17th ACC.

### **No. CCH 3.**

**NAME.** HAND SPACE MIMICRY.

**COMMANDS:** Student raises 2 hands palms facing Coach's about an equal distance between the Student and Coach and says "PUT YOUR HANDS AGAINST MINE, FOLLOW THEM AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION." He then makes a simple motion with right hand then left. "DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION?" Acknowledge answer. Student allows Coach to break solid comm line. When this is flat, the Student does this same with a half inch of space between his and the Coach's palms. The command being "PUT YOUR HANDS FACING MINE ABOUT 1/2 INCH AWAY, FOLLOW THEM AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION." "DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION?" Acknowledge. When this is flat, Student does it with a wider space and so on until Coach is able to follow motions a yard away.

**POSITION.** Student and Coach seated, close together facing each other, Coach's knees between Student's knees.

**PURPOSE:** To develop reality on the auditor using the reality scale (solid communication line). To get pc into communication by control and duplication. To find auditor.

**TRAINING STRESS:** That Student be gentle and accurate in his motions, all motions being Tone 40, giving pc wins. To be free in 2-way communication. That process be introduced and run as a formal process. To teach student that if coach dopes off in this process Student may take Coach's wrist and help him execute the command one hand at a time. That if Coach does not answer during anaten to question "DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION?", Student may wait for normal comm lag of that Coach, acknowledge and continue process.

**COACH'S QUESTIONS.**

- CCH 3:**
1. What is a Tone 40 motion?  
(Intention without reservation)
  2. Did you give me a Tone 40 motion?
  3. Was the motion executed?
  4. What is a change?  
(Any physical observed manifestation)
  5. Did you notice any change'?
  6. What was it?
  7. Did you take it up with me?
  8. Did you do a simple movement?
  9. Define two-way communication.  
(One question—the right one.)
  10. Did you receive a verbal origination?
  11. Did you understand it?
  12. Did you acknowledge it?
  13. Did you return me to session?
  14. Did you double question me?
  15. Did you change because I had changed?
  16. Did you follow my instruction?
  17. What did you do?
  18. What happened?

**HISTORY.** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington DC, 1956, as a therapeutic version of Dummy Hand Mimicry. Something was needed to supplant 'Look at me' 'Who am I?' and 'Find the auditor' part of rudiments.

### **No. CCH 4.**

**NAME.** BOOK MIMICRY.

**COMMANDS:** THERE ARE NO SET VERBAL COMMANDS.

Student makes simple motions with a book. Hands book to the Coach. Coach makes motion, duplicating Student's mirror-image-wise. Student asks pc if he is satisfied that the Coach duplicated the motion. If Coach is and Student is also fairly satisfied,



Student takes back the book and goes to next command. If Coach is not sure that he duplicated any command, Student repeats it for him and gives him back the book. If Coach is sure he did and Student can see duplication is pretty wrong, Student accepts Coach's answer and continues on a gradient scale of motions either with the left or right hand till Coach can do original command correctly. This ensures no invalidation of the Coach. Tone 40, only in motions, verbal 2-way quite free.

*POSITION:* Student and Coach seated facing each other, a comfortable distance apart.

*PURPOSE:* To bring up pc's communication with control and duplication (control and duplication = communication).

*TRAINING STRESS:* Stress giving Coach wins. Stress Student's necessity to duplicate his own commands. Circular motions are more complex than straight lines. Tolerance. of plus or minus randomness are apparent here and the Student should probably begin on the Coach with motions that begin in the same place each time and are neither very fast nor very slow, nor very complex. Introduced by the Student seeing that Coach understands what is to be done, as here is no verbal command, formal process.

*COACH'S QUESTIONS:*

- CCH 4:*
1. What is a Tone 40 motion?  
(Intention without reservation)
  2. Did you give me a Tone 40 motion?
  3. Was the motion executed?
  4. What is a change?  
(Any physical observed manifestation)
  5. Did you notice any change?
  6. What was it?
  7. Did you take it up with me?
  8. Did you do a simple movement?
  9. Define two-way communication.  
(One question—the right one.)
  10. Did you receive a verbal origination?
  11. Did you understand it?
  12. Did you acknowledge it?
  13. Did you return me to session?
  14. Did you double question me?
  15. Did you change because I had changed?
  16. Did you follow my instruction?
  17. What did you do?
  18. What happened?

*HISTORY:* Developed by L.R.H. for the 16th ACC in Washington DC, 1957. Based on duplication. Developed by L.R.H. in London, 1952.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr. rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is replaced by HCO B I December 1965, *CCHs*, Volume VI, page 118. See also HCO PL 17 May 1965, *CCHs*, Volume VI, page 40, which says that processes may not be used as drills.]

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 JULY 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**A TECHNICAL SUMMARY  
THE REQUIRED SKILLS OF PROCESSING  
AND WHY**

Here is where we stand and where we're going.

An auditor, to make a Clear or OT, has to be able to handle confidently certain skills.

Today we assume that every successful process we ever had is and was a valid process. We are at a point of summation and valuation as we are achieving excellent and steady progress even on the most unlikely cases. I consider that the period of *basic* mental research has ended and the period of adjustment of skills, on which I will for some time be engaged, has been entered upon.

I list here the auditor skills which are requisite to handle any case.

**SKILLS BY CASE LEVEL**

Case Levels 8, 7 and 6

Objective Processes

Reach and Withdraw Commands

CCHs

Havingness Processes

Case Levels 7, 6 and 5

Model Session

Repetitive Command Processes

R2H

Meter Reading

Simple Assessment of a form

Case Levels 6, 5, 4 and 3

Assessment of Levels

Listing and Nulling Lists

R3R

3N

These constitute, to use another table, the following exact skills:

Handling the pc's body (as in Reach and Withdraw or 8c).

Ability to execute the auditing cycle.

Ability to give repetitive commands.

Ability to handle a meter.

Ability to run a Model Session and keep the pc in session.

Ability to read a Tone Arm.

Ability to accurately meter date.

Ability to run R2H.

- Ability to locate and handle ARC Breaks.
- Ability to assess a simple form.
- Ability to find a level.
- Ability to list, complete and nul a list.
- Ability to run R3R.
- Ability to do 3N.
- Ability to do a form Line Plot for a GPM.
- Ability to do a Line Plot for an off-beat GPM.
- Ability to list for and find a goal.
- Ability to list for and find a top oppterm.
- Knowledge of the Time Track.
- Knowledge of the Thetan.
- Knowledge of the basics of Life.
- A General Knowledge of Scientology.

(Note: The abilities of R3R, R3N and R2H are also listed separately in the above.)

These, briefly, are the skills required to make an OT. They are well taught at Saint Hill. They are practised in Central Orgs as fast as released. HCO Bulletins exist on nearly all this material, except some fine points of R3R which are known but not yet written up, and some of the R3N Line Plots not yet issued.

## BASIC SKILLS

If you examine the above you will find that where the auditor cannot do the required skill the faults are only one or more of the following:

- Cannot execute the auditing cycle.
- Cannot execute an auditing cycle repetitively.
- Cannot handle a session.
- Cannot read a meter.
- Cannot study and apply Scientology data.

Given the ability to execute the auditing cycle once or repetitively, handle a session, read a meter and study and apply procedures, all the above listed auditing skills are easily acquired and successfully done.

Therefore in looking for the reasons for no results, one finds the failure to apply the required procedure and in tracing that, one inevitably finds one or more of these five basics amiss in the auditor.

It is no longer a question of whether Scientology works, it is only a question of whether the auditor can work Scientology. If he or she can't, then the trouble lies in one or more of these basics.

The trouble does *not* lie with the procedure or with the pc. Of course some procedures above are harder to do than others and some pcs can worry an auditor far more than others, but these are incidental and are very junior to the five basics above.

The lower the case level of the auditor, the harder time he or she will have grasping the know-how and using it. For instance a squirrel is only a dramatizing Case Level 6 or 7. A student having a rough time is a Case Level 6 or 5. Somebody almost heartbreaking to teach is a Case Level 7 or 8. BUT, with alert guidance and even making mistakes, I have seen Case Levels from 3 to 8 alike getting wins and finally smoothing out on the five basics above. I've seen it myself in the past two years of training at Saint Hill. So I've discarded Case Level as an index of auditing ability, it is only an index of how-hard-to-train.

The question of psychotic or neurotic does not enter. These are artificial states and have no real bearing, surprisingly enough, on Case Level. My belief in an auditor's ability to audit has far more bearing on his auditing than his or her aberrations.

The only factor left is auditor judgment. This varies about and improves with wins. But processes are so arranged that it is a question only of what is the highest process that gives TA action, rather than pre-session case estimation. Trial and error is the best test. I would use it myself, for I have often found the most unlikely preclear (at first glance) capable of running high level processes and some very "capable" people (at casual inspection) unable to see a wall. So I always run the highest level that I *hope* pc can run, and revise on experience with the pc if necessary.

### FORMER TRAINING

As all modern courses and Academies have stressed basic skills as above for some time, no past training has been lost.

Those who learned R2-12 are much better fitted to do R3R and 3N than those who did not.

We look on any auditor today to be able to do repetitive processes but remember, that was sometimes a hard-won ability and old Book and Bottle was developed to assist it.

People who learned Pre-hav assessing or goals finding are definitely well progressed.

Anyone who can do the CCHs successfully will always find them handy.

So I count no training lost. And I am about to collect all earlier processes that worked on psychosomatic ills and publish them, since being careful not to do healing has not protected us at all and we might as well take over the medical profession for I now find that only their trade association has been firing at us in the press. So that opens up a use for almost all training on processes ever given.

If an auditor has learned the above basics he or she can easily do the long list of skills required for Clearing or OT.

### CLEARING

We can clear to keyed-out clear or clear stably. I have considered it necessary to stress thorough clearing. We are on a longer road but a more certain and stable road when we erase the Time Track or sections of it. Clear is now Case Level 2.

The main goal, however, is OT, due to the general situation. When we were attacked I decided on a policy of:

1. Hold the line on the Legal Front and
2. Accelerate research to OT as our best means of handling the situation.

Both these policies are being successful in the extreme and I hope you agree with them.

By courtesy, one GPM run gives a first goal clear. No further test is done.

One chain of engrams completed is an R3R one-chain clear. This is easier than you might think.

Theta clear at this time is a Case Level 2 that is exterior.

OT is a Case Level 1 complete with skills rehabilitated.

The route to these states is very well established and is contained in the first list above.

### HOURS OF PROCESSING

Cases require as many hours as they are located on the Case Level Scale. The lower they are the more hours they require. The higher they are the less they require.

As some index, I have had about 800 hours lately including all techniques from R2-12 forward, much of it purely research auditing on myself as a pc, developing procedures and getting line plots. Barely 250 hours of this was effective auditing. And I am definitely on the easy last half to OT.

In a period of about half that, Mary Sue achieved 10 goal clear and has just completed her first assessed R3R chain. This included all the R3 goals work, the research of R2-12 on her as a pc, as well as R3N and R3R. Effective Auditing, given the data now known, amounted to about 150 hours or less.

A guess to OT, given a skilled auditor and training on all modern data as above, and an able pc, would be less than 500 hours to a one chain R3R clear. This expectancy is being fulfilled on the Saint Hill Course for those now in Z Unit. To this would have to be added any processing time necessary to get the pc up to R3R. I consider that OT lies on the sunny side of 1,000 hours of processing now for cases that can be audited.

### DIFFICULTY OF CLEARING

No case is really easy. A higher state attained is an uphill fight. So don't underestimate the difficulty of clearing.

We went too long on the Time Track before developing and working at Scientology .

BUT we can do it. And it is a lot more than worthwhile—it is vital that we do do it. If we miss now, we may be finished. For there is no help elsewhere and there never has been this technology or any *successful* mental technology. And just now nobody cares but us. When we've succeeded all the way everybody will want on. But not yet.

My own job is *very* far from an end. The job of getting the purely technology developed and organized is practically over, unless you consider a recording of the full technology as part of the job. I've only recorded essentials and am just writing the last bulletins on those. But ahead is a vast panorama of research on other dynamics and enormous amounts of other technology.

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6307C09	SHSBC-281	The Free Being
** 6307C10	SHSBC-282	Auditing Skills for R-3R
** 6307C10	SHSBC-284A	Preliminary Steps of R-3R, Part 1
** 6307C10	SHSBC-284B	Preliminary Steps of R-3R, Part 2

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JULY 1963

Sthil  
SHSBC

**AUDITING RUNDOWN  
MISSED WITHHOLDS  
TO BE RUN IN X 1 UNIT**

1. Complete a list on the following question:  
“In this lifetime what have you done that you have withheld from someone?”
2. On each withhold listed ask:
  - (a) “When was it?”
  - (b) “Where was it?”
  - (c) “Who failed to find out about it?”
  - (d) “Who nearly found out about it?”
  - (e) “Who still doesn’t know about it?”

Each answer must be written down and the sheet of answers showing to which withhold they relate must be turned in with the auditing report.

The answer sheet will be made available to all instructors on the Course.

The above suggestion was made by Bernie Pesco, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course student, and accepted for use.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: gl.bh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is superseded by HCO B 23 July 1963, *Auditing Rundown-Missed Withholds-To be Run in XI Unit.*]

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
11—18 July 1963

** 6307C11	SHSBC-283	ARC Breaks
** 6307C16	SHSBC-285	Tips on Running R-3R
** 6307C17	SHSBC-286	Dating
** 6307C18	SHSBC-287	Errors in Time

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JULY 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise for info

**CO-AUDIT**  
**ARC BREAK PROCESS**

A despatch from Dennis Stephens, DScn, Acting Assoc Sec Sydney, is informative in handling a co-audit on the ARC Break Process.

The Commands of the ARC Break Process are not entirely fixed at this time but are more or less as follows, each command being called a "leg".

What Attitude has been rejected?

What Reality has been refused?

What Communication has been ignored?

In private sessions each leg of this process is run flat (more or less) before the next is run and so on and on, around and around, some effort being made to give each leg an equal time. The rules of ARC (to raise one that is low, raise the other two) apply so that no great stress is given an inability on one leg, but all are treated equally.

The process fits in at Case Level 5, is a bit higher than R2H.

L. RON HUBBARD

The despatch follows:

Dear Ron,

The new ARC 1963 Process is producing good results here in Sydney.

We have recently introduced it onto our public co-audit. Certain problems introduced themselves in the application of this process to a . group of unskilled auditors who were not trained in the use of E-Meters, etc. The process as given was to be run a leg at a time, each leg to quiet TA or 3 equal comm lags, or a cognition.

Now to run it against the TA on public co-audit meant each student had a meter (which they haven't) and the idea was rejected as impractical. Similarly training them in spotting cognitions and comm lags was also rejected as being time consuming. The other possibility was the supervisors go around continuously and take TA reads. Now this system is not good because the supervisor coming up and taking reads disturbs the pc and so disturbs the TA and so defeats its own purpose. The other possibility was an elaborate series of wiring where each pc is switched in to a Master Board and the supervisor, by switches, plugs each pc onto the meter at his desk. We haven't got such equipment and can barely afford its installation. Anyway that was discarded too.

How to run it? Well, I tried the following system out and it works like a dream. Other orgs might find it useful too.

The pc runs the first leg until he has no more answers, he then goes to second leg until he has no more answers, and similarly with the 3rd leg. He then returns to the first leg, etc, etc. If the pc should ever (heaven forbid! and it's never happened yet) have "no more answers" for each and every leg he either has a thumping ARC Break or needs a "prod" from the meter. So the supervisor would just meter check one of the legs and steer the pc's attention to the answer and he's off on another chain!

The system works OK because the pc is going round and round the same series of commands and always gets another chance to look at each question. Run in this manner the process becomes virtually unlimited.

This system of running the process is particularly applicable where raw people are concerned, with not even a comm course under their belt and fresh from PE course.

Anyway it works very well.

Very best,

DENNIS

LRH: dr jh  
Copyright ©1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD



HCO BULLETIN OF 22 JULY 1963

MA  
Franchise  
BPI

## YOU CAN BE RIGHT

Rightness and wrongness form a common source of argument and struggle.

The concept of rightness reaches very high and very low on the Tone Scale.

And the effort to be right is the last conscious striving of an individual on the way out. I-am-right-and-they-are-wrong is the lowest concept that can be formulated by an unaware case.

What *is* right and what *is* wrong are not necessarily definable for everyone. These vary according to existing moral codes and disciplines and, before Scientology, despite their use in law as a test of “sanity”, had no basis in fact but only in opinion.

In Dianetics and Scientology a more precise definition arose. And the definition became as well the true definition of an overt act. An overt act is not just injuring someone or something: an overt act is an act of omission or commission which does the least good for the least number of dynamics or the most harm to the greatest number of dynamics. (See the Eight Dynamics.)

Thus a wrong action is wrong to the degree that it harms the greatest number of dynamics. And a right action is right to the degree that it benefits the greatest number of dynamics.

Many people think that an action is an overt simply because it is destructive. To them all destructive actions or omissions are overt acts. This is not true. For an act of commission or omission to be an overt act it must harm the greater number of dynamics. A failure to destroy can be, therefore, an overt act. Assistance to something that would harm a greater number of dynamics can also be an overt act.

An overt act is something that harms broadly. A beneficial act is something that helps broadly. It can be a beneficial act to harm something that would be harmful to the greater number of dynamics.

Harming everything and helping everything alike can be overt acts. Helping certain things and harming certain things alike can be beneficial acts.

The idea of not harming anything and helping everything are alike rather mad. It is doubtful if you would think helping enslaves was a beneficial action and equally doubtful if you would consider the destruction of a disease an overt act.

In the matter of being right or being wrong, a lot of muddy thinking can develop. There are no absolute rights or absolute wrongs. And being right does not consist of being unwilling to harm and being wrong does not consist only of not harming.

There is an irrationality about “being right” which not only throws out the validity of the legal test of sanity but also explains why some people do very wrong things and insist they are doing right.

The answer lies in an impulse, inborn in everyone, to *try to be right*. This is an insistence which rapidly becomes divorced from right action. And it is accompanied by an effort to make others wrong, as we see in hypercritical cases. A being who is apparently unconscious is *still* being right and making others wrong. It is the last criticism.

We have seen a “defensive person” explaining away the most flagrant wrongnesses. This is “justification” as well. 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 other-wrongness.

We have long said that that which is not admired tends to persist. If no one admires a person for being right, then that person’s “brand of being right” will persist, no matter how mad it sounds. Scientists who are aberrated cannot seem to get many theories. They do not because they are more interested in insisting on their own odd rightnesses than they are in finding truth. Thus we get strange “scientific truths” from

men who should know better, including the late Einstein. Truth is built by those who have the breadth and balance to see also where they're wrong.

You have heard some very absurd arguments out among the crowd. Realize that the speaker was more interested in *asserting* his or her own rightness than in *being right*.

A thetan *tries* to be right and *fights* being wrong. This is without regard to being right *about* something or to do actual right. It is an *insistence* which has no concern with a rightness of conduct.

One tries to be right *always*, right down to the last spark.

How then, is one ever wrong?

It is this way:

One does a wrong action, accidentally or through oversight. The wrongness of the action or inaction is then in conflict with one's necessity to be right. So one then may continue and repeat the wrong action to prove it is right.

This is a fundamental of aberration. All wrong actions are the result of an error followed by an insistence on having been right. Instead of righting the error (which would involve being wrong) one insists the error was a right action and so repeats it.

As a being goes down scale it is harder and harder to admit having been wrong. Nay, such an admission could well be disastrous to any remaining ability or sanity.

For rightness is the stuff of which survival is made. And as one approaches the last ebb of survival one can only insist on having been right, for to believe for a moment one has been wrong is to court oblivion.

The last defense of any being is "I was right". That applies to anyone. When that defense crumbles, the lights go out.

So we are faced with the unlovely picture of asserted rightness in the face of flagrant wrongness. And any success in making the being realize their wrongness results in an immediate degradation, unconsciousness, or at best a loss of personality. Pavlov, Freud, psychiatry alike never grasped the delicacy of these facts and so evaluated and punished the criminal and insane into further criminality and insanity.

All justice today contains in it this hidden error—that the last defense is a belief in personal rightness regardless of charges and evidence alike, and that the effort to make another wrong results only in degradation.

But all this would be a hopeless impasse leading to highly chaotic social conditions were it not for one saving fact:

All repeated and "incurable" wrongnesses stem from the exercise of a last defence: "trying to be right". Therefore the compulsive wrongness can be cured no matter how mad it may seem or how thoroughly its rightness is insisted upon.

Getting the offender to admit his or her wrongness is to court further degradation and even unconsciousness or the destruction of a being. Therefore the purpose of punishment is defeated and punishment has minimal workability.

But by getting the offender off the compulsive repetition of the wrongness, one then cures it.

But how?

By rehabilitating the ability to be right!

This has limitless application—in training, in social skills, in marriage, in law, in life.

Example: A wife is always burning dinner. Despite scolding, threats of divorce, anything, the compulsion continues. One can wipe this wrongness out by getting her to explain what is *right* about her cooking. This may well evoke a raging tirade in some extreme cases, but if one flattens the question, that all dies away and she happily ceases to burn dinners. Carried to classic proportions but not entirely necessary to end the compulsion, a moment in the past will be recovered when she

accidentally burned a dinner and could not face up to having done a wrong action. To be right she thereafter had to burn dinners.

Go into a prison and find one sane prisoner who says he did wrong. You won't find one. Only the broken wrecks will say so out of terror of being hurt. But even they don't believe they did wrong.

A judge on a bench, sentencing criminals, would be given pause to realize that not one malefactor sentenced really thought he had done wrong and will never believe it in fact, though he may seek to avert wrath by saying so.

The do-gooder crashes into this continually and is given his losses by it.

But marriage, law and crime do not constitute all the spheres of living where this applies. These facts embrace all of life. The student who can't learn, the worker who can't work, the boss who can't boss are all caught on one side of the right-wrong question. They are being completely one-sided. They are being "last-ditch-right". And opposing them, those who would teach them are fixed on the other side "admit-you are-wrong". And out of this we get not only no-change but actual degradation where it "wins". But there are no wins in this imbalance, only losses for both.

Thetans on the way down don't believe they are wrong because they don't dare believe it. And so they do not change.

Many a preclear in processing is only trying to prove himself right and the auditor wrong, particularly the lower case levels, and so we sometimes get no-change sessions.

And those who won't be audited at all are totally fixed on *asserted rightness* and are so close to gone that any question of their past rightness would, they feel, destroy them.

I get my share of this when a being, close to extinction, and holding contrary views, grasps for a moment the rightness of Scientology and then in sudden defence asserts his own "rightnesses", sometimes close to terror.

It would be a grave error to go on letting an abuser of Scientology abuse. The route is to get him or her to explain how *right* he or she is without explaining how wrong Scientology is, for to do the last is to let them commit a serious overt. "What is right about your mind" would produce more case change and win more friends than any amount of evaluation or punishment to make them wrong.

You can be right. How? By getting another to explain how he or she is right—until he or she, being less defensive now, can take a less compulsive point of view. You don't have to agree with what they think. You only have to acknowledge what they say. And suddenly they *can* be right.

A lot of things can be done by understanding and using this mechanism. It will take, however, some study of this article before it can be gracefully applied—for all of us are reactive to some degree on this subject. And those who sought to enslave us did not neglect to install a right-wrong pair of items on the far back track. But these won't really get in your way.

As Scientologists, we are faced by a frightened society who think they would be wrong if we were found to be right. We need a weapon to correct this. We have one here.

And you can be right, you know. I was probably the first to believe you were, mechanism or no mechanism. The road to rightness is the road to survival. And every person is somewhere on that scale.

You can make yourself right, amongst other ways, by making others right enough to afford to change their minds. Then a lot more of us will arrive.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :gl.Jh.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

(Note: This is the first in a series of HCO Bulletins designed for publication in Continental Magazines. I am developing a whole presentation of Scientology at this level for general use in life. Follow this HCO Bulletin with the next in magazines.)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 JULY 1963  
Issue II

Central Orgs  
Tech Depts

**ORG TECHNICAL  
HGC PROCESSES  
AND TRAINING**

(HCO Secs: Check out on all technical staff Star Rating.)

It is of the utmost importance that HGC Technical continues to be maintained as the world's best auditing.

The whole repute of Scientology on a continent ultimately depends on the quality of technical *delivered* by Central Organizations.

In times of shifting technology this may be considered difficult. However, nothing in the book maintains that an HGC must only deliver "the latest". The book only says *the best*.

Staff morale, the unit, broad dissemination depend basically upon technical quality.

If you will look into even the oldest HGC files you will find profiles with firm gains. This does not mean, then, that today's research line has to be installed at once to get gains on pcs.

Of course to attain clear or OT today's research line is vital.

But the problem is *not* upper echelon processing in HGCs, it is lower level cases.

If you go not on the basis of "make clears and OTs" but solely on the basis of "get maximum Tone Arm Action on the pc" you will have very happy pcs and eventual OTs.

To get Tone Arm Action it is necessary to

1. Have pcs who are getting wins and
2. Have staff auditors doing processes they can do successfully.

HGC Gains then depend on:

- A. Getting Tone Arm Action on every pc; and
- B. Training Auditors to handle the five basics well.

Programming for HGC pcs depends on the pc *and* the auditor available.

**PROGRAMMING PCS**

The stable datum for programming a pc is:

**RULE: RUN THE HIGHEST LEVEL PROCESS ON THE PC THAT CAN BE RUN THAT PRODUCES GOOD TONE ARM ACTION.**

The stable don't for programming a pc is:

**RULE: DON'T RUN A PROCESS A PC FEELS HE OR SHE CANNOT DO OR THE AUDITOR CANNOT DO.**

You don't need to predetermine (and sometimes downgrade) a pc's level in order to process him or her.

Programming has nothing to do with tests or hope or critical opinion.

Programming is a trial and error proposition based on:

- C. What highest process gives the pc TA Action?
- D. What process has the pc been interested in?
- E. What process can the auditor do confidently?

PC INTEREST is a nearer certainty of needle reads on the meter and Tone Arm Action than many other methods of assessment.

Any pc who has had earlier auditing can tell you what was or was not *interesting*. A discussion of this with the pc will establish which *type* of process it was. Don't necessarily just go on doing that process. But use it to classify what *type* of process the pc will most likely have wins doing—i.e. objective processes, repetitive processes, engram running, etc. A lot of pcs are audited at levels they have no idea they can do. They will do them, but a simple discussion about processes they have been *interested* in doing will reveal to them and the auditor where they are most likely to get TA Action with no strain.

### GAINS

Gains on a pc can be measured in terms of charge discharged, not necessarily in goals run out or some specific action done.

You can run out goals with *no* TA Action, run out engrams with *no* TA Action and yet the pc does not change.

The goals set by the pc at session beginning change on a changing pc. In reviewing cases watch those goals on the auditor's report. If they deteriorate the auditor has messed it up, leaving by-passed charge. If they remain the same session after session there was no real TA Action. If the goals change session by session there's lots of TA Action, too.

You can just get lots of TA Action, whatever you run, and eventually see a cleared pc.

No matter *what is* run, lack of TA Action will clear no one.

Wrong time is the exclusive source of *no* TA Action. Therefore as a pc's time concept is improved or his dates corrected you will see more TA Action. But many things contribute to wrong time, including bad meter dating and time disorienting implants. The question is not *what* corrects the pc's time so much as: is the pc getting the Tone Arm Action that shows Time is being corrected. Well done auditing cycles alone correct a flawed Time Concept.

So you have PC INTEREST, and TONE ARM ACTION that tell you the programming is right and if the pc is going Clear and OT. Buck these things and the pc won't go anywhere no matter what is run.

### PRECAUTIONS

Wrong dates, wrong goals, wrong Items, by-passing charge, never flattening a process, running a pc beyond regaining an ability or cogniting the process flat account for most upset in auditing.

There is no valid reason for a pc getting upset now that ARC Break assessments exist, providing that the auditor is *auditing* as per the next section.

## AUDITOR SKILL

Basic Auditor Skill consists of five things. If an auditor can do these five, little further trouble will be found.

Any staff training programme, any Academy basic goal, any HGC Auditing that produces results depend on these five basics.

If you review staff auditors or examine students on these basics by themselves, all auditing would rest on solid ground and get gains. Where any one of the following are out in an auditor there is going to be trouble all along the line. No fancy new process will cure what is wrong in a session if these things are not present.

The Basic Auditing Skills are:

1. ABILITY TO EXECUTE THE AUDITING CYCLE.
2. ABILITY TO EXECUTE THE AUDITING CYCLE REPETITIVELY.
3. ABILITY TO HANDLE A SESSION.
4. ABILITY TO READ A METER.
5. ABILITY TO STUDY AND APPLY SCIENTOLOGY DATA.

It takes very little to establish the presence or absence of these abilities in an HGC Auditor or a Student. Each one can be reviewed easily.

View an auditor's ability to audit in the light of the above only. Put him on TV for a half-hour rudiments and havingness actual session of any Model Session he or she is trained to use, and watch 1 to 4 above. Then give him or her an unstudied short HCO Bulletin and see how long it takes for the auditor to pass a verbal exam on it.

A comparison of this data with a number of the staff auditor's HGC case reports will show direct co-ordination. To the degree that few results were obtained the auditor missed on 1 to 5 above. To the degree that good results were obtained the auditor could pass 1 to 5 above. Inspection of half a dozen different cases the auditor has done is necessary to see a complete co-ordination.

*There is your training stress for staff training programmes. Only when the above skills are polished up do you dare to go into involved processes with the auditor. For a more complicated process further throws out any existing errors in the above five abilities and makes hash out of the lot.*

During such a period, one can fall back on auditor confidence. What process is the auditor confident he or she will get wins with? Well let him or her run it on the current pc. And meanwhile, with training, smooth the auditor out and get him or her genned in on higher level or more recent processes.

Without an auditor, a case will not progress. And a case will progress more with a confident auditor who can do something of what he or she is doing than with an auditor who is shaky. For the shakiness will magnify any faults in the five skills that the auditor has.

Auditors do by and large a pretty fine job. It takes a while to gen in a new skill. I can do it in one or two sessions so it's not causing me any strain. Mary Sue can get one straight in about four sessions. So nobody expects a new skill to appear magically perfect in no time at all. But the length of time it will take to groove in on a new skill depends on the five abilities above.

The main auditor faults will be found in auditors who are trying so hard themselves to be right that thee and me must be proven wrong. That shows up most strongly in No. 5 above. The degree of disagreement an auditor has with data measures the degree of unworkability that auditor will enter into processing and this is the same degree that that auditor thinks he or she has to preserve his or her survival by making

others wrong. This also enters into the other four abilities by a covert effort to make the pc wrong. This is rare. But it is best measured by an inability to accept data, and so can be tested by No. 5 above.

Processing on rightness and wrongness remedies this. Other processing remedies it. And just practice remedies it. This factor is easily disclosed as unhandled in some training courses where a blowing student sometimes gives long dissertations on "What they don't agree with in Scientology." That what they say doesn't exist in Scientology does not deter them from believing it does, for their last spark of survival demands that only they be right and all others wrong. Such a state of mind doesn't make a good auditor since both Scientology and the pc must be made wrong. Squirrels are only Case Levels 7 or 6 dramatizing alter-is on Scientology instead of their track. Even they can be made to audit by long training even in the absence of processing. They aren't just trying to make others wrong. Essentially that is the characteristic of a Case Level 8, Unaware. There aren't many of these around. Auditing and training can handle them, even if it takes a long time. Such people would almost die literally if they found they had ever been wrong and they get quite ill with aplomb just to prove you are wrong; it goes that far.

Case Level or sanity have little to do with anything when it comes to training auditors. Insanity is a goal "To be Insane", not an index of potential auditing ability. And only Case Level 8 does a complete shatter of a session as an auditor.

Take these factors into first account in an HGC.

Don't keep a staff upset by shifting processes continually. Processing is pretty stable which is why I can give you this expectancy for a new high level performance in HGC. Groove the staff auditor in for wins and TA Action. And all will be well. Groove them in by processes only and all will be chaos.

And in the Academy stress this data and teach the five abilities above beyond all other data and you'll have auditors. If the HGC could expect from an Academy graduates who had the five abilities listed above, everyone would get more comfortable.

An HGC need not have to run a school of its own to provide itself with auditors.

## SUMMARY

The data I have given you in this HCO Bulletin is not subject to change or modification.

HGC pcs will only win if they are run so as to obtain good TA Action.

The HGC will have trouble achieving that only to the degree that its staff has not achieved the five abilities above.

We are building on very solid ground. All actions we now undertake in the HGC and Academy should contribute to successful auditing, for out of that alone can clearing be achieved.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 JULY 1963

Central Orgs  
for info  
Sthil  
SHSBC

**AUDITING RUNDOWN  
MISSED WITHHOLDS  
TO BE RUN IN X 1 UNIT**

(supersedes HCO Bulletin of July 11, 1963, same title,  
which was issued to Sthil SHSBC only)

1. Ask pc following question:

“In this lifetime what have you done that you have withheld from someone?”

2. When pc has answered ask:

- (a) “When was it?”
- (b) “Where was it?”
- (c) “Who failed to find out about it?”
- (d) “Who nearly found out about it?”
- (e) “Who still doesn’t know about it?”

Each withhold and answer must be written down and the sheet of withholds and answers must be turned in with the auditing report.

The sheet will be made available to all instructors on the Briefing Course.

The above suggestion was made by Bernie Pesco, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course student, and accepted for use.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw jh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
23 - 25 July 1 963

- |            |           |   |
|------------|-----------|---|
| ** 6307C23 | SHSBC-288 | Between Lives Implants                                  |
| ** 6307C24 | SHSBC-289 | ARC Breaks and the Comm Cycle—The Revised Model Session |
| ** 6307C25 | SHSBC-290 | Comm Cycles in Auditing [see page 340 for graphs]       |



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JULY AD13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*STAR RATING*

**TIME AND THE TONE ARM**

(HCO Secs: Check out on all Technical staff except  
for percentage of cases which is not Star Rated)

I recently completed a study begun many years ago which gives us new hope and easier auditing of difficult cases.

We have known for many years (Dianetic Axioms) that Time is the Single Source of human aberration. This did not have the importance it deserved.

To make an OT one has to clear the Time Track.

This seemed very easy when I discovered a few months ago that anybody can run an engram. The reasons one can't are just (1) wrong time of the incident, (2) wrong duration of the incident, (3) incident may contain an implanted GPM or (4) it may be false track (therefore having wrong time and wrong duration).

So anybody that can be put into an auditing session can run Time Track with good perception. If the perceptions aren't there it's just wrong time or wrong duration or both, or it's a GPM in which case one reverts at once to R3N, or it's false track in which event one finds accurately when it was installed and the duration of *that* incident.

All apparent grouping of the track comes either from wrong time or false track (which is also wrong time). Either one looks like incidents are grouping.

Well, that seemed to wrap up clearing and OT, but I still didn't broadly release it; I wanted to be sure. I don't mind being wrong but I dislike making you wrong in your auditing, it's already happened too often.

So I carefully researched this all over again and found it was not enough just to clean track. One had to run track with TONE ARM MOTION.

That's the real barrier to clear and OT, given the above data. One can run incidents and GPMs but do these when run *give Tone Arm Motion?*

Without Tone Arm Motion no charge is being released and no actual case betterment is observed beyond a few somatics removed. The pc's session goals stay the same. The pc's life doesn't change.

So the clue to OT (and clear) is *Tone Arm Motion*. It must exist during the session. If it doesn't something is wrong.

At first I thought that a dating prepcheck "On Dating" or "On Dates" would re-establish all ceased TA action. It will up to a point and is valuable.

Repair of cases must contain such a Prepcheck and also discovering wrong dates and durations on engrams and GPMs. This is vital.

But it will not make some cases *continue* to get TA motion on the Time Track.

If a case, even when cleaned up on dating and properly assessed for level and Item in R3R or on R3N, does not *then* get TA motion on running track, another factor is present.

What is that factor? The pc has a "fragile Tone Arm". Just one wrong date or duration in R3R or just one wrong RI in R3N and Tone Arm Action ceases, the TA going way up or down and staying there. Stuck TA cases then give us a *type* of case.

So I knew there was another factor involved rather than Time alone. Time remains the single source. But a pc's regard for or attitude about Time can make it difficult for the auditor to run R3R or R3N.

Regard for Time sums up, of course, into ARC about Time, or just ARC.

### THE MECHANICS OF TIME

As in earlier writings Time is actual but is also an apparency. (See *Dianetics* '55 or other similar material.) Time is measured by motion. Motion is Matter with energy in space. Thus a person can conceive of Time as only Matter and energy in space. Such as a clock or a planetary rotation. Time is actual. But the person has become so dependent on Matter moving in space to tell Time that his Time Sense has become *dependent* on Matter, energy and space.

We care only for TA action. Our opinion of a pc's Time Sense is unimportant. Does the pc get TA action on R3R and/or R3N? If so, the pc's Time Sense is okay for making OT straight away. If not, if the TA is "fragile" (sticks easily high or low) then the pc's Time Sense needs improving.

Time Sense deteriorates to the degree that one has depended upon Matter, energy and space to tell Time (and on Time Confusing Implants such as false track; however, running out false track on a no TA motion case is not an answer).

The dwindling spiral was as follows:

- State A — Time Sense.
- State B — Time Sense dependent upon Matter, Energy and Space.
- State C — ARC Breaks with Matter, Energy, Space and other beings.
- State D — Deteriorated Time Sense.

By the time State D is thoroughly reached, you have a pc who gets no TA motion running track, as energy will not flow in the absence of Time.

There are four degrees of "Poor Time Sense". The first is average and common but is not enough to impair TA action. The TA sticks but getting wrong dates off restores TA action which then continues. The second is a case that has to be continuously repaired and delicately handled to get any TA action at all. The third is a case that gets TA action on repetitive processes or rudiments but not on GPMs or engram running (while silently moving through an engram few people get TA action; this comes when they answer "What happened?": the third under consideration doesn't get any TA even when answering "What happened?" and rarely if ever RRs). The fourth is a case that gets no TA action on repetitive processes and very little if any on Rudiments.

The four types of "Poor Time Sense" compare to

Case Level 5—(first type above) Gets TA action only when wrong dates are cleaned up.

Case Level 6—(second above) Gets TA action only with constant careful handling and TA action always packing up.

Case Level 7—(third above) TA action only on some repetitive processes and rudiments.

Case Level 8—(fourth above) No TA action on repetitive processes and only now and then on rudiments.

Case Levels 2 to 4 get TA action no matter what happens.

This then (TA Action) is your best index of Case Levels. IQ, graphs, tests, behaviour in life are all incidental.

Identification (A=A=A) is most easily present when Time Sense is awry, therefore, the degree a person Identifies different things establishes the degree of aberration.

## PROGRAMMING

Cases are programmed only against TA Action obtainable in auditing.

A case *must not* be run without TA Action or with minimal TA Action.

A case may be a Case Level 5 and need only a few wrong dates and durations corrected to get good TA Action. But it may also be a Case Level 6, 7 or 8.

Trial and error programming is best. Programme high and drop low, no matter what the morale factor may be.

Try to run GPMs, the Goal to Forget, etc, with R3N. If it can't be done, assess for R3R (Preliminary Step) and run a chain of engrams. If still no TA, drop to processes for Case Level 7. If still no TA, drop to processes for Case Level 8.

You may see by the pc's past auditor's reports what the Case Level is. How stuck has that TA been?

Don't run a case lower than it easily gets TA Action.

And don't brand a case at a low case level and then never graduate it upwards. When the lower process is flat, the upper process should now be runnable.

The story is told by the TA with one exception—auditor ability and training. *But* Case Levels 2, 3, 4 are not all that influenced by the auditor ability. The auditor's skill has to be pretty good to run Case Level 5 on R3R and R3N.

The auditor doesn't live who can run R3R or R3N on Case Levels 6, 7 or 8. It just won't run.

In the guess department the bulk of the cases about are 4s and 5s. A good-sized percentage are 6s and 7s. About 10% are Case Level 8. About 10% are Case Level 3. Therefore about 30% of a usual group of pcs will run with good TA on the Time Track, given trained auditing, without trouble. Another 30% will run with good TA on the Time Track with careful coddling and no serious date goofs. Except for the 1% Case 3, the rest will fall into Case Levels 6, 7 and 8, meaning that about 39% of the cases in Scientology won't run at once on R3R or R3N, and another 30% (Case Level 5s) need a Saint Hiller hanging over the auditor's shoulder or in the chair. And the other 30% (Case Level 4s) will run very well and easily on R3R and R3N.

So the biggest percentage group (Case Levels 6, 7, 8 combined) need special processes to graduate up to action with R3R and R3N.

These Case Level 6, 7 and 8 processes now exist and are being released as rapidly as they are demonstrated workable. R2H for Case Levels 5 and 6 has already been released. R2HL for Case Levels 6 and 7 is being readied up for bulletin. The Corner Process and others for Case Level 8 are tested and the data is being assembled. And other advances can be made.

To audit easily and relaxed with good TA Action on the pc is my immediate desire for auditors and auditing supervisors. I feel we are over the hump on this. The fundamental solution to it—Time and the Tone Arm—is contained in this HCO Bulletin.

Don't audit a pc without getting TA Action. Either repair the wrong dates and durations before going on or drop to processes of a lower case level or both.

ARC Breaks in session won't stop a TA. Only Time errors.

L. RON HUBBARD

LKH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 JULY 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**SCIENTOLOGY REVIEW**

(HCO Secs, take up at a Staff Meeting.  
Field Auditors, take up at group meetings.)

Exactly where are we technically, personally and organizationally?

It may be of some surprise to you that we have just about arrived. We've been so long on the road that some fainter hearts have begun to despair and less high case levels have begun to gloom.

Since last October I have been cracking through trying to get there before we were got.

It now is obvious that we have made it and even if we were hard hit socially or politically we would still make it. For we have the data.

I have not had time to get it all to you yet, but the data is now assembled for OT for everyone who can be audited at all. You already have most of it.

On the various PTPs of Scientology we have had some very significant wins as follows:

1. The discoveries about Time and the Tone Arm (HCO Bulletin of July 28, AD 13) related to case levels tells us if a case is winning, why it isn't winning and how to make it win, and gives us far less worries as auditors auditing cases. For some time now, overlooking four score of cases, many very rough, I have been breathing easy. And they're all winning.
2. Getting cases to RR on GPMs is entirely a matter of auditing those cases who don't on current basic processes until they do. So it isn't a worry about getting the case to RR. It's only how to get the case to run with TA action and get high enough to RR and run GPMs. We have the patterns and technology needful now.
3. ARC Breaky Cases. The ARC Break Assessments correctly done finish the problem of the consequences of ARC Breaks and put the Auditor at cause over ARC Breaks.
4. Natter. Persons who get auditing and natter, staff members who snap and snarl, bad morale, all wrap up in the ARC Break Assessments. This, done weekly in any group on group members, clearing every line, restores a theta atmosphere.
5. Incredulity of our data and validity. This is our finest asset and gives us more protection than any other single thing. If certain parties thought we were real we would have infinitely more trouble. There's actual terror in the breast of a guilty person at the thought of OT, and without a public incredulity we never would have gotten as far as we have. And now it's too late to be stopped. This protection was accidental but it serves us very well indeed. Remember that the next time the ignorant scoff.
6. The cold war has gotten less threatening, differences are less violent. We have had the time we needed.
7. Government attacks have entered a more desultory stage. Meters will go to jury trial eventually and we will certainly win. The U.S. Government Attorney handling the case became terribly ill and had to resign it.

8. Economic Problems. In organizations gross income is generally on the increase throughout the world, and shows no signs of dwindling and all this in the face of bad press. Personal income depends upon steady organizational gains and more positive results on pcs. Future personal income is without ceiling.
9. Personal States of Case. If you heed HCO Bulletin of July 28, AD13 and are getting good Tone Arm action on *any* process you will eventually make OT. OT is wholly a matter of consistent Tone Arm motion, session after session, not the significance of what is run.
10. State of Training as Auditors. Although I would like to see more auditors trained at Saint Hill, general training has improved and training data is complete. Shortened training time will soon be a reality. A new positive goal for HPA/HCA's will make more good auditors. I feel very good about general auditing ability. I recently summed up the basic skills of auditing and find that over the years we have been working right along and winning on training. All training done has been to the good. Changing technology has not influenced the basic skills and forthcoming material follows the pattern in which we have been trained.

### OTHER PROBLEMS

Solutions unexpectedly leaped up in fields where we were only vaguely aware of problems.

We bought an awful lot of time with the discovery of the exact nature of between lives implants and how it's worked. Using this data it is possible to keep any Scientologist from ever getting another one of those implants. As the general course of living is therapeutic, it takes violent implants such as Earth people get at every death to keep people unaware of former lives and aberrated. Just by omitting those implants and using their reporting technology to keep in touch amongst ourselves, we would salvage the lot in a few hundred years in any event. Our data is too widely disseminated to be re-collected and burned.

And just the other day I was personally looking over their shoulders.

World clearing is possible without extensive Auditing if we just keep our own show on the road and keep track of each other.

This was a breakthrough I didn't expect. And it's all ours.

The discovery of false pasts and futures was also a bonus. For it means more TA action on more cases and faster clearing. It's doubtful if ordinary track ever hurt anybody.

### SUMMARY

All we've got to do is keep going as we are for things to improve now.

The only thing which could slow us down is our own self-created dissidence. All we have to do is do our jobs and keep the peace and we've got it.

The make-break point is behind us. Ahead are only better days, improving little by little, day by day.

We've made it over the worst part.

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 AUGUST 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

## A II. ROUTINES

### E-METER ERRORS

#### COMMUNICATION CYCLE ERROR

The E-Meter has its role in all processing and must be used well. However an E-Meter can be misused in several ways.

#### METER DEPENDENCE

The meter in actual fact does nothing but locate charged areas below the awareness of the pc and verify that the charge has been removed. The meter cures nothing and does not treat. It only assists the auditor in assisting the preclear to look and verify having looked.

A pc can be made more dependent upon the meter or can be made more independent of the meter, all in the way a meter is used by the Auditor.

If a pc's case is improving the pc becomes more independent of the meter. This is the proper direction.

*Meter dependence* is created by invalidation by or poor acknowledgement of the Auditor. If the Auditor seems not to accept the pc's data, then the pc may insist that the Auditor "see it read on the meter". This can grow up into a formidable meter dependence on the part of the pc.

The rise of the TA is a "What's It?" The Fall of a meter TA is an "It's a \_\_\_\_\_." To get maximum charge off, the pc's groping (What's It) must become a pc's finding (It's a). If the pc asks the Auditor what or which reads on the meter and the Auditor *always* complies, the pc's TA will rise more and fall less as the pc is saying, "What's It?" and only the *meter* is saying, "It's a \_\_\_\_\_."

A pc must be carefully weaned of meter dependence, not abruptly chopped off. The pc says, "What's It?" The Auditor must begin to ask occasionally, "Well, What's It seem to you?" and the pc will find his own "It's a \_\_\_\_\_" and the TA will fall—as it would not if only the meter were employed.

Milking the TA of all the action you can get requires that the pc get most of the "It's a's" for his "What's Its". (See diagram attached.)

#### DATING DEPENDENCE

**RULE: USE THE METER TO DATE AND VERIFY DATE CORRECTNESS BY ALL MEANS BUT *ONLY* AFTER THE PC HAS BEEN UNABLE TO COME UP WITH THE DATE.**

Example: Pc can't decide, after much puzzling, if it was 1948 or 1949. Finally, the Auditor says, "1948" "1949" and sees the meter reads on 1948 and says, "It was 1948." But if the pc says, "It was 1948," the Auditor only checks it if the TA sticks up higher, meaning probably a wrong date. He checks with, "In this session have we had a wrong date? That reads, what date was wrong?" and lets the pc argue it out with himself—TA action will restore.

#### RIs

Reliable Items have to be *clean*. The pc can usually tell. But the pc *can't* tell the right RI out of a list or the right goal unless the Auditor sees it RR or fall. But sometimes the Auditor thinks an RI is clean (no longer reads having read) when it still has somatics on it. In this case it's suppressed and the Auditor checks it for suppress.

The pc saying the RI is not clean (should still be reading) carries more weight than the meter.

As the pc gets along in running Time Track and GPMs with their goals and Reliable Items he or she often becomes better than the meter as to what is right or wrong, what is the goal, what RI still reads.

### METER INVALIDATION

An Auditor who just sits and shakes his head, “Didn’t Rocket Read” can give a pc too many loses and deteriorate the pc’s ability to run GPMs.

In a conflict between pc and meter, take the pc’s data. Why? Because Protest and Assert and Mistake will also read on a meter. You can get these off, but why create them?

The meter is not there to invalidate the pc. Using the meter to invalidate the pc is bad form.

You’ll have less trouble by taking the pc’s data for the pc will eventually correct it.

The meter is invaluable in locating by-passed charge and curing an ARC Break. But it can be done without a meter, just by letting the pc think over each line read to him or her from the ARC Break Assessment and say whether it is or isn’t and if it is, spotting the thing by-passed.

### CLEANING CLEANS

The Auditor who cleans a clean meter is asking for trouble.

This is the same as asking a pc for something that isn’t there and develops a “withhold of nothing”.

Example: Ask “Do you have a present time problem?” Get no needle reaction. Ask the pc for the PTP that hasn’t read. That is impossible for the pc to answer. That’s what’s meant by cleaning a clean.

### DIRTY NEEDLE

All dirty needles are caused by the Auditor failing to hear all the pc had to say in answering a question or volunteering data.

Charge is removed from a case only by the Comm Cycle pc to Auditor.

The Auditor’s command restimulates a charge in the pc. The only way this charge can be blown is by the pc telling the Auditor.

“Auditor” means “A listener”. The Auditor who has not learned to listen gets:

First	—	Dirty Needle
Next	—	Stuck Tone Arm
Finally	—	ARC Break

The most important line in Auditing is from pc to Auditor. If this line is open and not hurried or chopped you get no Dirty Needles and Lots of TA Action.

To continuously get in Auditor to pc and impede the line pc to Auditor is to *pile up* endless *restimulated charge* on a case.

RULE: TONE ARM ACTION OF ANY KIND WITHOUT ANY SIGNIFICANCE OF WHAT’S BEHIND IT WILL TAKE A PC TO OT EVENTUALLY.

RULE: THE MOST CORRECT TRACK SIGNIFICANCES RUN BUT WITHOUT TA ACTION WILL NOT CHANGE BUT CAN DETERIORATE A CASE.

RULE: THE CORRECT TRACK SIGNIFICANCES RUN WITH TA ACTION WILL ATTAIN OT FASTEST.

Thus we see that an Auditor can get everything right except TA action and not make an OT. And we see that TA action without running specific things *will* make an OT, (though it might take a thousand years).

Therefore TA action is superior to *what is* run. Running the right things with TA action is faster only.

Thus the line pc to Auditor is somewhat senior to the Comm Line Auditor to pc. (See diagram.)

Don't get the idea that the *process is* not important. It is. People were made to talk in psychoanalysis without getting anywhere but there they probably had no TA and ran the wrong significances. It takes the right process correctly run to get TA action. So don't underrate processes or the action of the Auditor.

Realize that the answering of the process question is senior to the asking of another process question. A pc could talk for years without getting *any* TA action. Got it? So listen as long as a TA moves.

Learn to see if the pc has said everything he or she wants to say before the next Auditor action, never do a new Auditor action while or if the pc wants to speak and you'll get superior TA action. Cut the pc off, get in more actions than the pc is allowed to answer and you'll have a Dirty Needle, then a stuck TA and then an ARC Break.

See the attached drawing of this. And all will suddenly get clearer about any pc you've audited. And trouble will evaporate.

By cutting the "Itsa Line" an Auditor can make case gain disappear.

"Learn To Listen." That's what "Auditor" means.

It has taken me so long to see this in others because I don't cut the pc's line very often and repair it fast when I do. So forgive me for bringing it up so late.

When the pc is talking and you're getting no TA, you already have an ARC Break or are about to get one. So assess the by-passed charge.

RULE: DON'T DEMAND MORE THAN THE PC CAN TELL YOU.

RULE: DON'T RECEIVE LESS THAN THE PC HAS TO SAY.

Watch the pc's eyes. Don't take auditing actions if the pc is not looking at you.

Don't give acknowledgements that aren't needed. Over acknowledgement means acknowledging before the pc has said *all*.

## SUMMARY

Running the right process is vital. Getting TA action on the right process is skilled auditing.

Listening is superior to asking.

Build up the pc's confidence in his own knowingness and continuously and progressively reduce the pc's dependence on a meter.

LRH:dr.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6308C06	SHSBC-291	Auditing Comm Cycles—Definition of an Auditor
** 6308C07	SHSBC-292	R-2H Fundamentals [see page 343 for graph]
** 6308C08	SHSBC-293	R-2H Assessment [see page 344 for graph]




# Basic Error of The Auditing Cycle

Comm Cycle

Cause - Distance - Effect

What's It





~~It's a line~~

- ① DN
- ② Duck TA
- ③ ARC Br



Body Discomfort  
Body Mass  
ARC Breaks



Tone Arm Action

When It's a line is cut, auditing ceases to work.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 AUGUST 1963

HCO Secs  
Org Secs  
Franchise  
Field  
BPI

**DEFINITION OF RELEASE**  
(Cancels HCO Bulletin of 14 January 1963)

A RELEASE is one who knows he or she has had worthwhile gains from Scientology processing and who knows he or she will not now get worse.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 AUGUST 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ARC BREAK ASSESSMENTS**

In a session *don't ever* do an ARC Break Assessment until the pc has given up trying to untangle it. This particularly applies to R3R and 3N.

**DATES R2H**

Don't ever date anything for the pc until the pc has completely given up trying himself.

DON'T USE METERING, ARC BREAK ASSESSMENTS, DATING, or incomprehensible or new commands to CUT THE ITSA LINE. Let it run. Help only when it's stopped.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :dr.jh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 AUGUST 1963

Central Orgs

**LECTURE GRAPHS**

The following graphs accompany Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Lectures of:


July	25,	AD 13
August	7,	AD 13
August	8,	AD 13

L. RON HUBBARD


LRH:dr.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
14—15 August 1963



** 6308C14	SHSBC-294	Auditing Tips
** 6308C15	SHSBC-295	The Tone Arm



SHSBC LHH Lecture Jul 25, 63



SHSBC LRH lecture Jul 25, 63



SHSBC LRH Lecture 7/8/63

$\Theta^N$   $\left. \begin{matrix} A \\ R \\ C \end{matrix} \right\}$   
Life Potential

— versus —→

$\Theta^N$  (thought)  
Matter  
Energy  
Space  
Time  
Form  
Location  
The Things of Life

$\Theta$  Bill  $\Theta$  Joe

Lecture Graph

SHSBC LRH Lectured 8 Aug 63

K D C D E - O F / K D C D E - O F / K D

K D C D E - O F

Incident	A R C	Missed w/H
Earlier Incident	A R C	Earlier Missed w/H



*SCIENTOLOGY TWO*  
*STAR RATED HCO BULLETIN*

**HOW TO DO AN ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT**

(HCO Secs: Check out on all technical Executives and Personnel. Tech Dir: Check out on HCO Secs and Assn Org Secs.)

The successful handling of an ARC Break Assessment is a skilled activity which requires:

1. Skill in handling a Meter.
2. Skill in handling the Itsa Line of the Auditing Cycle.
3. Skill in Assessment.

The lists given in HCO Bulletin of July 5, AD13 "ARC BREAK ASSESSMENTS", are used, either from that HCO Bulletin or amended.

There are several uses for ARC Break Assessments.

1. Cleaning up a session ARC Break.
2. Cleaning up auditing in general.
3. Cleaning up a pc's or student's possible ARC Breaks.
4. Cleaning up a member of the public's possible or actual ARC Breaks.
5. Regular use on a weekly basis on staff or organization members.

There are others. Those above are the chief uses.

For long time periods the standard 18 button prepcheck is faster, but an ARC Break Assessment is still useful in conjunction with it.

The drill is simple. If complicated by adding in R2H material, dating, and other additives, the ARC Break Assessment ceases to work well and may even create more ARC Breaks.

If used every time a pc gets in a little trouble in R3N or R3R the ARC Break Assessment is being used improperly. In R2H, R3N, R3R sessions it is used *only* when the pc shows definite signs of an ARC Break. To use it oftener constitutes no auditing.

Unnecessary use of an ARC Break Assessment may ARC Break the pc with the Assessment.

The ARC Break Assessment may be repaired by an 18 Button Prepcheck "On ARC Break Assessments .....".

**ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT BY STEPS**

**STEP ONE:**

Select the proper list. This is done by establishing what the pc has been audited on. If more than one type of by-passed charge is suspected, do more than one list. If the ARC Break is not completely cured by one list, do another kind of list. (All lists have been in HCOBs as "L".)

**STEP TWO:**

Inform the pc that you are about to assess for any charge that might have been restimulated or by-passed on his or her case. Do not heavily stress the ARC Break aspect. Right: "I am going to assess a list to see if any charge has been by-passed on your case." Wrong: "I'm going to try to cure (or assess) your ARC Break."

### STEP THREE:

Without regard to pc's natter, but with quick attention for any cognition the pc may have during assessment as to by-passed charge, assess the list.

Phrase the question in regard to the reason for the Assessment—"In this session....." "During this week ....." "In Scientology ....." etc. Call each line once to see if it gives an instant read.

The moment a line gives a reaction, stop, and do Step Four.

### STEP FOUR:

When a line reacts on the needle, say to the pc, "The line .....reacts. What can you tell me about this?"

### STEP FIVE:

Keep Itsa Line in. Do not cut the pc's line. Do not ask for more than pc has. Let pc flounder around until pc finds the charge asked for in Step Four or says there's no such charge. (If a line reacted because the pc did not understand it, or by protest or decide, make it right with the pc and continue assessing.)

### STEP SIX:

In a session: If pc found the by-passed charge, ask pc "How do you feel now?" If pc says he or she feels OK, cease assessing for ARC Breaks and go back to session actions. If pc says there's no such charge or gets misemotional *at Auditor*, keep on assessing on down the list for another active line, or even on to another list until the charge is found which makes pc relax.

In a routine ARC Break check (not a session but for a longer period), don't stop assessing but keep on going as in Step Five, unless pc's cognition is huge.

### END OF STEPS

Please notice: This is not R2H. There is no dating. The auditor does not further assist the pc with the meter in any way.

If the pc blows up in your face on being given a type of charge, *keep going*, as you have not yet found the charge. Typical response to wrong charge found: Pc: "Well of course it's a cut communication! You've been cutting my communication the whole session. You ought to be retreaded .. etc." Note here that pc's attention is still on auditor. Therefore the correct charge has not been found. If the by-passed charge has been found the pc will relax and look for it, attention on own case.

Several by-passed charges can exist and be found on one list. Therefore in cleaning up a week or an intensive or a career (any long period) treat a list like rudiments, cleaning everything that reacts.

*Blow down* of the Tone Arm is the meter reaction of having found the correct by-passed charge. Keep doing Steps One to Six until you get a blow down of the Tone Arm. The pc feeling better and being happy about the ARC Break will coincide almost always with a Tone Arm Blow Down.

You can, however, undo a session ARC Break Assessment by continuing beyond the pc's cognition of what it is. Continuing an assessment after the pc has cognited, invalidates the pc's cognition and cuts the Itsa Line and may cause a *new* ARC Break.

Rarely, but sometimes, the ARC Break is handled with no TA blow down.

### PURPOSE OF ASSESSMENT

The purpose of an ARC Break Assessment is to return the pc into session or into Scientology or into an Org or course. By-passed charge can cause the person to blow out of session, or out of an Org or a course or Scientology.

WITH A SESSION (formerly “in”): Is defined as “INTERESTED IN OWN CASE AND WILLING TO TALK TO THE AUDITOR”. AGAINST SESSION: Against session is defined as “ATTENTION OFF OWN CASE AND TALKING AT THE AUDITOR IN PROTEST OF AUDITOR, PT AUDITING, ENVIRONMENT OR SCIENTOLOGY”.

WITH SCIENTOLOGY: With Scientology is defined as “INTERESTED IN SUBJECT AND GETTING IT USED”. AGAINST SCIENTOLOGY: Against Scientology is defined as “ATTENTION OFF SCIENTOLOGY AND PROTESTING SCIENTOLOGY BEHAVIOUR OR CONNECTIONS”.

WITH ORGANIZATION: With organization can be defined as “INTERESTED IN ORG OR POST AND WILLING TO COMMUNICATE WITH OR ABOUT ORG”. AGAINST ORGANIZATION: Against organizationness is defined as “AGAINST ORGANIZATION OR POSTS AND PROTESTING AT ORG BEHAVIOUR OR EXISTENCE” .

The data about ARC Breaks can be expanded to marriage, companies, jobs, etc. Indeed to all dynamics—*With* Dynamic, *Against* Dynamic.

What it boils down to is this: There are only two conditions of living, but many shades of grey to each one.

These conditions are:

1. LIFE: NOT ARC BROKEN: Capable of some affinity for, some reality about and some communication with the environment; and
2. DEATH: ARC BROKEN: Incapable of affinity for, reality about and communication with the environment.

Under One we have those who can disenturbulate themselves and make some progress in life.

Under Two we have those who are in such protest that they are stopped and can make little or no progress in life.

One, we consider to be in some ARC with existence.

Two, we consider to be broken in ARC with existence.

In a session or handling the living lightning we handle, people can be hit by a forceful charge of which they are only minutely aware but which swamps them. Their affinity, reality and communication (life force) is retarded or cut by this hidden charge and they react with what we call an ARC Break or have an ARC Broken aspect.

If they know what charge it is they do not ARC Break or they cease to be ARC Broken.

It is the unknown character of the charge that causes it to have such a violent effect on the person.

People do *not* ARC Break on known charge. It is always the hidden or the earlier charge that causes the ARC Break.

This makes life look different (and more understandable). People continuously explain so glibly why they are acting as badly as they are. Whereas, if they really knew, they would not act that way. When the true character of the charge (or many charges as in a full case) is known to the person the ARC Break ceases.

How much by-passed charge does it take to make a *case*? The whole sum of past by-passed charge.

This fortunately for the pc is not all of it in constant restimulation. Therefore the person stays somewhat in one piece but prey to any restimulation.

Auditing selectively restimulates, locates the charge and discharges it (as seen on the action of a moving Tone Arm).

However, accidental rekindlings of past charge unseen by pc or auditor occur and the pc “mysteriously” ARC Breaks.

Similarly people in life get restimulated also, but with nobody to locate the charge. Thus Scientologists are lucky.

In heavily restimulated circumstances the person goes OUT OF. In such a condition people want to stop things, cease to act, halt life, and failing this they try to run away.

As soon as the *actual* by-passed charge is found and recognized as *the* charge by the person, up goes Affinity and Reality and Communication and life can be lived.

Therefore ARC Breaks are definite, their symptoms are known, their cure is very easy with this understanding and technology.

An ARC Break Assessment seeks to locate the charge that served, being hidden, as a whip-hand force on the person. When it is located *life* returns. Locating the actual by-passed charge is returning life to the person.

Therefore, properly handling ARC Breaks can be called, with no exaggeration “Returning Life to the person”.

One further word of caution: As experience will quickly tell you, seeking to do *anything at all* with an *earlier* by-passed charge incident which led to the ARC Break immediately the earlier incident is found will lead to a vast mess.

Let the pc talk about it all the pc pleases. But don’t otherwise try to run it, date it or seek to find what by-passed charge caused the earlier incident. In assessing for ARC Breaks, keep the Itsa Line in very well and keep the What’s It out in every respect except as contained in the above Six Steps.

## SUMMARY

An ARC Break Assessment is simple stuff, so simple people are almost certain to complicate it. It only works when kept simple.

Old auditors will see a similarity in an ARC Break Assessment List and old end rudiments. They can be handled much the same but only when one is covering a long time period. Otherwise assess only to cognition and drop it.

The trouble in ARC Break Assessments comes from additives by the auditor, failure to keep on with additional lists if the type of charge causing the ARC Break isn’t found on the first list chosen, failure to read the meter, and failure to keep the Itsa Line in.

Doing ARC Break Assessments to cure ARC Breaks is *not* the same drill as R2H and confusing the two leads to trouble.

Handled skillfully as above, ARC Break Assessing cures the great majority of woes of auditing, registraring, training and handling organization. If you find you aren’t making ARC Break Assessments work for you check yourself out on this HCO Bulletin carefully, review your meter reading and examine your handling of the Itsa Line. If you want live people around you, learn to handle ARC Break Assessments.

Don’t worry about pcs getting ARC Breaks. Worry about being able to cure them with assessment until you have confidence you can. There’s nothing so uplifting as that confidence, except perhaps the ability to make any case get TA motion.

Don’t *ever* be “reasonable” about an ARC Break and think the pc is perfectly right to be having one “because .....”. If that ARC Break exists, the pc doesn’t know what’s causing it and *neither do you* until you and the pc find it! If you and the pc knew what was causing it, there would be no further ARC Break.

HCO BULLETIN OF 20 AUGUST AD 13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*SCIENTOLOGY THREE & FOUR*

**R3R—R3N**

**THE PRECLEAR'S POSTULATES**

We have long known that the preclear's postulates made at the time of the incident contained charge.

As the preclear is moved back on his time track beyond Trillions Three, you will find that incidents and Reliable Items contain less charge proportionately to the pc (who was stronger then) and that the pc's postulates made then contained more charge.

In short as you go earlier on the Time Track, the incidents seemed weaker to the pc then and the pc, being more capable, had stronger postulates.

Thus it is not uncommon to find a GPM on the early track producing only falls on the pc and the pc's postulates made at that time rocket reading (or falling).

This, in fact, gets even more disproportionate so that on the *very* early track you *might* find that running RIs out of a GPM produces no TA motion, but taking the pc's postulates out produces a TA blow down that "goes through 7" (around the whole TA dial and back up).

In my recent surveys of the Tone Arm and its relationship to auditing, it became apparent that *three* types of charge existed in a GPM.

1. Charge as an engram.
2. Charge as Reliable Items.
3. Charge as postulates.

All three must be removed from a GPM.

Any incident, wherever it is on the track, contains postulates (comments, considerations, directions) made by the pc at that time.

Thus in *all* incidents the pc's postulates must be called for and removed.

To remove a postulate from any incident, have the pc repeat it until it no longer reacts on the needle of the meter. If it comes down to a persistent tick get suppress off it and get it repeated again, just as in the case of any RI in a GPM.

**DON'T LEAVE POSTULATES CHARGED.**

Treat them like GPM Items whether in a GPM or an engram.

Add to your ARC Break L lists L3 and L4, "Have we by-passed any postulates?"

There are implants which tell the pc not to erase his own postulates. There is also a Bear Series Goal "To Postulate"

Sometimes the postulate lies *ahead* of the actual engram in R3R. Example: A man decides to get hurt, then enters into an engramic situation. The engram does not wholly free until the postulate is removed.

Occasional calling for “any postulates, considerations or comments you had in this incident” while running R3R engrams or R3N will keep the incident going well. When the pc says one, have him or her repeat it until it no longer reacts on the needle.

I bring this up at this time as I have found a case that got *no* TA action on engrams or GPMs or RRs on RIs until the postulates were given special attention, at which time TA action of an excellent kind occurred.

### SUMMARY

A stuck TA is always caused by running the pc above the pc’s tolerance of charge. You can stop any TA by ramming the pc into incident after incident without cleaning them up. A postulate is only one kind of charge.

At any position on the Time Track *also* look for the pc’s postulates. Early on the Time Track expect them to occasionally “blow the Meter apart”.

Flatten any postulate found by getting it repeated until the reaction is gone off the needle. And all charge, of course, on anything, whether falls or RRs, must be removed from engrams or GPMs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dr.bh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

20—21 August 1963

- |            |           |                       |
|------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| ** 6308C20 | SHSBC-296 | The Itsa Line         |
| ** 6308C21 | SHSBC-297 | The Itsa Line (cont.) |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 AUGUST AD13

Route Copy to:  
HCO Area Sec  
Org/Assn Sec  
D of P  
Head of Staff Co-audit  
PE Director

TECH PREPARATION  
FOR HCO POL LTR 21 AUG AD 13

***PROJECT 80***

**THE ITSA LINE AND TONE ARM**

The HCO Area Secretary should cause to be played to staff the SHSBC LRH lectures of:

14 August AD 13  
15 August AD 13  
20 August AD 13  
21 August AD 13  
22 August AD 13

These lectures contain all the material necessary for great technical improvement in the organization in both training and processing and particularly on the staff co-audit.

Public Dissemination via PE and outside unskilled co-audit is resolved in these lectures.

A great many questions, complications and additives can grow up around the Itsa Line so as to amount to several brands of Scientology. These are taken up in great detail in these lectures.

This is part of a programme to bring home to Central Organizations the current ease of getting acceptable results in the Academy, on the HGC and in the Co-audit by use of only the Tone Arm and Itsa Line. And carry forward the groundwork for outside co-auditing and broader dissemination.

We are building all future processing, training and dissemination on the very firm foundation of the definition of an auditor (one who listens), the Itsa Line (listen to the preclear) and the solution of problems (the preclear is always right). This communicates with extreme ease and simplicity.

We are building all professional auditing on the Itsa Line, plus directing pc's attention plus the Tone Arm.

We are building all top skill auditing on the Itsa Line, directing the pc's attention to what must be audited to make clear and OT and the Tone Arm.

These tapes contain all the vital basic information.

If you are having any difficulties with income, results, staff co-audit or public dissemination, the broad technical data contained in the Itsa Line, ARC Break Assessments and Tone Arm Action will rapidly resolve them.

This begins a new era for Scientology.

Get the data known to staff by holding these tape plays for me, at least two of these tapes a week, with all staff attending.

Stressing any other data or reviewing any other material, playing any other tapes broadly to staff or students at this time will retard your forward progress by overloading the line.

So I'm counting on you as HCO Area Sec to take care of this for me and keep staff attention squarely on:

1. The Itsa Line
2. The Tone Arm
3. Proper use of ARC Break Assessments
4. Directing pc's attention adroitly.

This does *not* affect what we already know and does not outmode such things as metering, Auditor's Code, etc.

If you take care of this one for me on the technical end, you'll get a lot of gains and prosperity.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[HCO PL 21 August 1963, *Change of Organization Targets-Project 80*, referred to above is in OEC Vol. 2, page 95. ]

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
22—29 August 1963

** 6308C22	SHSBC-298	Project 80
** 6308C27	SHSBC-299	Rightness and Wrongness
** 6308C28	SHSBC-300	The TA and the Service Facsimile
** 6308C29	SHSBC-301	The Service Facsimile (cont.)



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 SEPTEMBER 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*SCIENTOLOGY THREE*  
*CLEARING—CLEARING—CLEARING*

**ROUTINE THREE SC**

There has been such a rush on in technical that it may have looked to you that we were in a state of rapid change. This was occasioned by a speed-up caused by various events. You are getting about a century of research (or more) in a very few months. So bear with me. The end is not only in sight. It's here. My job is mainly now to refine and get the data to you.

The order brought into our work by making FIVE LEVELS OF SCIENTOLOGY is paying off rapidly. Level One is in development. Level Two is well away. Level Four is complete. And suddenly Level Three leaped to a final phase.

We can CLEAR, CLEAR, CLEAR.

This has been a stepchild for months, even years now. It has been mauled, messed up, invalidated and rehabilitated and knocked around. But a BOOK ONE CLEAR was what most people came into Scientology to obtain. And now I've done it. I've found out why not and how.

And this HCO Bulletin is a hurry-skurry outline of the steps so you can do it. There will be lots of HCO Bulletins on this. The tapes of August 27, 28 and 29, AD13, give most of its theory.

CLEAR DEFINED—Book One definition holds exactly true. A Clear is somebody with no "held down fives" in this lifetime (see *Evolution of a Science*).

CLEAR TEST—Clear sits at Clear read on the TA with a *free needle*. No natter. No upsets. No whole track keyed in. No SERVICE FACSIMILE.

CLEAR STABILITY—We are not concerned with stability. But we can now key out so thoroughly that we need not stress "keyed out clear". I have found the means, I am sure, to make this state far more stable and recreate it easily if it slips.

So forgive me for being indecisive about clear states for these past many months.

The breakthrough is stated as follows: IF YOU CANNOT MAKE A CLEAR IN A 25-HOUR PREPCHECK THE PC HAS ONE OR MORE SERVICE FACSIMILES.

The barrier to clearing and the reason for fast relapse when clear was attained has been the SERVICE FACSIMILE.

SERVICE FACSIMILE defined: *Advanced Procedure and Axioms* definition accurate. Added to this is: 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 generated by the *pc*, not the bank. Thus the *pc* restimulates the bank with the computation; the bank, unlike going to OT, does not retard the *pc* in this instance.

The Service Facsimile is usually a this lifetime effort only. It might better be called a SERVICE COMPUTATION but we'll hold to our old terms. The *pc* is doing it. In *usual* aberration the *bank* is doing it (the *pc*'s engrams, etc). Where you can't clear the *pc* by auditing just *bank*, *you* have to get out of the road what the *pc* is doing to stay aberrated. If you clear only what the *bank* is doing the clear state rapidly relapses. If you clear what the *pc* is doing the bank tends to stay more quiet and unrestimulated. It is the *pc* who mostly keys his bank back in. Therefore the *pc* who won't go free needle clear is himself unconsciously preventing it. And by knocking out this effort we can then key out the bank and we have a fast clear who pretty well stays clear (until sent on to OT).

The state is desirable to attain as it speeds going to OT.

All this came from studies I've been doing of the Tone Arm. The Tone Arm must move during auditing or the *pc* gets worse. All those *pcs* whose Tone Arms don't easily get into action and hang up are SERVICE FACSIMILE *pcs*.

Note that the SERVICE FACSIMILE is used to:

- FIRST:     Make self right.  
            Make others wrong.
- SECOND:    To Avoid Domination.  
            To Dominate Others.
- THIRD:     To Increase own survival.  
            To hinder the survival of others.

The Service Facsimile is all of it logical gobbledegook. It doesn't make good sense. That's because the *pc* adopted it where, in extreme cases, he or she felt endangered by something but could not *Itsa* it. Hence it's illogical. Because it is senseless, really, the computation escapes casual inspection and makes for aberrated behaviour.

## TO MAKE A CLEAR

The steps, in brief, are:

1.     ESTABLISH SERVICE FAC. This is done by Assessment of Scientology List One of 2-12 and using that for a starter and then using the Preliminary Step of R3R as published (HCO Bulletin of July I, AD 1 3). One uses only things found by assessment, never by wild guesses or *pc*'s obvious disabilities. These assessments already exist on many cases and should be used as earlier found.

2.     AUDIT WITH RIGHT-WRONG. Ask *pc* with *Itsa* Line carefully in, FIRST QUESTION: "In this lifetime, how would (whatever was found) make you right?" Adjust question until *pc* can answer it, if *pc* can't. Don't *force* it off on *pc*. If it's correct it will run well. Don't keep repeating the question unless *pc* needs it. Just let *pc* answer and answer and answer. Let *pc* come to a cognition or run out of answers or try to answer the next question prematurely and switch questions to: SECOND QUESTION: "In this lifetime, how would (whatever was found) make others wrong?" Treat this the same way. Let the *pc* come to a cog, or run out of answers or accidentally start to answer the first question. Go back to first question. Do the same with it. Then to second question. Then to first question again, then to second.

If your assessment was right *pc* will be getting better and better TA action. But the TA action will eventually lessen. On any *big* cognition, end the process. This may all take from 2 hours to 5, I don't think more. The idea is not to beat the process to

death or sink pc into bank GPMs. The pc will have automaticities (answers coming too fast to be said easily) early in the run. These must be gone and pc bright when you end. You are only trying to end the compulsive character of the Service Facsimile so found and get it off automatic and get pc to see it better, not to remove all TA action from the process.

3. AUDIT SECOND PROCESS. Using the same method of auditing as in 2. above, use the THIRD QUESTION: "In this lifetime how would (same one used in Step 2) help you escape domination?" When this seems cooled off use FOURTH QUESTION: "In this lifetime how would (same one) help you dominate others?" Use THIRD QUESTION and FOURTH QUESTION again and until pc has it all cooled off or a big cognition.

4. AUDIT THIRD PROCESS. Using the same method as in 2. above use the FIFTH QUESTION: "In this lifetime, how would (same one) aid your survival?" and then SIXTH QUESTION: "In this lifetime how would (same one) hinder the survival of others?" Use FIVE and SIX as long as is necessary to cool it all off or to produce a big cognition.

5. PREPCHECK WITH BIG MID RUDS, using the question, "In this lifetime, on (same one) has anything been . . . ?" and get in Suppress, Careful of, Failed to Reveal, Invalidate, Suggest, Mistake been made, Protest, Anxious about, Decided.

If the pc has a really shattering cognition just halt Prepcheck and end it off.

This Prepcheck is done of course off the meter until the pc says no, then checking it on the meter and cleaning it off. Once you've gone to meter on a button stay with meter for further queries. But don't clean cleans and don't leave slows or speeded rises either. And don't cut pc's Itsa Line.

That should be the end of a Service Facsimile. But a pc may have *several*, so do it all again through all steps as often as is needed.

Pcs who have had Scientology List One of R2- 12 should be given these as the first things used. Pcs who have had assessments done for R3R chains should have these assessment results used (or as much of them as apply) for the next runs. Even if the chain assessment has been run on R3R still use it for R3SC.

### COMPLETING CLEARING

To complete clearing then, it is only necessary to give a permissive In This Lifetime 18 button Prepcheck making the pc look hard for answers, short of ARC Breaking pc.

And you should have a beautiful free needle and TA at the clear read and the pc shining.

If clearing did not occur these following faults were present in the auditing:

1. Pc did not agree with assessment, it read only because pc did not understand it or protested it.
2. The assessment was wrong.
3. The atmosphere of auditing was critical of pc.
4. The Itsa Line was not in.
5. The auditor let the Itsa Line wander to early track.
6. The auditor Q'ed and A'ed and went off process and into engrams on pc's "sell".

7. The process was not done.
8. The assessment was done by physical disability inspection or by choosing pc's habits, not by actual assessment.
9. The auditing did not produce TA action (wrong assessment and/or Itsa Line out would be all that could produce no TA action).
10. Pc already sitting in a heavy ARC Break by reason of whole track by-passed charge.
11. This process used instead of an ARC Break Assessment well done, thus making this process a punishment.
12. Questions phrased wrong.
13. Questions were over-run.
14. Questions were under-run.
15. Auditor too choppy on Prepchecking.
16. ARC Breaks in these sessions were not cleaned up.
17. Pc trying to plunge into early track and stay restimulated.
18. Pc trying to get early track GPMs or engrams run to avoid giving up Service Facsimile.
19. Auditor missed withholds accumulated during clearing.
20. Process end product "clear" overestimated by auditor, *pc* or supervisors.  
The keynote of clearing a Service Facsimile is INTEREST. If pc isn't interested in it, the assessment is wrong.

The keynote of auditing tone is permissive, happy, easy, not militant. Let pc run on and on.

On phrasing question, no matter *what is* assessed it is always IT MAKES PC RIGHT AND OTHERS WRONG. Pc is not trying to make it wrong.

-----

An ordinary Prepcheck, done with a Service Facsimile present, will turn on mass on the pc. Why? Pc is asserting Service Facsimile.

-----

Well that's the fast rundown on R3SC (Routine Three, Service Facsimile Clear). And that's clearing. A lot of theory is missing in this HCO Bulletin but not one essential step. You can do it.

If a person is cleared before going on to OT they make it hundreds of hours faster !

(NOTE: All OT processes will shortly be released with R4 designations but with little other change.)

LRH:jw.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6309C03	SHSBC-302A	R3SC
** 6309C04	SHSBC-302	How to Find a Service Facsimile
** 6309C05	SHSBC-303	Service Fac Assessment

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 SEPTEMBER 1963

DofT, DofP  
Five copies to  
each Org  
Orgs do not re  
stencil

*SCIENTOLOGY FIVE*  
**INSTRUCTING IN SCIENTOLOGY AUDITING**  
**INSTRUCTOR'S TASK**  
**D of P's CASE HANDLING**

As given at the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Instructors Conference of this date, the task of the Scientology Auditing Course Instructor (and D's of P handling cases through uncleared staff auditors) is to accomplish training and processing and therefore auditing with uncleared students or auditors.

The following drawings and explanations were made.

In Drawing A we see the auditor's perception of the pc as limited by auditor's own Service Facsimile.

In Drawing B we see the Auditor's perception of the pc the way it would be if the Service Fac were removed.

Thus we see judgement missing because of lack of perception of the pc or his or her condition or case in Drawing A, thus permitting only processes not requiring high level perception or decisions based upon the momentary condition of the pc.

In Drawing B we see that perception is not limited, judgement can be exercised by the auditor because the pc can actually be observed by him. Higher level processes can only be run by an auditor approximating the observation condition shown in Drawing B.

In Drawing C we see the actual observation limitations of auditor or pc in an aberrated condition. The keynote is SAFE ASSUMPTIONS as per Service Fac. Thus only Safe Assumptions will be entertained and no real auditing occurs. Only ineffective assumptions or questions are likely to be asked or viewed. Example: "What about thinking about stealing a paper clip from HASI?" This actual question was once asked in O/W, and its prototypes keep real auditing from occurring since neither pc nor auditor get close to any real aberration. (That either auditor or pc consider the assumption safe does not mean it is not aberrated and subject to fault.) So no real auditing of the case is undertaken and when something worth while auditing is contacted, either auditor draws off or pc (unobserved by an aberrated auditor) draws off. This reduces processing results to next to nothing. It also sometimes leads both auditor and pc in over both their heads as little is observed and all these "Safe Assumptions" are also aberrated .

The Instructor's (and Case Supervisor's) Solution is seen in Drawing D.

Auditing at lower stages, done by aberrated auditors (who have Service Facs in place) must be assumed to be independent of observation of the PC Occurrences (since observation of the pc as in Drawing A does not exist).

The Instructor therefore directs the Student Auditor's attention toward the Scientology Body of Data in order to get effective auditing done. So does any Case Supervisor. This body of data is designed to accomplish auditing independent of Observation of the pc and the many varieties of changes and differences amongst pcs. The Instructor uses such mechanisms as "If you can breathe you can audit," "Do it exactly by the Bulletin." He instructs only in broadly workable processes and along

definite rote lines. He uses the habit patterns of discipline to enforce the auditor's attention to and compliance with workable drills and data.

If this is done (and *only* if this is done) will auditing occur that is capable of producing effective results independent of the condition shown in Drawing A.

If the condition shown in Drawing C is permitted to occur, then all manner of squirrel processes and actions will occur in sessions, wild solutions will reign and general chaos will result. But more importantly the auditing necessary to produce the ideal condition shown in Drawing B can occur only in the presence of Instruction or Supervision shown in Drawing D.

Thus one produces cleared auditors by operating only as per Drawing D. These facts are not the result of theoretical supposition, but of careful empirical observation and test. Therefore, Instruction and performance of uncleared auditors must follow Drawing D.

The accomplishment of Classes II and III auditing and Levels II and III results is possible by following Drawing D. It fails only when Drawing D is not understood and followed by Instructors and Auditing Supervisors.

The liability is that the student's or auditor's Service Fac may contest Instruction as shown in Drawing D. There is no liability if the student is already capable of Drawing B observation (which is rare in uncleared persons). If a Service Fac is in the road of Instruction as per Drawing D, it still has been and can be overcome *far* more easily than overcoming various erroneous and varying observations of pcs, as to confront the pc is to confront aberration directly and to confront the Body of Data is to confront only an orderly and pleasant arrangement of truthful facts that will still hold good when the student is cleared, whereas the pc's aberration, unstable before processing, will be gone.

Thus we study valid workable data that is broadly true and enforce compliance with it rather than studying or classifying Individual Cases and their aberrations as was done exclusively in older Mental Sciences (which failed where we have already succeeded for years).

Class IV material (OT and Whole Track) is sometimes too much for the uncleared auditor since it is complex. It requires strict adherence to the Body of Data *as well as* some observation of the pc. Thus Class IV materials (OT and Whole Track) are best done when the conditions of Drawing B and Drawing D both be present in the session.

This establishes levels of data and classification of its use. Some auditors with Service Facsimiles in place will be unable to successfully handle Class IV data. And some pcs unless cleared of the added restimulation of this life and the environment before being put on Whole Track will be unable to climb the hill.

Therefore *all* instruction and use of Scientology Auditing Skills and Materials are most successfully done as per Drawing D and have proven unsuccessful when auditor observation of the pc was assumed or auditor judgement relied upon while the auditor or student was in an uncleared state as per Drawings A and C.

This shows an Instructor in or Supervisor of Scientology Auditing his surest route to success with students without blocking those students already in condition to observe pcs. Those students whose Service Facsimiles revolt at Drawing D will also most surely prevent their observation of the pc and Instruction and Supervision Methods as per Drawing D can overcome the barrier whereas nothing will actually surmount the failure to observe the pc, short of clearing the auditor's Service Fac. This last is a matter, also, of close observation of students over a period of two years.

The object is to get auditing done under supervision and both during and after Instruction. Only then can we ever broadly attain cleared auditors or any of our objectives.

Instruction fails when these principles are not present or when done without heavy stress on the Body of Data and compliance with good auditing practice.

This is in no way critical of students or uncleared auditors. It is simple observation. It is effective.

It is no mean development to accomplish auditing without observing the more subtle conditions of the pc. We have done just that. Therefore, as the student or auditor does not usually observe the pc because of his own Service Fac, and as Level II and III can be done entirely by data, drills and rote procedures, all but Class IV can be attained without cleared auditors. If only cleared auditors were permitted to audit then nobody would be able to start the clearing. This shortage of cleared auditors will exist to nearly the end of this universe. So it is a good thing to have the problem resolved, as it is in this HCO Bulletin.

Of course, the most valid reason for using this approach is that only the disciplined Body of Data used exactly is capable of resolving cases and no amount of confront of PC Occurrence would by itself resolve anything.

It's the Body of Data exactly and precisely used that resolves the human or any other mind. And that's the main reason to make the student concentrate upon it. So this is a safe thing to do—concentrate on the Body of Data—no matter why.

L. RON HUBBARD





LRH: dr.bh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Drawings A, B, C and D discussed in the above HCO B are on the following page.]

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
10—19 September 1963

** 6309C10SHSBC-304	Destimulation of a Case
** 6309C11SHSBC-306	Service Facs and GPMs
** 6309C12SHSBC-305	Service Facs
** 6309C17SHSBC-307	What You Are Auditing
** 6309C18SHSBC-308	St. Hill Service Fac Handling
** 6309C19SHSBC-309	Routine 4M TA [HCO B 2 Oct. 63 cancels R4M TA]

# Conditions of Observation





Central Orgs  
Franchise

## **REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING**

(Compiled from HCO Bulletins of July 2, 3 and 4, AD12)

### **HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN**

Just as an E-Meter can go dead for the auditor in the presence of a monstrous ARC break, I have found it can go 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've developed Repetitive Rudiments.

The auditor at first does *not* consult the meter, but asks the rudiments question of the pc until the pc says there is no further answer. At this point the auditor says, "I will check that on the meter." And asks the question again. If it reads, the auditor uses the meter to steer the pc to the answer, and when the pc finds the answer, the auditor again says, "I will check that on the meter" and does so.

The cycle is repeated over and over until the meter is clean of any instant read (see HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962, for Instant Read).

The cycle:

1. Run the rudiment as a repetitive process until pc has no answer.
2. Consult meter for a hidden answer.
3. If meter reads use it to steer ("that" "that" each time the meter flicks) the pc to the answer.
4. Stay with the Meter and do (2) and (3).

The process is flat when there is no instant read to the question.

One does not "bridge out" or use "two more commands". When the meter test of the question gets no instant read, the auditor says, "The meter is clean".

The trick here is the definition of "With Session". If the pc is With Session the meter will read. If the pc is partially against session the meter will read poorly, and the rudiment will not register and the rudiment will get missed. But with the pc with session the meter will read well for the auditor.

### **FAST CHECKING**

A *Fast Check* on the Rudiments consists only of Steps (2) and (3) of the cycle done over and over.

Watching the meter the auditor asks the question, takes up only what reads and, careful not to Q and A, clears it. One does this as many times as is necessary to get a clean needle. But one still says "The meter is clean" and catches up the disagreement by getting the additional answers.

When the question is seen to be clean, the question is left.

In using Fast Checking NEVER SAY, "THAT STILL READS." That's a flunk. Say, "There's *another* read here. "

### **REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING**

We will still use the term "Prepchecking" and do all Prepchecking by repetitive command.

### STEP ONE

Without now looking at the Meter, the auditor asks the question repetitively until the preclear says that's all, there are no more answers.

### STEP TWO

The auditor then says, "I will check that on the meter" and does so, watching for the Instant Read (HCO Bulletin May 25, 1962).

If it reads, the auditor says, "That reads. What was it?" (and steers the pc's attention by calling each identical read that then occurs). "There .....That .....That ....." until the pc spots it in his bank and gives the datum.

### STEP THREE

The auditor then ignores the meter and repeats Step One above. Then goes to Step Two, etc.

### STEP FOUR

When there is no read on Step Two above, the auditor says, "The meter is clean."

This is *all* there is to Repetitive Prepchecking as a system. Anything added in the way of more auditor questions is destructive to the session. Be sure not to Q and A (HCO Bulletin of May 24, 1962).

Be sure your TR4 is *excellent* in that you *understand* (really, no fake) what the pc is saying and acknowledge it (really, so the pc gets it) and return the pc to session. Nothing is quite as destructive to this type of auditing as bad TR4.

### END WORDS

The E-Meter has two holes in it. It does not operate on an ARC broken pc and it *can* operate on the last word (thought minor) only of a question. Whereas the question (thought major) is actually null.

A pc can be checked on the END WORDS OF RUDIMENTS QUESTIONS and the charge on those single words can be made known and the question turned around to avoid the last word's charge.

Example: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

The word "difficulties", said to the pc by itself gives an Instant Read. Remedy: Test "Difficulties". If it reads as itself then change the question to: "Concerning your difficulties, are you willing to talk to me?" This will only react when the pc is unwilling to do so.

Caution: This trouble of END WORDS reading by themselves occurs mainly in the presence of weak TR1 and failure to groove in the question to a "thought major". With good TR1 the END WORDS read only when the question is asked.

IN PRACTICE you only investigate this when the pc insists strongly that the question is nul. Then test the end word for lone reaction and turn the question about to make it end with another end word (question not to have words changed, only shifted in order). Then groove it in and test it for Instant Read. If it still reacts as a question (thought major) then, of course, it is not nul and should be answered.

### DOUBLE CLEANING

"Cleaning" a rudiment that has already registered nul gives the pc a Missed Withhold of nothingness. His nothingness was not accepted. The pc has no answer. A missed no-answer then occurs. This is quite serious. Once you see a Rudiment is clean, let it go. To ask again something already nul is to leave the pc baffled—he has a missed withhold which is a nothingness.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 SEPTEMBER AD13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*SCIENTOLOGY TWO*

**PREPCHECK BUTTONS**

(Cancels HCO Tech Ltr of Oct 1, AD12)

The following order and number of Prepcheck Buttons should be used wherever “an 18 button Prepcheck” is recommended. Do not use the old order of buttons, not because of any danger, but these below are slightly more effective. The old order of buttons may still be used.

The full command is usually “(Time Limiter) (on subject) has anything been\_\_\_\_\_” or “is there anything you have been\_\_\_\_\_” for some of them which don’t fit with “has anything been \_\_\_\_\_”. The (on\_\_\_\_\_may be omitted. The Time Limiter is seldom omitted as it leads the pc to Itsa the Whole Track. On an RRing goal found and used in R3SC the Time Limiter “In this Lifetime” can be used with good effect. All Service Fac questions or Prepchecks must have a Time Limiter.

In running R4 (R3M2), pc’s actual GPMs, the goal and RIs are Prepchecked without a Time Limiter as pc is on the whole track anyway. But in all lower levels of auditing, particularly when using a possible goal as a Service Fac, the Time Limiter, usually “In this Lifetime \_\_\_\_\_”, must be used or pc will become Over Restimulated.

For all uses the 18 Prepcheck Buttons now are:

SUPPRESSED  
CAREFUL OF  
FAILED TO REVEAL  
INVALIDATED  
SUGGESTED  
MISTAKE BEEN MADE  
PROTESTED  
ANXIOUS ABOUT  
DECIDED  
WITHDRAWN FROM  
REACHED  
IGNORED  
A FAILURE  
HELPED  
HIDDEN  
REVEALED  
ASSERTED  
SOLVED

**BIG MID RUDS**

It will be noted that the first 9 are the Big Mid Ruds used as “Since the Last Time I audited you has anything been\_\_\_\_\_?”

## A USEFUL TIP

To get the Meter clean on a list during nulling the list the easiest system is to show the pc the list and just ask, "What happened?" This saves a lot of Mid Ruds.

## TWO USEFUL PAIRS

When trying to get an Item to read the two buttons *Suppress* and *Invalidate* are sometimes used as a pair.

To get a pc easier in session the buttons *Protested* and *Decided* are sometimes used as a pair.

## DIRTY NEEDLE

Mid Ruds (called because Middle of Session was the earliest use + Rudiments of a Session) are less employed today because of the discovery that all Dirty Needle phenomena is usually traced to the auditor having *cut* the pc's communication. To get rid of a Dirty Needle one usually need ask only, "Have I cut your Communication?" or do an ARC Break assessment if that doesn't work. A Dirty Needle (continuously agitated) always means the auditor has cut the pc's Itsa Line, no matter what else-has happened.

Chronically comm chopping auditors always have pcs with Dirty Needles. Conversely, pcs with high Tone Arms have auditors who don't control the Itsa Line and let it over-stimulate the pc by getting into lists of problems or puzzlements, but a high Tone Arm also means a heavy Service Fac, whereas a Dirty Needle seldom requires Mid Ruds or Prepchecks. It just requires an auditor who doesn't cut the pc's Itsa Line.

## THE OLD ORDER OF PREPCHECK BUTTONS

The following buttons and order were the original buttons and may still be used, particularly if the pc is allergic to Mid Ruds:

SUPPRESSED  
INVALIDATED  
BEEN CAREFUL OF  
SUGGESTED  
WITHHELD  
PROTESTED  
HIDDEN  
REVEALED  
MISTAKE (BEEN MADE)  
ASSERTED  
CHANGED (OR ALTERED)  
DAMAGED  
WITHDRAWN (FROM)  
CREATED  
DESTROYED  
AGREED (WITH)  
IGNORED  
DECIDED

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 SEPTEMBER 1963

Central Orgs

*SCIENTOLOGY 0 TO V*

**TAPE COVERAGE OF NEW TECHNOLOGY**

Due to certain pressures in the world at the end of 1962, I deemed it advisable to speed up research as a means of handling developing situations.

This activity proved fruitful beyond any expectations for the period devoted to it.

To increase an already burdened personal time schedule was not without repercussion. It was in the first place impossible to crowd more action into the crowded hours but somehow I did so. I cut out all social engagements, almost all appointments and even reduced time spent talking to students. I canceled all lecture appearances abroad. I let my cars and motorcycles rust and my cameras gather dust. I kept Mary Sue up all night auditing or being audited. And somehow, through the devotion of staff, everywhere, kept the show on the road and handled the legal front also.

The stepped up schedule period has not ended but the golden knowledge has been gathered in and *all targets hoped for* have been *exceeded*.

This period has also been hard on staff, students and all Scientologists due to shifting technology.

One of the ways of reducing research time is omitting written records. Therefore I have relied on the Saint Hill Course Lecture tapes to bear the burden of collecting the data together.

On these tapes over a certain period we have a full record of the *results* of this stepped up period of research.

What one is greeted with, in listening to these tapes, is a whole new clarification of Scientology including breaking it into progressive classes or levels of data.

Hardly any HCO Bulletins mirror this period. It is all on tapes.

A full progressive summary of Modern Scientology from the lowest to the highest levels is to be found on the following tapes:

24 July '63	—	ARC Breaks and the Comm Cycle.
25 July '63	—	Comm Cycles in Auditing.
6 August '63	—	Auditing Comm Cycles.
7 August '63	—	R2-H Fundamentals.
8 August '63	—	R2-H Assessment.
14 August '63	—	Auditing Tips.
15 August '63	—	The Tone Arm.
20 August '63	—	The Itsa Line.
21 August '63	—	The Itsa Line (continued).
22 August '63	—	Project 80.
27 August '63	—	Rightness and Wrongness.
28 August '63	—	The TA and the Service Facsimile.
29 August '63	—	Service Facsimile (continued).

3 September '63	—	R3SC.
4 September '63	—	How to Find a Service Facsimile.
5 September '63	—	Service Fac Assessment.
10 September '63	—	Destimulation of a Case.
11 September '63	—	Service Facs and GPMs.
12 September '63	—	Service Facs.
17 September '63	—	What You Are Auditing.
18 September '63	—	St Hill Service Fac Handling.
19 September '63	—	Routine 4M-TA.
24 September '63		Summary—
25 September '63		(These three lectures not yet given at time
26 September '63		of writing this HCO Bulletin.)

Additionally we have some earlier tapes that amplify the material of the pc's Actual GPMs and the theory behind them in:

20 November '62	—	The GPM.
28 March '63	—	The GPM.
2 April '63	—	Line Plot, Items.
4 April '63	—	Anatomy of the GPM.
16 April '63	—	Top of GPM.

Other tapes made up to 24 July 1963 carry the full story of Implant GPMs, their patterns and handling and the Whole Track. These have only passing importance as a *pc's Actual Goals and GPMs are a thousand thousand times more aberrative and important than Implants*. But one has to know the extent and nature of Implant GPMs in order not to get them confused with Actual GPMs.

The road into Scientology, the road to Clear and the road to OT are all delineated on the tapes listed above between 24 July '63 and 26 September '63, a total of 25 tapes. (I anticipate 3 of these lectures for this week in order to get out this HCO Bulletin. )

Thus in 25 1/2 hour tapes we have a summary and clarification and new data on Modern Scientology for all levels and classes.

Auditing has been redefined, comm cycles have been inspected, Service Facsimiles have been unearthed and clarified. Most old auditing problems have been swept away and the road has been opened.

This has been a fantastic and dramatic period in the history and development of Scientology and I'm proud that it came off.

And I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the floods of congratulations that have been pouring in from everywhere as these tapes have been released.

History has been made. Scientology is capable of fully freeing Man.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 SEPTEMBER 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*SCIENTOLOGY I to IV*

**ADEQUATE TONE ARM ACTION**

Now that it has been established fully that *a pc's gain is directly and only proportional to Tone Arm Action*, the question of how much Tone Arm Action is adequate must be answered.

These are rough answers based on direct observation of pcs after sessions.

Tone Arm action is measured by DIVISIONS DOWN PER 21/2 hour session or per hour of auditing.

TA action is not counted by up and down, only *down is* used. Usually the decimal system is used. But fractions can also be employed. Needle falls are neglected in the computation, only actual motion of the Tone Arm is used.

One can add up or approximate the TOTAL DOWN TONE ARM MOTION. After a session, if an auditor is keeping good reports of TA motion, one adds up all the divisions and fractions of division of Down Motion (not up) and the result is known as TOTAL TA FOR THE SESSION.

A needle gives about a 10th of a Division of motion in one sweep across the dial but, as above, is not used in his computation. Needle action is neglected in the add-up.

Example: As noted in the TA column of an auditor's report, 4.5, 4.2, 4.8, 4.0, 3.5 gives you .3 + .8 + .5 gives you 1.6 Divisions of TA action for that period of time. When this is done for a full 2.5 hour session the following table gives you a rough idea of what is expected and what will happen to the pc.

<i>Amount Per Session</i>	<i>Session Rating</i>	<i>PC Reaction</i>
25 Divs	Excellent	Feels wonderful
20 Divs	Good	Feels good
15 Divs	Acceptable	Feels "Better"
10 Divs	Poor	Slight Change
5 Divs	Unacceptable	No Change
0 Divs	Harmful	Gets Worse

Anything from 10 Divs to 0 Divs of Down Tone Arm for a 21/2 hour session is something to do something about. One gets very industrious in this range.

For a 25 hour intensive the scale of TA divisions down for the entire intensive would be:

<i>Amount Per Intensive</i>	<i>Session Rating</i>	<i>PC Reaction</i>
250 Divs	Excellent	Feels wonderful
200 Divs	Good	Feels good
150 Divs	Acceptable	Feels "Better"
100 Divs	Poor	Slight Change
50 Divs	Unacceptable	No Change
0 Divs	Harmful	Gets Worse

The preclear's case state can be completely predicted by the amount of TA action received in a session or an intensive.

The only exception is where the pc in running R4 (old R3) processes can get into a "creak" of by-passed goals or RIs which make him uncomfortable although TA action has been good or even excellent. A case analysis will locate the by-passed charge. On any auditing where charge has been by-passed but TA action was good the pc's subjective reality on gain will not seem to compare with the TA action gotten in the auditing, but the moment the by-passed charge is located the gain attributable to TA action will be felt.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
25—26 September 1963

- |            |           |                                 |
|------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
| ** 6309C25 | SHSBC-310 | Summary II. Scientology 0       |
| ** 6309C26 | SHSBC-311 | Summary III About Level IV Aud. |



HCO BULLETIN OF 1 OCTOBER 1963

Franchise  
CenOCon

*SCIENTOLOGY ALL*

**HOW TO GET TONE ARM ACTION**

The most vital necessity of auditing at *any* level of Scientology is to get Tone Arm Action Not to worry the pc about it but just to get TA action. Not to find something that will get future TA. But just to get TA NOW.

Many auditors are still measuring their successes by things found or accomplished in the session. Though this is important too (mainly at Level IV), it is secondary to Tone Arm Action.

1. Get good Tone Arm Action.
2. Get things done in the session to increase Tone Arm Action.

**NEW DATA ON THE E-METER**

The most elementary error in trying to get Tone Arm action is, of course, found under the fundamentals of auditing—*reading an E-Meter*.

This point is so easily skipped over and seems so obvious that auditors routinely miss it. Until they understand this one point, an auditor will continue to get minimal TA and be content with 15 Divisions down per session—which in my book isn't TA but a meter stuck most of the session.

There is something to know about meter reading and getting TA. Until this is known nothing else can be known.

**TONE ARM ASSESSMENT**

The Tone Arm provides assessment actions. Like the needle reacts on list items, so does the Tone Arm react on things that will give TA.

*You don't usually needle assess in doing Levels I, II and III. You Tone Arm Assess.*

The Rule is: THAT WHICH MOVES THE TONE ARM DOWN WILL GIVE TONE ARM ACTION.

Conversely, another rule: THAT WHICH MOVES ONLY THE NEEDLE SELDOM GIVES GOOD TA.

So for Levels I, II and III (and not LEVEL IV) you can actually paste a paper over the needle dial, leaving only the bottom of the needle shaft visible so the TA can be set by it and do all assessments needed with the Tone Arm. If the TA moves on a subject then that subject will produce TA if the pc is permitted to talk about it (Itsa it).

Almost all auditors, when the Itsa Line first came out, tried only to find FUTURE TA ACTION and never took any PRESENT TA ACTION. The result was continuous listing of problems and needle nulling in an endless search to find something that "would produce TA action". They looked frantically all around to find some subject that would produce TA action and never looked at the Tone Arm of their meter or tried to find what *was moving it NOW*.

This seems almost a foolish thing to stress—that what *is* producing TA will produce TA. But it is the first lesson to learn. And it takes a lot of learning.

Auditors also went frantic trying to understand what an ITSA LINE was. They thought it was a Comm Line. Or part of the CCHs or almost anything but what it is. It is too simple.

There are two things of great importance in an auditing cycle. One is the Whatsit, the other is the Itsa. Confuse them and you get no TA.

If the auditor puts in the Itsa and the preclear the Whatsit, the result is no TA. The auditor puts in the Whatsit and the pc the Itsa, always. It is so easy to reverse the role in auditing that most auditors do it at first. The preclear is very willing to talk about his *difficulties, problems* and *confusions*. The auditor is so willing to Itsa (discover) what is troubling the preclear that an auditor, green in this, will then work, work, work to try to Itsa something “that will give the pc TA”, that he causes the pc to “Whatsit Whatsit Whatsit that’s wrong with me”. Listing is not really good Itsa-ing; it’s Whatsit-ing as the pc is in the mood “Is it this? Is it that?” even when “solutions” are being listed for assessment. The result is poor TA.

TA comes from the pc saying, “It *IS*” not “Is it?”

Examples of Whatsit and Itsa: Auditor: “What’s here?” (Whatsit) Pc: “An auditor, a preclear, a meter.” (Itsa)

Itsa really isn’t even a Comm Line. It’s what travels on a Comm Line from the pc to the auditor, if that which travels is saying with certainty “It *IS*”.

I can sit down with a pc and meter, put in about three minutes “assessing” by Tone Arm Action and using only RIC get 35 Divisions of TA in 2% hours with no more work than writing down TA reads and my auditor’s report. Why? Because the pc is not being stopped from Itsa-ing and because I don’t lead the pc into Whatsit-ing. And also because I don’t think auditing is complicated.

Tone Arm Action has to have been *prevented* if it didn’t occur. Example: An auditor, noting a Whatsit moved the TA, every time, promptly changed the Whatsit to a different Whatsit. Actually happened. Yet in being asked what he was doing in session said: “I ask the pc for a problem he has had and every time he comes up with one I ask for solutions to it.” He didn’t add that he frantically changed the Whatsit each time the TA *started* to move. Result—9 Divisions of TA in 21/2 hours, pc laden with by-passed charge. If he had *only* done what he said he had he would have had TA.

If it didn’t occur, Tone Arm Action has to have been prevented! It doesn’t just “not occur”.

In confirmation of auditors being too anxious to get in the Itsa Line themselves and not let the pc is the fad of using the meter as a Ouija Board. The auditor asks it questions continually and never asks the pc. Up the spout go Divisions of TA. “Is this Item a terminal?” the auditor asks the meter. Why not ask the pc? If you ask the pc, you get an Itsa, “No, I think it’s an oppterm because .....” and the TA moves.

Now to give you some idea of how crazy simple it is to get in an Itsa Line on the pc, try this:

Start the session and just sit back and look at the pc. Don’t say anything. Just sit there looking at the pc. The pc will of course start talking. And if you just nod now and then and keep your auditor’s report going unobtrusively so as not to cut the Itsa, you’ll have a talking pc and most of the time good TA. At the end of 21/2 hours, end the session. Add up the TA you’ve gotten and you will usually find that it was far more than in previous sessions.

TA action, if absent, had to be prevented! It doesn’t just fail to occur.

But this is not just a stunt. It is a vital and valuable rule in getting TA.

RULE: A SILENT AUDITOR INVITES ITSa.

This is not all good, however. In doing R4 work or R3R or R4N the silent auditor lets the pc Itsa all over the whole track and causes Over-Restimulation which locks up the TA. But in lower levels of auditing, inviting an Itsa with silence is an ordinary action.

In Scientology Levels I, II and III the auditor is usually silent much longer, proportionally, in the session, than he or she is talking—about 100 of silence to 1 of talking. As soon as you get into Level IV auditing however, on the pc's actual GPMs, the auditor has to be crisp and busy to get TA and a silent, idle auditor can mess up the pc and get very little TA. This is all under "controlling the pc's attention". Each level of auditing controls the pc's attention a little more than the last and the leap from Level III to IV is huge.

Level I hardly controls at all. The rule above about the silent auditor is employed to the full.

Level II takes the pc's life and livingness goals (or session goals) for the pc to Itsa and lets the pc roll, the auditor intruding only to keep the pc giving solutions, attempts, dones, decisions about his life and livingness or session goals rather than difficulties, problems and natter about them.

Level III adds the *rapid* search (by TA assessment) for the service facsimile (maybe 20 minutes out of 2 1/2 hours) and then guides the preclear into it with R3SC processes. The rule here is that if the thing found that moved the TA wouldn't make others wrong but would make the pc wrong, then it is an oppterm lock and one Prepchecks it. (The two top RIs of the pc's PT GPM is the service facsimile. One is a terminal, the pc's, and the other is an oppterm. They each have thousands of lock RIs. Any pair of lock RIs counts as a service facsimile, giving TA.) A good *slow* Prepcheck but still a Prepcheck. Whether running Right-Wrong-Dominate-Survive, (R3SC) or Prepchecking (the only 2 processes used) one lets the pc really answer before acking. One question may get 50 answers! Which is One Whatsit from the auditor gets 50 Itsas from the pc.

Level IV auditing finds the auditor smoothly letting the pc Itsa RIs and lists but the auditor going at it like a small steam engine finding RIs, RIs, RIs, Goals, RIs, RIs, RIs. For the total TA in an R4 session only is proportional to the number of RIs found without goofs, wrong goals or other errors which rob TA action.

So the higher the level the more control of the pc's attention. But in the lower levels, as you go back down, the processes used require less and less control, less auditor action to get TA. The Level is designed to give TA at that level of control. And if the auditor actions get busier than called for in the lower levels the TA is cut down per session.

## OVER-RESTIMULATION

As will be found in another HCO Bulletin and in the lectures of summer and autumn of 1963, the thing that seizes a TA up is Over-Restimulation. THE RULE IS: THE LESS ACTIVE THE TA THE MORE OVER-RESTIMULATION IS PRESENT. (THOUGH RESTIMULATION CAN ALSO BE ABSENT.)

Therefore an auditor auditing a pc whose TA action is low (below 20 TA Divisions down for a 2 1/2 hour session) must be careful not to over-restimulate the pc (or to gently restimulate the pc). This is true of all levels. At Level IV this becomes: don't find that next goal, bleed the GPM you're working of all possible charge. And at Level III this becomes: don't find too many new Service Facs before you've bled the TA out of what you already have. And at Level II this becomes: don't fool about with a new illness until the pc feels the Lumbosis you started on is handled utterly. And at Level I this becomes: "Let the pc do the talking".

Over-Restimulation is the auditor's most serious problem.

Under-Restimulation is just an auditor not putting the pc's attention on anything.

The sources of Restimulation are:

1. Life and Livingness Environment. This is the workaday world of the pc. The auditor handles this with Itsa or “Since Big Mid Ruds’ and even by regulating or changing some of the pc’s life by just telling the pc to not do this or that during an intensive or even making the pc change residence for a while if that’s a source. This is subdivided into Past and Present.
2. The Session and its Environment. This is handled by Itsa-ing the subject of session environments and other ways. This is subdivided into Past and Present.
3. The Subject Matter of Scientology. This is done by assessing (by TA motion) the old Scientology List One and then Itsa-ing or Prepchecking what’s found.
4. The Auditor. This is handled by What would you be willing to tell me, Who would you be willing to talk to. And other such things for the pc to Itsa. This is subdivided into Past and Present.
5. This Lifetime. This is handled by slow assessments and lots of Itsa on what’s found *whenever it is found to be moving the TA* during slow assessment. (You don’t null a list or claw through ten hours of listing and nulling to find something to Itsa at Levels I to III. You see what moves the TA and bleed it of Itsa *right now*. )
6. Pc’s Case. In Levels I to III this is only indirectly attacked as above.

And in addition to the actions above, you can handle each one of these or what’s found with a slow Prepcheck.

#### LIST FOR ASSESSMENT

Assess for TA motion the following list:

The surroundings in which you live.

The surroundings you used to live in.

Our surroundings here.

Past surroundings for auditing or treatment.

Things connected with Scientology (Scientology List One).

Myself as your auditor.

Past auditors or practitioners.

Your personal history in this lifetime.

Goals you have set for yourself.

Your case.

At Level II one gets the pc to simply set Life and Livingness goals and goals for the session, or takes up these on old report forms and gets the decisions, actions, considerations, etc., on them as the Itsa, cleaning each one fairly well of TA. One usually takes the goal the pc seems most interested in (or has gone into apathy about) as it will be found to produce the most TA.

Whatever you assess by Tone Arm, once you have it, get the TA out of it before you drop it. And don’t cut the Itsa.

## MEASURE OF AUDITORS

The skill of an auditor is directly measured by the amount of TA he or she can get. Pcs are not more difficult one than another. Any pc can be made to produce TA. But some auditors cut TA more than others.

Also, in passing, an auditor can't falsify TA. It's written all over the pc after a session. Lots of TA = Bright pc. Small TA = Dull pc.

And Body Motion doesn't count. Extreme Body Motion on some pcs can produce a division of TA! Some pcs try to squirm their way to clear! A good way to cure a TA conscious body-moving pc is to say, "I can't record TA caused while you're moving."

As you may suspect, the pc's *case* doesn't do a great deal until run on R4 processes. But destimulation of the case can produce some astonishing changes in beingness. Key-out is the principal function of Levels I to III. But charge off a case is charge off. Unless destimulated a case can't get a rocket read or present the auditor with a valid goal. Levels I to III produce a Book One clear. Level R4 produces an O.T. But case conditioning (clearing) is necessary before R4 can be run. *And* an auditor who can't handle Levels I to III surely won't be able to handle the one-man band processes at Level IV. So get good on Levels I to III before you even study IV.

## THE FIRST THING TO LEARN

By slow assessment is meant letting the pc *Itsa* while assessing. This consists of *rapid auditor action*, very crisp, to get something that moves the TA and then immediate shift into letting the pc *Itsa* during which be quiet! The slowness is overall action. It takes hours and hours to do an old preclear assessment form this way but the TA *flies*.

The actual auditing in Level III looks like this—auditor going like mad over a list or form with an eye cocked on the TA. The first movement of the TA (not caused by body motion) the auditor goes a tiny bit further if that and then sits back and just looks at the pc. The pc comes out of it, sees the auditor waiting and starts talking. The auditor unobtrusively records the TA, sometimes nods. TA action dies down in a couple minutes or an hour. As soon as the TA looks like it hasn't got much more action in it the auditor sits up, lets the pc finish what he or she was saying and then gets busy busy again. But *no* action taken by the auditor cuts into the TA action. In Levels I to III no assessment list is continued beyond seeing a TA move until *that* TA motion is handled.

In doing a Scientology List One assessment one goes down the list until the TA moves (not because of body motion). Then, because a TA is not very pinpointed, the auditor covers the one or two above where he first saw TA and, watching the pc for interest *and* the TA, circles around that area until he is sure he has what made the TA move and then bleeds that for TA. by *Itsa* or Prepcheck.

Yes, you say, but doesn't the auditor do TRs on the pc? One question—one answer ratio? NO!

Let the pc finish what the pc was saying. And let the pc be satisfied the pc has said it without a lot of chatter about it.

TA NOT MOVING SIGNALS AUDITOR TO ACT.

TA MOVING SIGNALS AUDITOR NOT TO ACT.

Only the auditor can kill the TA motion. So when the TA starts to move, stop acting and start listening. When the TA stops moving or seems about to, stop listening and start acting again.

Only act when the TA is relatively motionless. And then act just enough to start it again.

Now if you can learn *just this*, as given here, to act when there's no TA and not act when there is TA, you can make your own start on getting good TA on your preclear.

With this you buy leisure to look over what's happening. With half a hundred rules and your own confusion to worry about also, you'll never get a beginning. So, to begin to get TA on your pc, first learn the trick of silent invitation. Just start the session and sit there expectantly. You'll get some TA.

When you've mastered this (and what a fight it is not to act, act, act and talk ten times as hard as the pc) then move to the next step.

Cover the primary sources of over-restimulation listed above by asking for solutions to them.

Learn to spot TA action when it occurs and note what the pc was saying just then. Co-ordinate these two facts—pc talking about something and TA moving. That's Assessment Levels I to III. Just that. You see the TA move and relate it to what the pc is saying just that moment. Now you know that if the pc talks about "Bugs" he gets TA action. Note that down on your report. BUT don't otherwise call it to pc's attention as pc is already getting TA on another subject. This pc *also* gets TA on Bugs. Store up 5 or ten of these odd bits, without doing anything to the pc but letting him talk about things.

Now a few sessions later, the pc will have told all concerning the prime source of over-restimulation I hope you were covering with him or her by only getting the pc started when he or she ran down. But you will now have a list of several other things that get TA. **THE HOTTEST TA PRODUCER ON THIS LIST WILL GET A PC'S GOAL AS IT IS HIS SERVICE FAC.** You can now get TA on this pc at will. All you have to do is get an Itsa going on one of these things.

ANY TA is the sole target of Levels I to III. It doesn't matter a continental what generates it. Only Level IV (R4 processes) are vital on what you get TA on (for if you're not accurate you will get *no* TA at Level IV).

From Levels I to III the pc's happiness or recovery depends only on that waving TA Arm. How much does it wave? That's how much the case advances. Only at Level IV do you care what it waves on.

You're as good an auditor in Levels I to III as you can get TA on the pc and that's all. And in Level IV you'll get only as much TA as you're dead on with the right goals and RIs in the right places and those you don't want lying there inert and undisturbed.

Your enemy is Over-Restimulation of the pc. As soon as the pc goes into more charge than he or she can Itsa easily the TA slows down! And as soon as the pc drowns in the over-restimulation the TA stops clank! Now your problem is correcting the case. And that's harder than just getting TA in the first place.

Yes, you say, but how do you *start* "getting in an Itsa Line?" "What is an Itsa?"

All right—small child comes in room. You say, "What's troubling you?" The child says, "I'm worried about Mummy and I can't get Daddy to talk to me and ...." NO TA.

This child is not saying anything is it. This child is saying, "Confusion, chaos, worry." No TA. The child is speaking in Opptersms.

Small child comes in room. You say, "What's in this room?" Child says, "You and couch and rug ...." That's Itsa. That's TA.

Only in R4 where you're dead on the pc's GPMs and the pc is allowed to say it is or isn't can you get TA good action out of listing and nulling. And even then a failure to let the pc say it is it can cut the TA down enormously.

Auditor says, “You’ve been getting TA movement whenever you mention houses.

In this lifetime what solutions have you had about houses?” And there’s the next two sessions all laid out with plenty of TA and nothing to do but record it and nod now and then.

### THE THEORY OF TONE ARM ACTION

TA motion is caused by the energy contained in confusions blowing off the case. The confusion is held in place by aberrated stable data.

The aberrated (non-factual) stable datum is there to hold back a confusion but in actual fact the confusion gathered there only because of an aberrated consideration or postulate in the first place. So when you get the pc to as-is these aberrated stable data, the confusion blows off and you get TA.

So long as the aberrated stable datum is in place the confusion (and its energy) won’t flow.

Ask for confusions (worries, problems, difficulties) and you just over-restimulate the pc because his attention is on the mass of energy, not the aberrated stable datum holding it in place.

Ask for the aberrated stable datum (considerations, postulates, even attempts or actions or any button) and the pc as-ises it, the confusion starts flowing off as energy (not as confusion), and you get TA.

Just restimulate old confusions without touching the actual stable data holding them back and the pc gets the mass but no release of it and so no TA.

The pc has to say, “It’s a “ (some consideration or postulate) to release the pent-up energy held back by it.

Thus an auditor’s worst fault that prevents TA is permitting the dwelling on confusions without getting the pc to give up with certainty the considerations and postulates that hold the confusions in place.

And that’s “Itsa”. It’s letting the pc say what’s there that was put there to hold back a confusion or problem.

If the pc is unwilling to talk to the auditor, that’s What to Itsa—”decisions you’ve made about auditors” for one example. If the pc can’t seem to be audited in that environment, get old environments Itsa’ed. If the pc has lots of PTPs at session start, get the pc’s solutions to similar problems in the past.

Or just Prepcheck, slow, the zone of upset or interest of the pc.

And you’ll get TA. *Lots* of it.

Unless you stop it.

There’s no reason at all why a truly expert auditor can’t get plenty of TA Divisions Down per 2 1/2 hour session running any old thing that crops up on a pc.

But a truly expert auditor isn’t trying to Itsa the pc. He’s trying to get the pc to Itsa. And that’s the difference.

Honest, it’s simpler than you think.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :gw.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 2 OCTOBER 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*URGENT*

**GPMs**

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCESS WITHDRAWN**

The Tape of September 24, 1963, R4MTA, has been withdrawn.

The process R4MTA has been canceled. Cases having a hard time do not get Blowdowns high in the bank. Rather they get a “disintegrating RR” on the Item. Listing by Blowdown can get the pc into other GPMs and skips RIs.

R3M2 is reinstated in full and exactly as R4M2.

List an Item list to the 1st RR, test the Item you’re listing from. If the RI you’re listing from doesn’t read, give the pc the new Item. If not, list to next RR.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.bh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
15 October—7 November 1963

** 6310C15	SHSBC-312	Essentials of Auditing
** 6310C16	SHSBC-313	The Itsa Maker Line
** 6310C17	SHSBC-314	Levels of Auditing
** 6310C21	SHSBC-315	Attack and GPMs
** 6310C22	SHSBC-316	The Integration of Auditing
** 6310C23	SHSBC-317	Auditing the GPM
** 6310C29	SHSBC-318	Routine 4
** 6310C30	SHSBC-319	R4 Case Assembly
** 6310C31	SHSBC-320	R4M2 Programming
** 6311C05	SHSBC-321	Three Zones of Auditing
** 6311C07	SHSBC-322	Relationship of Training to O.T.



Central Orgs  
Franchise

*SCIENTOLOGY I TO III*

**HOW TO GET TA  
ANALYSING AUDITING**

There are several distinct forms or styles of auditing. There was first the old finger snapping handling of engrams. Then there is Formal Auditing for which we still have TRs 0 to 4. Then there is Tone 40 Auditing, still used today in the CCHs. These are distinctively different styles and a good auditor can do one or another of them without mixing them up. Just as Tone 40 Auditing is still used, so is Formal Auditing—in fact Scientology 4 on the GPMs *must* be run ONLY with *Formal Auditing* and the old TRs and other training are still used to develop it in the student.

Now there has emerged a *new* Auditing style. It is Listen Style Auditing. And the first thing to learn about it is that it is a *new* style of Auditing and that it is distinctly different from Formal Auditing and Tone 40 Auditing. Naturally an auditor who can do this new style can also do other styles better, but the other styles are themselves and this new style is itself. Listen Style Auditing is peculiarly fitted to undercut formerly difficult cases at the lower levels of Scientology and to get the necessary TA action.

Listen Style Auditing has or is developing its own TRs. It has its own technology and this leaves the technology of other Auditing Styles still valid and untouched.

Some of the data of Listen Style Auditing is:

1. The definition of Auditor is one who listens.
2. The pc is always right.
3. The task of the Auditor is to get the pc to comm/and to Itsa.
4. The success of the session is measured solely by Tone Arm Action.
5. The style applies to Scientology Levels I to III.
6. As the level in which it is used is increased, the amount of Auditor direction of the pc's attention is increased. The gap becomes very wide in control between Level III and IV, so much so that only Formal Auditing is used for GPMs as this material is all sub-Itsas for the pc.

The basic crimes of Listen Style Auditing are:

1. Not getting Tone Arm Action on the pc;
2. Cutting the pc's comm;
3. Cutting, evaluating or invalidating the pc's Itsa;
4. Failing to invite Itsa by the pc;
5. Itsa-ing for the pc;
6. Not getting Tone Arm Action on the pc.

These are some of the major musts and crimes of Listen Style Auditing. While some of these also apply to Formal Auditing, to show you how different the new style is, if you tried to use only Listen Style Auditing on Scientology IV and failed to use Formal Auditing at that high level, the pc would soon be in a great big mess! So the style has its uses and exactions and it has its limitations.

Now, realizing it is a new style, not a whole change of Scientology, the older Auditor should study it as such and the new student—as mainly Listen Style will be taught in Academies—should spend some earnest time in learning to do it as itself. I have had to learn every new Auditing Style and sometimes have taken weeks to do it. I can still do them all, each as itself. It took me two weeks of hard daily grind to learn Tone 40 Auditing until I could do it with no misses. It's like learning different dances.

And when you can polka and also waltz, if you're good you don't break from a waltz into a polka without noticing the difference—or looking silly. So the second thing to learn well about Listen Style Auditing is that it has to be learned and practised as itself.

Listen Style Auditing is peculiarly fitted by its simplicity to analysis by an instructor or student or old-timer. The steps are:

1. Learn HCO Bulletin of October 1, 1963.
2. Muck along with what you learned a bit.
3. Tape a 1 hour session you give on a tape recorder.
4. Analyse the tape.

You'll be amazed at the amount of miss until you actually hear it back.

These are the points to look for:

1. Did the Auditor get a dirty needle (continual agitation, not a smooth flow up or down)? If so the Auditor cut the pc's comm. This is entirely different from cutting Itsa. Just how was the pc's comm cut? Listen to the tape. Whether the auditor got a DN or not, do this step. How many ways was the pc prevented from talking to the Auditor? Particularly how did the Auditor's actions cut the comm with Auditing or unnecessary action? How was the pc discouraged from talking? What was said that stopped the pc from talking?
2. Establish whether or not the auditor got good TA action by adding up the session's total down TA. See HCO Bulletin of September 25, 1963. If the Auditor did not get good TA action he or she either
  - (a) Cut pc's Itsa or
  - (b) Restimulated nothing for the pc to Itsa.

Which was it? The odds are heavily on (a). Listen to the tape and find out how the auditor reduced the pc's Itsa. Note that Itsa is entirely different than comm. Was the pc given anything to Itsa? Was the pc permitted to Itsa it? How much did the Auditor Itsa for the pc? Did the Auditor attempt to change the Itsas?

3. By various ways (by direct invitation, sounding doubtful, unconfident, challenging) an auditor can make a pc Whatsit. The amount a pc is made or allowed to Whatsit reduces TA action. How many ways did the Auditor make the pc Whatsit (give problems, confusions as answers or just plain put the pc into a questioning attitude)? How doubtful or worried did the Auditor sound? How much did the Auditor make the pc worry over TA action or other things (all of which add up to making the pc Whatsit, thus reducing Tone Arm Action)?
4. How much did the Auditor invite unwanted communication about confusions, problems by silence? How much did the Auditor prevent wanted communication by various actions?
5. What errors in the session are obvious to the Auditor? What errors are not real to the Auditor?
6. Does the Auditor have another rationale or explanation for not getting TA action or for what causes TA action? Does the Auditor consider there is another explanation for getting dirty needles?
7. Does the Auditor consider TA action unnecessary for session gains?
8. Does the pc in the taped session agree with the faults discovered? (May be omitted.)

Such a tape should be made periodically on an Auditor until that Auditor can get 35 Divisions of TA at any level from I to III on any pc.

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 OCTOBER AD13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

### R3SC SLOW ASSESSMENT

Ian Tampion of the Melbourne Org, just completing the SHSBC, reports on Itsa and Slow Assessment.

Dear Ron,

Over the past couple of weeks I have had some good wins auditing pcs on R3SC Slow Assessment so I thought I'd write out what I've learned about it from your lectures, bulletins, Mary Sue's talks and D of P instructions and from my experience in Auditing. My only doubt about what I've done is that I may have been combining R1C (Itsa Line) with R3SC but anyway it worked so if I've got my data straight you may like to pass it on to other auditors. Here it is:

*Aim:* To keep the pc talking (Itsa-ing) about his present time environment, getting as much TA action as possible, for as long as possible without finding and running a "glum area" that makes the TA rise.


To do this an Auditor should be aware of, and able to use the following definitions:

*Pc "Itsa-ing":* Pc saying what *is*, what is there, who is there, where it is, what it looks like, ideas about, decisions about, solutions to, things in his environment. The pc talking continuously about problems or puzzlements or wondering about things in his environment is *not* "Itsaing".

*Present Time Environment:* The whole area covering the pc's life and livingness over a definite period. It may be the last day, the last week, the last year, depending on the pc.

*A Glum Area:* That area which when the pc is supposedly "Itsa-ing" about it, makes him glum and the TA rise, indicating that a Service Facsimile is doing the confronting on that area and not the pc.

The following diagram and the explanation below illustrate just what is taking place in a Slow Assessment and how the definitions given above apply.



While the pc is talking about football he can say Itsa game, Itsa played by two teams, Itsa played on a field, etc, etc, etc. The same applies to the areas TV, Work, Wife, Club, Garden, House and Mountains. All this will give nice TA action and good gains for the pc.

Now, when he starts talking about cars he will say, “I often have punctures,” “I wonder why my car will only do 100 mph,” etc, etc. While he’s talking like this there will be no TA action or a rising TA and if the auditor lets the pc continue, he will get steadily worse. So, the auditor must put in an Itsa line—e.g. “What have you done about this?” and the TA will start moving again and the pc will get brighter as *now* he is “Its-ing”, before he wasn’t.

Later, or earlier, the pc will start talking about Taxes, his problems, worries, puzzlements, wonders about Taxes—the TA will rise and the pc will become glum. Then, even though the auditor puts in an Itsa line as with the subject of cars, the TA continues to rise and the pc remains glum. This is because the pc can’t Itsa this area—he’s “got it all made”—“IGNORE THEM” and this does all his confronting for him. In other words, the Service Fac is a substitute confront and so the TA rises (Note the old rule about rising needle equals no confront! ). This is a glum area so the auditor lists “In this lifetime what would be a safe solution regarding Taxes?”, completes the list, nulls it, gets the Service Fac “Ignore them”, runs it on R3SC and soon the pc will be able to Itsa on the subject of Taxes. This area could be found in the first 5 minutes in which case it may be possible to just note it down and get the pc on to areas he can confront and come back to this one later.

The assessment should go on for hours and hours and hours with excellent TA action and the pc gaining in his ability to Itsa all the time. However it won’t go that way if the auditor doesn’t get the pc to really Itsa what is in his environment, e.g. the auditor shouldn’t be content to have the pc say he lives “out in the suburbs”, he wants the address, its distance from the city, the type of house, how many rooms, what the street looks like, the names of the houses, occupants, who the neighbours are, etc, etc, etc. Itsa! Itsa! Itsa! Also, it won’t go that way if the auditor tries to list safe solutions every time the pc starts talking about his problems in an area as in the example given above with the car. Problems are *not* Itsa.

Itsa! Itsa! Itsa! Equals TA action! TA action! TA action! Equals Pc better! Pc better! Pc better! Good gains! !

I hope you find this all okay and pass it on Ron as it’s sure a doll of an auditing activity.

Very best,

Ian Tampion

P.S. I found out how most of this goes in auditing by making mistakes first so I learnt the hard way.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 NOVEMBER AD13

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**ROUTINE 3**  
**R-3 MODEL SESSION REVISED**

(Amended from HCO B of May 21, AD13)

Here is the new Routine 3 Model Session as outlined in HCO Bulletin May 13, AD13. All other Model Sessions are canceled herewith. This form is to be used in all auditing in the future.

**SESSION PRELIMINARIES**

All auditing sessions have the following preliminaries done in this order.

1. Seat the pc and adjust his or her chair.
2. Clear the Auditing room with "Is it all right to audit in this room?" (not metered).
3. Can squeeze "Squeeze the cans, please." And note that pc registers, by the squeeze, on the meter, and note the level of the pc's havingness. (Don't run hav here.)
4. Put in R Factor by telling pc briefly what you are going to do in the session.

**START OF SESSION:**

5. "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"

"START OF SESSION." (Tone 40)

"Has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No," say again, "START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No," say, "We will cover it in a moment."

**RUDIMENTS:**

6. "What goals would you like to set for this session?"

Please note that Life or Livingness goals have been omitted, as they tend to remind the pc of present time difficulties and tend to take his attention out of the session.

7. At this point in the session there are actions which could be undertaken: the running of General O/W or the running of Mid Rudiments using "Since the last time I audited you", or pull missed W/Hs as indicated. But if pc cheerful and needle smooth, just get down to work.

One would run General O/W if the pc was emotionally upset at the beginning of the session or if the session did not start for the pc, the latter being simply another indication of the pc's being upset or ARC broken, but these symptoms must be present, as sometimes the session hasn't started merely because of poor Tone 40 or because the pc had something he wanted to say before the auditor started the session.

### *RUNNING O/W:*

“If it is all right with you, I am going to run a short, general process. The process is: ‘What have you done?’, ‘What have you withheld?’ “ (The process is run very permissively until the needle looks smooth and the pc is no longer emotionally disturbed.)

“Where are you now on the time track?”

“If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process.” (After each command, ask, “When?”)

“That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?”

“End of process.”

### *RUNNING THE MID RUDIMENTS:*

One would use the Middle Rudiments with, “Since the last time I audited you”, if the needle was rough and if the Tone Arm was in a higher position than it was at the end of the last session.

#### ORDER OF BUTTONS

Here is the correct wording and order of use for the big Mid Ruds.

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suppressed?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been careful of?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have failed to reveal?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been invalidated?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suggested?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has any mistake been made?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been anxious about?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been protested?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been decided?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been asserted?”

In using the first three buttons (Suppressed, Careful of and Failed to Reveal), the rudiment question should be asked directly of the pc off the meter (repetitive). When the pc has no more answers, check the question on the meter. If the question reads, stick with it on the meter like in Fast Rud checking until it is clean.

The last six buttons are cleaned directly on the meter as in Fast Ruds.

### *PULLING MISSED WITHHOLDS:*

Use: “Since the last time you were audited has a withhold been missed on you?”

“Since the last time you were audited is there anything someone failed to find out about you?”

“Since the last time you were audited has someone nearly found out something about you?”

### *BODY OF SESSION:*

8. Now go into the body of the session.

*END BODY OF SESSION:*

9. "Is it all right with you if we end the body of the session now?" "Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I do so?" "End of the body of the session."

*SMOOTH OUT SESSION:*

10. Smooth out any roughness in the session if there has been any, favouring Suppress, Failed to Reveal, Protest, Decide, Overts, Assert, using prefix "In this session .....?"

*GOALS & GAINS:*

11. "Have you made any of these goals for this session?" "Thank you for making these goals," or "Thank you for making some of these goals, I'm sorry you didn't make all of them," or "I'm sorry you didn't make these goals."

"Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?"  
"Thank you for these gains," or "I'm sorry you didn't make any gains."

*HAVINGNESS:*

12. (After adjusting the meter) "Please squeeze the cans." (If the squeeze test was not all right, the Auditor would run the pc's Havingness process until the can squeeze gives an adequate response.)

*ENDING SESSION:*

13. "Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?"
14. "Is it all right with you if I end this session now?"
15. "END OF SESSION (Tone 40). Has this session ended for you?" (If the pc says, "No," repeat, "END OF SESSION." If the session still has not ended, say, "You will be getting more auditing. END OF SESSION.") "Tell me I am no longer auditing you."

Please note that Havingness is run after Goals and Gains as this tends to bring the pc more into present time and to take his attention to a degree out of the session.

Wording for the above follows the tradition of earlier model sessions.

Adhere severely to this session form. It is nearly an irreducible minimum and is very fast, but it is all necessary.

The Random Rudiment here is "What happened?"

Session Mid Ruds are simply "Protest, Assert and Decide".

RI rudiments are "Suppress and Invalidate".

ARC Break handling is in accordance with HCO Bulletin of March 14, 1963. Don't continue a session until you find out why the ARC Break.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Central Orgs  
Franchise

## DIRTY NEEDLES

If your pc has a *dirty needle*, its cause is CUT ITSA or an L1 *session* ARC Break.

*NO* other source such as a wrong Item or goal or earlier engrams or service fac by-passed charge can cause a dirty needle.

If it's a dirty needle its cause lies in basic auditing not in technique errors.

This rule is invariable. The *apparent* exception is the session ARC Break that keys in by-passed technique charge.

Example: PC has a wrong goal. Session ARC Break caused by cleaning a clean on the meter. This keys in wrong goal. Auditor does an L4 ARC Break Assessment over a dirty needle, finds "wrong goal". PC brightens up a bit. Auditor thinks he has found all the by-passed charge but actually continues session with a somewhat gloomy pc whose needle occasionally gets dirty. The *session* ARC Break was left in place. This makes the auditor think a wrong goal can cause a dirty needle. The heavy charge keyed in (and that had to be gotten fast) was the wrong goal. But the *session* (II. ) ARC Break caused the dirty needle.

An auditor whose Basic Auditing is poor (who Qs and As, cuts Itsa, invalidates or evaluates, or who misses meter reads on rudiments or prepchecks or cleans cleans or misses withholds) can be spotted by his pc's dirty needle. It's an invariable sign.

*If the pc has a dirty needle the Basic Auditing of the auditor is bad.*

That auditor ought to put one of his sessions on tape and listen to it and analyze it as per the earlier HCO Bulletin.

Oddly enough, an auditor could run perfect technique on goals and yet be so poor in basic auditing that the pc is always ARC Breaking. This would be spotted by the pc's chronically dirty needle.

You may see a dirty *read* on a pc while listing something or assessing. This means nothing as long as it is a dirty *read*. A dirty needle, of course, jitters all the time.

By their pcs' needles you can know them.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :dr.cden  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



HCO BULLETIN OF 26 NOVEMBER 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*ALL LEVELS*

*STAR RATING*

**A NEW TRIANGLE  
BASIC AUDITING, TECHNIQUE,  
CASE ANALYSIS**

All processing can be broken down into three separate parts for any level of auditing.

These three parts are: (1) BASIC AUDITING (2) TECHNIQUE and (3) CASE ANALYSIS.

**BASIC AUDITING**

The handling of the pc as a being, the auditing cycle, the meter, comprise the segment of processing known as Basic Auditing.

If an auditor cannot handle this segment or any part of it well, trouble will develop in the other two segments (technique and case analysis). When technique and case analysis seem to fail “even when done by the book” the fault commonly lies in Basic Auditing. One or more of the five faults elsewhere listed will be present and these faults effectively prevent *any* technique or case analysis from working.

Where Scientology “isn’t working”, the wrong first places to look are technique and case analysis. The right place to look is Basic Auditing.

Until an auditor can handle a pc in session easily, handle a meter smoothly and accurately and is flawless in his auditing cycle, he or she should have no hope of making *any* technique work or of analyzing any case for anything.

In smooth Basic Auditing lies the open sesame to all cases, for only then do technique and case analysis function. The gun barrel is Basic Auditing. Technique and Case Analysis form the Ammunition and sight. A poor basic auditor using a fine technique is firing ammunition with no gun. It doesn’t go anywhere.

There is a level of Basic Auditing for every level of Scientology. At the lowest level it is only the ability to sit and listen. It grows in complexity from there up to the fabulous co-ordination of pc, auditing cycle and meter so flawless that neither auditor nor pc are aware of the presence of Basic Auditing at all, but only the actions of the technique and the guidance of case analysis. And between those two practices of Basic Auditing lie many gradients.

Basic Auditing is the rock on which all gains are built.

**TECHNIQUE**

The techniques of Scientology are many, spread out over 13 years of development.

A technique is a process or some action that is done by auditor and pc under the auditor's direction.

The lowest technique is the single co-audit question given by the supervisor to let the pc Itsa. The highest is the complex listing of goals and GPMs.

A technique is a patterned action, invariable and unchanging, composed of certain steps or actions calculated to bring about tone arm action and thus better or free a thetan.

There have been thousands of techniques. Less than a hundred, at a guess, are in common recommended use for the various levels of auditing.

Techniques have their place in various levels of auditing today rather than various differences of case.

As cases may be audited only at the level in which they are trained, by modern ruling, and as several techniques exist at each level for choice out of Case Analysis, it will be found quite simple to select a technique and get results with it. Safe auditing and good sense dictate such selection and classing of techniques, and trouble only results when someone sells himself out of his level to a high fast flounder.

Techniques exist in tables and texts for the various levels and it will be found that these give the best case results applied in that way.

## CASE ANALYSIS

Case Analysis establishes two things (a) What is going on with the case and (b) What should be done with it.

Case Analysis is a new subject to auditors at this time. It is commonly confused with techniques and the gravest fault is treating Case Analysis as only another assessment technique.

There is a level of Case Analysis for every level or class, to compare with the Basic Auditing and Technique of that class.

My first development in this new segment of processing was Programming. This is the consecutive techniques or actions a case should have to get adequate Tone Arm action and achieve a new plateau of ability.

But Case Analysis itself has steps like (a) and (b) above.

There is also an invariable sequence of application in a more advanced Case Analysis. These steps should be very, very well known by a trained auditor since all Case Analysis fits into them:

1. Discover what the pc is "sitting in".
2. Have the pc detail what assumptions and considerations he or she has had about it; and
3. Identify it fully and correctly.

The "it" above can be as slight as a worry, as bothersome as a Present Time Problem or as overwhelming as a Goals Problem Mass. Whatever "it" is the Case Analysis steps would be the same.

In the first step the survey may be very brief. It should certainly have certainty in it for the pc. It can be very general. It can be a part of a case or a geographical location. The pc could be clear or insane. The sequence or the 3 steps would be the same.

The next step (2) gets the lies off, giving TA action and thus clearing away charge for a more accurate assault in (3). This second step can be very lengthy as in Level Two or very brief as in OT auditing techniques. But it must exist whether short or long. Otherwise the analysis is heavily hindered by the lies and these will read on the meter and upset the analysis or they will cloud the pc's perception on which all Itsa depends. So the lies must come off in *any* Case Analysis. Usually this is quite permissive and gently done. But it can amount to also pulling missed withholds. It all depends on the level on which the analysis is being done and what is being analyzed. This step (2) becomes itself a technique at lower levels. It is just a spatter and promise at high level auditing.

The third step can be long or short but must always be there. Here, with the charge gone in (2), the auditor and pc can now identify the thing much better and the pc can have a final certainty on it. Usually at lower levels, the certainty is only that it is *gone*. The familiar "How do you feel about that problem now?" "What problem?" is a lower level result of Case Analysis. At the highest level, "On checking the meter, I find that is a wrong Item" would be the auditor's final (3) statement.

So Case Analysis at any level has as its action establishing what the pc is in, what it has been supposed to be and what it now is (or isn't).

Anything from a habit to a headache could be analyzed in this way. At the lowest levels it could occupy an intensive, at the highest levels five minutes.

ARC Break handling has been the most familiar tool of Case Analysis.

Case Analysis handles the momentary or prolonged problem, determines the technique to be used, and is always done with Basic Auditing.

An auditor has three hats. One is his Basic Auditor's hat. This he never takes off. The other two are his Technique hat and his Case Analysis hat and these he switches back and forth at need.

These are the three segments. Put together well, they make successful auditing.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :dr.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

26 November—12 December 1963

** 6311C26	SHSBC-323	R4 Auditing
** 6311C27	SHSBC-330	TVD-25, Auditing Demo and Comments by LRH
** 6311C28	SHSBC-324	Seven Classifications
** 6312C03	SHSBC-325	Certifications and Classifications
** 6312C04	SHSBC-326	TVD-24, Basic Auditing
** 6312C05	SHSBC-327	Basic Auditing
** 6312C10	SHSBC-328	Scientology 0
** 6312C12	SHSBC-329	Summary of O.T. Processes

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 DECEMBER 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**CASE ANALYSIS**  
**HEALTH RESEARCH**

I recently indicated that I was doing some research into alleviation of physical difficulties, not because we are in healing but because the AMA should be taught a lesson for attacking us.

The research took a sudden optimistic turn with the new subject of Case Analysis, HCO Bulletin of November 26, 1963. While Case Analysis is not used for healing purposes, it can be varied at very low levels to produce some astonishing results in health.

The steps for Case Analysis are (1) Discover what the pc is sitting in, (2) Get the lies off, (3) Locate and indicate the charge. In (1) the pc is sitting in whatever the pc says he or she is sitting in, i.e. "I don't know" means pc is sitting in a puzzle and is used with steps (2) and (3) by finding what he has supposed and then with the Itsa handled, establishing the truth of it.

The following example severely follows the (1), (2) and (3) steps of Case Analysis without seeming to and without the pc having a clue about either Case Analysis or Scientology for that matter. This was done by a DScn using the new fundamentals of Case Analysis as an independent action to help someone, and very cleverly done it was. I asked the auditor to write it up for you.

"Dear Ron,

"An account of an assist which I gave recently.

"The pc, aged 17 years, was completely new to Scientology: he was suffering from chronic bronchitis, which was currently particularly worrying to him as he had just been given a serious warning by his doctor that this could become TB.

"I used the case-analysis assist, first establishing he was 'sitting in' chest trouble, then getting him to tell me all he could about the condition, then I asked (after the TA had slowed down) what he considered was the cause of the trouble, i.e. getting the untruth off, and he said, 'Well, I think it is caused by the climate'—this was accompanied by a big TA blowdown; no further considerations were forthcoming and no more TA action, so I then asked if this condition 'had anything to do with something that he himself had wanted to do' (i.e. an ACTUAL GPM)—no BD, so then asked did it have any connection with 'something that someone else had tried to make him do' (i.e. IMPLANT GPM), no BD, so then asked if this was connected with someone or something he had ever known (RIs). This produced a big BD and pc spoke of his grandfather's death: a further BD when I enquired if his grandfather had died of some chest trouble. Then I asked if any other person or incident was connected to his chest trouble: big BD on 'Nearly drowned in a swimming pool just before grandfather died.' I let him ITSA on both these incidents until TA slowed down, then indicated to him that the trouble was connected to grandfather's death AND the near-drowning incident—this gave a further BD.

“In all this assist (in model session) took 34 minutes and made 7 divisions of TA BD: pc made his goal ‘To get to the cause of the trouble’, and the Gain: ‘It’s got me deeply interested in the work.’ Pc has virtually lost his cough and has applied for a staff appointment at HCO WW. This pc had never heard of Scientology prior to about one week before the assist.

Best,  
(Auditor)”

Note: 12 days after this auditing the coughing was still in abeyance.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 DECEMBER 1963

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*ROUTINE VI*

**INDICATORS**

**PART ONE: GOOD INDICATORS**

Note: No Auditor at this date is qualified to run actual GPMs regardless of any former training. The successful technology has not been fully released. There are *no* Class VI Auditors. If you were trained, run only Implant GPMs, the technology for which has been fully released.

An INDICATOR is a condition or circumstance arising in an R VI Auditing Session which Indicates whether the session is running well or badly, and if badly what action the Auditor should at once take.

There are good indicators and bad indicators, but all of them are indicators.

The good indicators mean that the session is progressing properly and that the next routine action should be undertaken. Good indicators abound in a properly run session. Here are some GOOD INDICATORS:

PC cheerful.  
PC cognizing on Items or Goals.  
PC's Items found are the ones the pc thought they were on the list.  
PC listing Items briefly and accurately.  
Early Items on list turning out to be the right ones.  
The right item reading on the needle with a chug as though through a resistive wall and then heavily falling with Blowdown.  
Items found not rocket reading.  
Goals found rocket reading.  
Short Item lists (1 to 15 or 20 items on the list).  
Items being found rapidly without a lot of hassle even though the right item hard to make read.  
Tone Arm continuing in motion.  
Not stuck (symptom of wrong goal or by-passed GPMs or RIs).  
Needle active.  
Not stuck (symptom of RR gone off which means wrong goal or wrongly worded goal). PC not troubled with new mass appearing when item is given.  
RI given pc blowing tone arm down when pc asked if it is it.  
Further blowdown of TA with full dial needle slash when pc told it is his or her item.  
Distinct needle slash, two inches or so, when pc asked if new item solves or is solved by RI found just before.  
Full dial slash of needle when pc answers question as to what is the position of the newly found Item in the bank.  
Heat on the Item list.  
Heat on the goals list.  
Heat on the RI found.  
No pain on RI found.  
Tone Arm riding between 2.5 and 3.75 (acceptable) or 2.25 and 3. (excellent).  
Good Tone Arm Action on finding Items (about 125 TA Divisions per GPM in fast running). (About 30 or 40 TA Divisions down per 2 1/2 hour session, minimum.)  
The right item reading with only some coaxing.

PC with no PTP about which really went where concerning goals or RIs found in earlier session.  
 PC with no question as to what was the right goal or item after it is found.  
 PC not critical or ARC Breaky.  
 PC not protesting Auditor's actions.  
 PC looking younger by reason of R VI Auditing.  
 PC without weariness.  
 PC without pains or aches or illnesses developing during auditing.  
 PC wanting more Auditing.  
 PC's confidence in finding goals and items getting progressively better.  
 PC's Itsa free but not so extensive as to halt session progress, giving no more than 30 seconds or a minute, usually less, to Itsaing a goal or item.  
 Auditor seeing how goals oppose goals. Auditor seeing how RIs solve RIs or are solved by them.  
 The goals plot making sense to the Auditor.  
 The Line Plot looking proper, with correct gradients, to the Auditor.  
 No vast mental effort demanded of the Auditor to follow pc's logic in why something opposes something or solves something.  
 PC not developing heavy PTPs or somatics between sessions or in session.

-----

The good indicator tells you things look the way they ought to look and are going the way they *have* to go to make an OT.

When these good indicators are absent *then* is the time to start doing searches, repairs etc.

In actual practice you get so used to good indicators that you don't really think of them as indicators at all. Therefore you keep your attention alert for bad indicators and when these show up you *have* to act and promptly.

Like many other things in this universe you don't concentrate on the smooth, you stay alert for the rough.

But it is a great mistake for an Auditor to be so nervous about bad indicators that the pc is thrown into a Whatsit when nothing is wrong. Things will go wrong *then* for sure.

The rule is: Expect good indicators and go on with routine actions as long as they are present. Observe quickly and knowingly bad indicators and rapidly act with the correct response.

Every bad indicator is precise, easily observed and has an exact counter-action.

The speed with which a bad indicator is observed and the certainty with which it is corrected prevents the session from producing *more* bad indicators.

Observe the trouble sign instantly. Know what to do for that exact sign instinctively. Repair swiftly. And in these points we have the whole secret of fast progress.

It is not the pc who slows the session. It is the Auditor's lack of knowledge of bad indicators and their remedies. The longer a bad indicator goes unobserved and unrepaired the longer it will take to repair it. In R VI errors consume time far, far out of proportion to successes. One overlooked bad indicator can consume a month of auditing time. In that month three whole banks would have been run. But no. The month is consumed with unproductive wanderings, the pc and auditor torn to bits with stress and ARC Breaks.

It's all a matter of indicators and knowing what to do. If that knowledge is poor, then—well, no OT, that's all. The road is traveled with total correctness only. It is never traveled at all when unremedied bad indicators are present. The auditor is either totally competent or totally incompetent. There are no shades of grey. One error unremedied puts the whole project on the dump heap.

So the auditor has to know his business. And so does the pc. And errors can't be let go by. This is the Routine of Perfection. Sloppy, hope it will get by, well it doesn't matter attitudes will not make OTs.

Any error passed up and neglected will within minutes or sessions wreck the lot. Miss a GPM or half a dozen Items and within two banks the pc will bog completely and hopelessly and *never* progress further until the earlier error is remedied.

It's like having a pc on rubber bands. The pc will go down the track from an error just so far and then, as though the bands tighten to drag him back, will run slower and slower and then suddenly one is faced with a pc who can't run at all!

But these errors are *not* undetectable. The instant they occur a bad indicator shows up. The speed errors are remedied determines the speed of advance of the case.

The don't-care, hope-it-will-get-by, why-repair auditor just *can't* audit R VI and will only seriously mess up pcs. This is the condition of the final road out. I wish it were different but it isn't. It's that way.

An auditor *can* know his business.

There is a finite, specific answer for every bad indicator that shows up. Therefore an auditor, to succeed in R VI must:

1. Know Basic Auditing and meters and Itsa like an old smoothie;
2. Know the anatomy of GPMs, RIs, and the objects of the mind and all their possible combinations like a card sharp knows cards;
3. Know the techniques of R VI like a completely relaxed one-man band;
4. Know all good indicators at a glance;
5. Know every bad indicator and its response with a bang-bang, one-two certainty that never permits a moment's wonder as to what's going on or what to do.
6. Know the rules of R VI rat-a-tat-tat.

Given those six things, an auditor can make an OT in under a thousand hours. A weakness on any one of them will not only not make an OT but will fiendishly mess up a case. For even if you know R VI cold you will make enough mistakes to keep you very busy.

The pity of it is that one must become an expert before he or she performs on an actual case. But that must be overcome. I learned it from scratch. So can you with all the data now neat before us.

LRH: dr.bh  
Copyright © 1963  
by L. Ron Hubbard.  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6312C31	SHSBC-1	Indicators
** 6401C07	SHSBC-2	Good Indicators (Lower Levels)
** 6401C09	SHSBC-3	Bad Indicators



## SAINT HILL STAFF COURSE LECTURES

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
30 December 1963—1 June 1964

6312C30	SH SC-1A	Summary of R6, Part 1
6312C30	SH SC-1 B	Summary of R6, Part 2
6312C31	SH SC-2&3	Objects of the Mind
6401 C01	SH SC-4	R6 Indicators
6401C16	SH SC-5A	On R6, Part 1
6401C16	LECTURE	To Instructors on Routine 6 (could be same tape as above)
6401C16	SH SC-5B	On R6, Part 2
6401C20	SH SC-6A	R6 Line Plots and Admin, Part 1
6401C20	SH SC-6B	R6 Line Plots and Admin, Part 2
6401 C21	SH SC-7A	R6 Case Analysis, Part 1
6401C21	SH SC-7B	R6 Case Analysis, Part 2
6402C05	SH SC-8A	The Pattern of the Bank (film), Part 1
6402C05	SH SC-8B	The Pattern of the Bank (film), Part 2
6402C06	SH SC-9	R6 on Items and Goals
6402C11	SH SC-10	Bad Indicators
6402C13	SH SC-1 1A	Goals, Part 1
6402C13	SH SC-11 B	Goals, Part 2
6402C17	SH SC-12A	Goals Listing and Plotting, Part 1
6402C17	SH SC-12B	Goals Listing and Plotting, Part 2
6402C18	SH SC-13A	Technical Rules and Bad Indicators, Part 1
6402C18	SH SC-13B	Technical Rules and Bad Indicators, Part 2
6402C19	SH SC-14A	GPM Series and Examination Review, Part 1
6402C19	SH SC-14B	GPM Series and Examination Review, Part 2
6402C20	SH SC-15	Goals Finding and Plotting
6402C24	SH SC-16	Q & A on R6
6402C25	SH SC-17A	The Goals Pattern, Part 1
6402C25	SH SC-17B	The Goals Pattern, Part 2
6406C01	SH SC-18	The Line Plot—Goals Plot—Series Plot

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JANUARY 1964

Central Orgs  
Franchise

**METER LEVEL WARNING**  
**HOW TO KILL A PC IN LEVEL 5**

**Breath and Body Motion**  
(All levels)

Body Motion, sudden expulsions of breath, emphatic gestures, shouts and foot squirmings and anger can make the TA move down and can cause surges that can be mistaken for reads, even rocket reads. Not knowing this can falsify an assessment or leave the bank undischarged.

In all assessing or meter running make sure it was the *Bank* the meter read, not Breath or Body Motion.

\* \* \* \* \*

**How to Kill a Pc in Level 5**  
(taken from LRH instruction to students  
on Saint Hill Special Briefing Course)

What's all the shouting on Items in "R3N"? Items won't read unless pc quietly *random lists*. I think you've forgotten in written random listing as how to make RRs appear on the Implant RIs. Get a random list of a few the *pc* thinks of. Then the Implant RI will read easily with no shout.

This datum gets lost every few months. Keep it around.

Pc's sudden expulsion of breath can cause an RR too. Maybe you're getting no charge off.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:vm.bh  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
4—9 February 1964

** 6402C04	SHSBC-4	Auditor Self-criticism
** 6402C06	SHSBC-5	Comm Cycle in Auditing
6402C09	SH DEMO	Auditing Session

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 JANUARY 1964

Sthil

HCO (Sthil) LTD

**CASE SUPERVISOR**

The post of Auditing Supervisor is abolished since all instructors are doing auditing supervision as a training measure.

The missing action is that of Case Supervisor.

The Auditing Supervision done by all instructors quite rightly concentrates on student skill in auditing.

A Case Supervisor is needed, therefore, whose sole interest and concern is the advance of cases on the Saint Hill Briefing Course by any and various means.

The Case Supervisor will be instructed and supervised by the Course Supervisor in the marking of folders and handling various cases and will take over the full handling of case folders as soon as feasible.

All problems having to do with the individual cases of students, any and all auditing assignments and all individual case problems are to be routed to the Case Supervisor.

In all questions of what is to be run on a student, regardless of his situation in training, the word of the Case Supervisor, under the Supervision of the Course Supervisor, is final.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Executive Director  
HCO (Saint Hill) Ltd

LRH :dr.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This is excerpted from HCO Policy Letter of 24 January 1964, *Case Supervisor*, a full copy of which can be found in OEC Volume 4, page 435.]

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE**  
25 February 1964

\*\* 6402C25      SHSBC-6      What Auditing Is and What It Isn't

### 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 (1/8"). Asks if it's the correctly worded goal. Gets a tick (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 2 1/2 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  
Copyright ©1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 MARCH 1964

Central Orgs

Franchise Sthil students

**CLASS II MODEL SESSION**

(Amends and cancels HCO Bulletin of June 23, 1962.)

The Class II Model Session has the benefit of requiring no other Rudiments process (except in the Havingness Questions) than the question itself. There are, therefore, no additional processes except Havingness.

Beware of *any* Q and A in using this script (HCO Bulletin May 24, 1962 [1] ).

Don't stray off Model Session into unusual questions or processes. Use Model Session as the surround for processes to be run on the pc. Don't use it as a process.

Questions are asked of the pc and not checked on the needle. Auditor watches meter and records TA.

**SESSION PRELIMINARIES**

All auditing sessions have the following preliminaries done in this order.

1. Seat the pc and adjust his or her chair.
2. Clear the Auditing room with "Is it all right to audit in this room?" (not metered).
3. Can squeeze "Put your hands in your lap." "Squeeze the cans, please." And note that pc registers on the meter by the squeeze read on the meter, and note the level of the pc's havingness. (Don't run hav here.)
4. Put in R Factor by telling pc briefly what you are going to do in the session. (What you intend to run.)

**START OF SESSION:**

Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

START OF SESSION.

Has this session started for you? (If pc says, No, say again, START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you? If pc says, No, say, We will cover it in the rudiments. )

**BEGINNING RUDIMENTS:**

*GLL.* What goals would you like to set for this session?

*O/W.* One would run General O/W if the pc was emotionally upset at the beginning of the session or if the session did not start for the pc, the latter being simply another indication of the pc's being upset or ARC broken, but these symptoms must be present, as sometimes the session hasn't started merely because of poor Tone 40 or because the pc had something he wanted to say before the auditor started the session.

**RUNNING O/W:**

If it is all right with you, I am going to run a short, general process. The process is: "What have you done?", "What have you withheld?" (The process is run very permissively until the needle looks smooth and the pc is no longer emotionally disturbed. )

Where are you now on the time track?

If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process. (After each command, ask, "When?")

That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?

End of process.

*Aud:* Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?

*W/h.* Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? (If pc says, Yes) What was it?

*PTP.* Do you have a present time problem? What is the problem?

### **START OF PROCESS:**

Now I would like to run this process on you (name it). What would you say to that? (Get pc's agreement, if not obtainable, choose another process unless old process is not complete.)

### **MIDDLE RUDIMENTS:**

In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal, or been careful of? What was it?

### **END RUDIMENTS:**

*1/2\_Un T:* In this session, have you told me any half-truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me, or tried to damage anyone? What was it?

*? or C:* In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command? What question or command did you fail to answer?

*Dec:* In this session, is there anything you have decided? What was it?

*W/h:* In this session, have you thought, said, or done anything I have failed to find out? What was it?

*Aud:* In this session, has anything been misunderstood? What was it?

### **GOALS & GAINS:**

Have you made any of these goals for this session? "Thank you for making these goals" or "Thank you for making some of these goals, I'm sorry you didn't make all of them" or "I'm sorry you didn't make these goals."

Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention? "Thank you for these gains" or "I'm sorry you didn't make any gains."

*Env:* In this session, was the room all right? (If question reacts or can squeeze denotes down havingness, run hav.)

### **END OF SESSION:**

Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?

Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

END OF SESSION: Has this session ended for you? (If pc says, No, repeat,

END OF SESSION. If session still not ended, say, "The session has been ended.")

### **END OF PROCESS NON-CYCLICAL:**

If it is all right with you, I will give this command two more times and then end this process. (Gives command two more times.)

Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process? End of process.

### **END OF PROCESS CYCLICAL:**

Where are you now on the time track?

If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process. (After each command ask, "When?")

That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?

End of process.

Most flagrant errors that can be made:

1. Fumbling with script, not knowing Model Session.
2. Failing to get in the R Factor by telling pc what you are going to do at each new step.
3. Doing only what the pc suggests.
4. Adding unusual questions or remarks or making sudden irrelevant statements.
5. Using parts of Model Session as repetitive processes which deter the completion of auditing cycles already begun.
6. Failure to complete the Auditing Comm Cycle on any part of Model Session.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 MARCH 1964

Class VI  
Central Orgs

*SCIENTOLOGY VI*

**OVERWHELMING THE PC**

Since there is so much charge available in actual GPMs (several thousand times the charge in any other process) the auditor must be *very* smooth. He or she must *not* overwhelm the pc.

If the pc is overwhelmed, these immediate consequences occur:

1. Pc will not cognite;
2. Pc's judgment will vanish;
3. Meter will read on anything with long protest surges;
4. Charge will transfer to other goals or items, making them read;
5. Pc may ARC Break;
6. Pc may go into Sad Effect;
7. Pc may go below ARC Break into propitiation with consequent no co-operation but *apparently* OK.

EXAMPLES OF OVERWHELM

Violations of the auditing cycle can bring about overwhelm:

Auditor: Is that your item? (Pc comm lags, auditor doesn't wait it out.) Well, is it your item? (Pc still comm lags. Auditor gets very impatient. )  
Well, that's your item!

Any part of this can overwhelm the pc. *Always* wait out the comm lag.

The pc is under the pressure of charge. He is slow. The auditor not in that charge can think faster. Therefore the auditor fails to see why the pc is taking time.

Auditing sessions *look* like just two people are sitting there. An unschooled auditor fails to realize he is looking at a pc who is miles away and deep in. The pc is in the room isn't he? Therefore the auditor assumes, as in any social conversation, the pc is there. Well, the pc isn't. The pc is buried under charge. Charge slows down responses.

When you pile charge up on the pc (a slightly misworded item or two) the pc ceases to be capable of clear thought and will reject even right items.

The auditor sees this, gets impatient, starts to overwhelm by informing the pc. The correct step is to do some Case Analysis and get the charge lessened. *Then* the pc can think.

Example: Auditor sees clearly how blah brings about blah. Pc doesn't. Auditor's wrong action is to explain it. Correct action is for auditor to get charge on pc lessened by Case Analysis.

The pc's judgment is the finest asset the auditor has in a session. By overwhelm, contradiction, small breaks of the auditing comm cycle, echo metering, *charge is added to pc's case*.

*Charge becomes no cognite.*



No cognite adds more charge by failing to as-is by pc understanding.

No cognite soon becomes overwhelm.

The less a pc cognites the more charge is accumulated.

It is the charge that overwhelms. Auditor errors add charge. Pc then is overwhelmed.

Example: Pc originates he thinks item is Woof. Auditor checks Garf. Now pc eventually given Woof (even when he said it was his in the first place) fails to understand it.

-----

You can get a pc protesting silently and have everything on a list start to read. Then you can't find the item or goal. Everything reads. Rough auditing, auditor contradictions and comm cycle failures bring this about.

Example: Pc says "I think my Item is Woof." (It isn't but pc thinks so.) Auditor: (Not even bothering to check Woof) "I'm sorry, it didn't read when I called it a while ago." There goes the list. Everything may start to read. And it wasn't even pc's item. But the auditor overwhelmed the pc by a direct refusal of the pc's idea. So the list went wild on the pc's unspoken protest. The right action, the very least the auditor could have done was recheck the item. *That* action at least acknowledged the pc. *Then* the auditor can say "I'm sorry. It doesn't read, and suppress on it doesn't read either." *Now* the pc is happy and the auditor can go on nulling.

In Class VI the pc is right a lot more times than at lower levels. You start arguing with the pc's heat-on-items (or goals) and you'll soon have a messed up meter and an overwhelmed pc.

Of course, you must *never* give a pc goals or items that don't read. That's simply criminal. But you must do everything you can to get what the pc thinks is right to read. If you can't, then tell the pc you can't and all will be well, even so.

-----

A whole list or several parts of it will go alive on overwhelm.

By overwhelming the pc you can get wrong goals and items galore.

And you get a no-cognite pc and after that you've had it.

No auditor can find anything without the pc's co-operation. Preserve it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

5—12 March 1964

** 6403C05	SHSBC-8	Case Analysis—Healing
** 6403C10	SHSBC-9	Summary of Lower Levels—Clearing at Level Four
6403C12	SHSBC-10A	Track Analysis (film)
6403C12	SHSBC-10B	Running GPMs (film)

Class VI  
Central Orgs

*SCIENTOLOGY VI*

**METER  
EVERYTHING READING**

There are only a few things which cause “everything to read” on a list of goals or items.

(1) METER ABILITY

*First* amongst these (as in any level) is the inability of the auditor to read a meter.

In Class VI work the inability to read a meter is very subtle. It is usually that the auditor has not learned the difference between a surge and a real goal read or item read.

On a live Item list everything has some charge on it. Only the right item reads in its own peculiar way.

A right read is definitely itself and the auditor must learn it.

An actual goal chugs. It is no clean read. It may not even blow down. It is sporadic. But it is definitely a highly charged read.

Most Implant GPMs read with a *long clean* enthusiastic RR. Lovely. But it isn't an *actual GPM*. The actual GPM chugs. It's no clean sweep of needle. And it's no mere Tick.

An Actual RI reads with a blowdown of the TA and *heavy* needle action. The action is so heavy that the sensitivity must not be higher than 4 in Class VI work. A surge looks like an RI if you run sensitivity at 16 or 32.

The auditor new to Class VI work is cocky about his metering. Yet he or she has to learn to recognize the character of a thing by its meter action.

An auditor who can't tell an actual RI from a lock RI on an Items list with a glance at the meter response will give the pc a lot of bum items.

An auditor who can't tell an Actual GPM from an Implant GPM or a no GPM merely by meter behaviour and no further questions will make a lot of mistakes.

In *addition* to how it read on the meter you do a full check-out, of course.

And in check-outs you must know, as well, by meter behaviour during checkout, what you are checking out even before you get the final answer by the check-out patter.

There are two ways then of recognizing the character of what you're checking. One is by the reads you get from questions about it. The other is its character of read on the meter. *Both* are needed to get accuracy.

An auditor new to Class VI will buy a Tick. The only ticks in Class VI are on mid ruds and dogs. (Joke.)

If you can't get a long fall in response to one of your offered identities "Implant RI, lock on an Implant" and so on down the whole list of questions, then you'll still get one on "*It isn't*". No ticks need apply.

The auditor who buys an actual GPM because of a tick on "It's an Actual GPM" and no better read, would praise psychiatry.

Class VI is all big read stuff. If there are no big reads on anything, including buttons, then whatever it is just "isn't".

It must read big if only on "Suppress" or "Wronged" if it's anything at all.

If "everything on a list is reading" it may just be that the auditor doesn't know a read when he or she sees one.

An Item list *should* give a 1" or 2" surge on every item the first time through. Only the Actual RI on it reads its head off. And blows down. And keeps reading a while. Those other items' surges just die out.

On a goals list the list ought to be complete enough that no goal on it except actual goals moves the needle. The actual goal when read gives a chug.

A goals list is very easily suppressed. The Actual GPM may be dug off it only by asking on each goal "Has (goal being tested) been suppressed or wronged?"

The same thing can occur with an Items list. It's been flattened out of existence. But the right item will still read on "suppressed or wronged" with a long fall and so can be found again.

But all such actions are made infrequent by an auditor's knowing how the real thing looks and spotting it the first time.

Locks and actual RIs read quite differently. Lock goals and implant goals and actual goals all read very differently. And all at a glance. Check-out on Items becomes unnecessary when the auditor *knows* how they should look and can *see* what happened on the meter.

One of the funniest auditor flubs, but not to the pc, is the auditor who, not being able to get anything to read while trying to learn the character of an Item or goal, merely keeps repeating the same question, trying by will power to make it read. An Item or goal is what it is and dozens of repeats of the same question will not make it into something it is not.

All things are something. The trick is to ask if it is what it really is. Only then does one get a proper long fall on assessing.

Identifying what things are is a game of charades. And if one doesn't guess the right answer one doesn't get the nod from the meter.

The nod is a big read always if the thing being identified is anything at all. And the nod also says, by the way the needle nods, if the guess is true.

## (2) THE ABANDONED ITEM OR GOAL ANOTHER WAY EVERYTHING READS

Given an auditor who knows the different reads on the meter, there is just one other way one can be fooled.

*If the right Item or Goal on a list has been read and abandoned, all its locks will begin to read like real items or goals.*

This is a fabulously important datum. The too cautious auditor can wreck everything by reading the right item, getting the right read, and then abandoning it to try to see if anything else is it.

Example: On an Item (or Goals) list the auditor has found “Bark”. It has read well when called. The auditor feels insecure, so he or she then goes on to check “Woof”. “Woof” now reads well. Pc is restive. So auditor tries another Item on the list, “Growl”. This too reads well but won’t “bring about”. Auditor now tests “Arf”. This reads fine too.

But everything is now up the spout. Pc is miserable and ARC Breaking. Auditor is frantic. An ARC Break Assessment would show “Item abandoned”.

But *what* Item was abandoned? There has been “Woof” “Growl” “Bark” and “Arf”. Which is right? They have all read !

Now you *must* get the exactly worded item or goal. No near misses will do. The *exact* wording. The right “up” or “upon”. Exact. If the wording is not EXACTLY RIGHT, the mass of the Item (or GPM) will not as-is. The pc will be left in heavy charge. So *almost* right is WRONG. Always. The goal “To Catch” is going to cause ARC Breaks and somatics if called “To Grab”. The goal “To Be Creative” will give you a sick pc if found as “To Be Artistic”. And worse, if an Item has one “s” missing, it’s wrong. “Moaning” is wrong as “Moanings”. The bank is a demon for exactness. The mind is not a confusion. It’s a martinet of too much order.

So “*almost* finding it” is not finding it at all.

Nothing is ever *almost* right in Class VI. The meter does not almost read.

So you have to find the exact goal wording or Item wording.

Now back to “Bark”. This was the first one read. It was then abandoned. This charged up its locks. So now “Woof” “Arf” and “Growl” are all capable of making “Bark” read. It is “Bark” that is still reading even when you call “Woof” and “Growl” and “Arf”. You have broken down the divisions amongst them.

Now what to do? How to find what is really reading? Ask “Has Growl been Suppressed or Wronged?” Small read. “Has Woof been Suppressed or Wronged?” Small read. “Has Bark been Suppressed or Wronged?” Big reads. Clean up “Bark” by getting pc to get off the Suppress etc, and “Bark” now reads and “Woof” “Growl” and “Arf” do not. So “Bark” is the Item.

Moral: When nulling, if you see a real big read mark it as “First read” or “1st Rd” and be safe. It’s all right to null onward *but you* may now find everything reading.

Pc announcing “Bark is my Item” if ignored without immediate check-out gives the same effect, since if “Bark” was the pc’s Item and was abandoned, all else can start to read, as the charge will transfer.

Hence the rule “An actual RI or actual goal abandoned on a list can now cause other lock items or goals to read well.”

The nervous auditor gets into this trap endlessly and *so never learns* that an Actual goal or Actual RI has its own peculiar read. Such an auditor loses all confidence in nulling accuracy and the pc goes wild.

### (3) WRONG GOALS

If you ever run a wrong goal on a pc, again everything tends to read.

As we now have the pattern, the RR probably won't go all the way off, but the needle will get tight and good indicators will flee. The pattern is close enough to keep the RR on somewhat.

But anything the pc gave you by way of Items would read.

Wrong goals are harder to detect than they were. The pattern is too good a guide. Almost any goal will run on it.

But black mass and pressure will appear, good indicators will vanish. Bad indicators will appear. And no mass as-is.

Any actual RI has enough power to make lock or wrong goals based on it read. For instance, an Actual RI "Speeding" will cause the goal "To Speed" to check out as an Actual GPM! So beware of wrong goals. And do careful check-outs and buy only good forceful reads in answer to your assessment questions.

Implant RIs are incapable of giving a lock goal charge enough to check out. But an Actual RI has enough charge to do so. I've had four different goals check out for the same position. But only one gave good indicators and consistent responses.

Abandoning a right goal can make a pc *very very* sick. So there's a limit on banging a goal around.

-----

Experience tells one at length what a right goal or Item reads like, how it checks out and when one is going up the garden path.

But experience is based on sound beginnings. So know the above well. And then you can build up to good certainty on how it's done.

The first thing to know, of course, is that there is a right way to do it. If you don't realize that and try for it, then you'll never learn and Class VI will remain a closed mystery to you.

But it need not, for we do know.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE**  
17 March 1964

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 MARCH 1964

CenOCon

**HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES**

(Cancels previous issues on same subject)

Effective immediately, the following processes are allowed in the HGC on any preclear, on the judgment of the Case Supervisor.

For psychosomatics: ARC '63.

For clearing: Recall a Terminal and Problems Intensive, alternated with R-2H.

8-C and any older processes the auditor has confidence in are allowed.

Study and use the materials of the last six tapes of the Saint Hill Briefing Course, but do not run or list any Goals or Items on any preclear.

Refresh the Case Supervisor on ARC Break assessments and have ARC Breaks handled by the Case Supervisor. Clean up all the ARC Breaks in the area.

Train your auditing staff on the above and on the new "Auditing by Lists" process, when issued.

Campaign to the public: "Clean up your ARC Breaks with life."

The above, with clarifications, will remain standard HGC fare for years, as it contains the cream of all processes for the last fourteen years, and actual clearing.

Avoid advertising Itsa. Relegate it to Co-audits. Avoid R-2-12, R-3 and R-4 type processes. Advertise and deliver clearing as above.

Flatten, flatten all processes begun in the HGC.

Preclear Log Books will conform to this rundown.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

18—24 March 1964

6403C18	SH TVD	TV Demo's Comments by LRH
** 6403C19	SHSBC-12	Flattening a Process
** 6403C24	SHSBC-13	International City

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 2 APRIL AD14

Magazine Article  
BPI

**TWO TYPES OF PEOPLE**

Completing research on the highest levels of clearing now being taught as the upper course at Saint Hill, Class VI, OT, I made a very fundamental discovery about Man and Life that I'd like you to know about.

You probably have speculated on this many times—are there two kinds of people: good people and bad people? Society is more or less organized on the basis that there are. And certainly one sees that some are successful and some aren't, some are good to know and some aren't.

Even in modern TV fiction one has the cowboys in the white hats and the cowboys in the black hats; indeed one probably couldn't have stories at all to Man's way of thinking unless there were heroes and ogres. And even fiction is rigged as a moral lesson in good and bad people.

Philosophers long before Greece pondered moral conduct in terms of good and bad. And Diogenes was looking for an honest man, implying some weren't.

More recent speculation in the 19th Century termed all men evil unless forced to be good.

Some schools of thought tried to avoid the point by saying early childhood formed character. Yet other schools maintained Man would always be evil unless personally threatened, which gives us the presence of police in the society. But even police sometimes work on the idea that there are good and bad people.

From all this one could judge that Man had a problem about whether people are good or bad.

Probably at this minute you could think of some examples of good people and bad people. You know those who rave and gnaw the rug at the very thought of Scientology helping anyone, so therefore there must be people of evil intention toward their fellows.

And there are.

The research results you would be interested in show clearly that there are two types of behaviour—that calculated to be constructive and that calculated to be disastrous.

These are the two dominant behaviour patterns. There are people then who are trying to build things up and others who are trying to tear things down.

And there are no other types. Actually there aren't even shades of grey.

The disaster type can be repressed into inactivity (and illness) and the constructive type can also be repressed (and made ill).

Thus there are two basic actions, each with many other subsidiary actions.

There is also a cyclic or combined type who is alternately constructive and disastrous.

So there are cowboys in white hats and cowboys in black hats. And the cowboys in the grey hats are too sick to be in the game.

One scholarly chap (a very sick fellow) hopefully told me once that there were no true villains, no purely evil people. He was whistling past the graveyard. There may not be evil people, but there are people currently devoted to doing evil actions.

All such conduct is apparent and dominant. We see such people all the time. We just don't want to see them.

The underlying reasons for this are, in the absence of processing, fixed and unchangeable in any one lifetime.

As Man knows a man only in one lifetime, the basic cause or changes have not been observed. Thus to all practical purposes for Man, some are good and some are evil. And if we didn't have Scientology it would not only not be observed but couldn't ever be changed.

That this condition exists—that half are good and half are bad according to their personalities—oddly enough does not alter basic Scientology concepts. It explains why certain persons *appear* to be evil and some *appear* to be good.

Examining the actual goals of an individual shows us why.

About half the goals of any one individual are constructive, the remainder are destructive.

It takes a being a *very* long time to live completely through the cycle of one goal, much less a *series* of goals.

Therefore any one individual at any given long period of his existence is only fixated on disaster and at a subsequent long period is fixated only on being constructive.

So the same being at different lifetimes is good and evil.

Given a sudden overwhelming experience a “good person” may be shifted violently in his own goals pattern and become evil. And a “bad person”, acted upon powerfully by life, will become good. But they also become sick. Their illness stems from being moved out of present time into past heavy energy patterns. It is no cure to so move them despite the assertions of 19th Century mentalists and their shock “treatment”. This shows why shock sometimes works and why changes of character come about. And it also shows why such changes are accompanied by severe illness and early death. The person is thrown violently out of present time into a painful past.

The problem is not a problem of sanity and insanity. It is a problem of disastrous motives and constructive motives and the degree to which either is suppressed.

By suppressing the damaging motives of a being who is currently inclined to disaster, one can make that being “behave”. But by suppressing the constructive motives of a being currently inclined to constructiveness (as in the military), one can make that being “behave” also. But both will become physically ill, neurotic or insane in the absence of processing.

So the same being in one long period is constructive and in the next long period disastrous.

As Man measures time in small bits such as youth, old age or a lifetime, he could conceive of a being as either only constructive or only disastrous.



Fortunately for us, this also solves the ancient riddle that one cannot be granted power without also having good intentions. The only way final and powerful abilities can be returned to an individual is by ridding him of *all* these hidden compulsions, a task now accomplished at Level VI.

This gives the Scientologist a useful insight into character. A sick being is one who has been bent upon violence and was suppressed, or one who was bent upon constructiveness and was suppressed.

It also gives us a whole span of new processes for Level III called “Auditing by Lists”, available in HGCs or from informed field auditors. This is quite in addition to what it does at Level VI. And it also tells us that no one with obsessive intentions will ever make it to the highest and most powerful levels with disastrous inclinations.

But at the street level, with no processing involved, we have these two basic types—good and evil.

And these subdivide into the good who couldn’t be good and became sick, and the evil who couldn’t be evil and became sick.

But these facts are more than philosophic observations. They deliver to us understanding and more chance to be right about people. And they give us as well the wide open door to making people well at Level III.

One cannot push research as I have done in the past year into the stratosphere without learning more at sea level also. And this is what has happened here.

The basic travail of Man is that he is divided into those who build and those who demolish, and in this conflict of intentions his fight, whichever side he is on, is always lost.

Or was lost until the Scientologist came along.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: gl.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 APRIL 1964

CenOCon

*ALL LEVELS*

**Q AND A**

A great number of auditors Q and A.

This is because they have not understood what it is.

Nearly all their auditing failures stem not from using wrong processes but from Q and A.

Accordingly I have looked the matter over and re-defined Q and A.

The origin of the term comes from “changing when the pc changes”. The basic answer to a question is, obviously, a question if one follows the duplication of the Comm formula completely. See Philadelphia Congress 1953 tapes where this was covered very fully. A later definition was “Questioning the pc’s Answer”. Another effort to overcome it and explain Q & A was the Anti-Q and A drill. But none of these reached home.

The new definition is this:

Q AND A IS A FAILURE TO COMPLETE A CYCLE OF ACTION ON A PRECLEAR.

A CYCLE OF ACTION IS REDEFINED AS START—CONTINUE—COMPLETE.

Thus an auditing comm cycle is a cycle of action. It starts with the auditor asking a question the preclear can understand, getting the preclear to answer it and acknowledging that answer.

A process cycle is selecting a process to be run on the preclear, running the Tone Arm action into it (if necessary) and running the Tone Arm action out of it.

A programme cycle is selecting an action to be performed, performing that action and completing it.

Thus you can see that an auditor who interrupts or changes an auditing comm cycle before it is complete is “Q and A-ing”. This could be done by violating or preventing or not doing any part of the auditing cycle, i.e., ask the pc a question, get an answer to a different idea, ask the different idea, thus abandoning the original question.

An auditor who starts a process, just gets it going, gets a new idea because of pc cognition, takes up the cognition and abandons the original process is Q and A-ing.

A programme such as “Prepcheck this pc’s family” is begun, and for any reason left incomplete to go chasing some new idea to Prepcheck, is a *Q and A*.

Unfinished cycles of action are all that louse up cases.

Since Time is a continuum, a failure to carry out a cycle of action (a continuum) hangs the pc up at that exact point.

If you don’t believe it, prepcheck “Incomplete actions” on a pc! What Incomplete action has been suppressed? etc, cleaning the meter for real on every button. And you’d have a clear—or a pc that would behave that way on a meter.

Understand this and you’ll be about ninety times as effective as an auditor.

“Don’t Q and A!” means “Don’t leave cycles of action incomplete on a pc.”

The gains you hope to achieve on a pc are lost when you Q and A.

LRH:dr.rd.cden  
Copyright ©1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 APRIL 1964

Franchise

*ALL LEVELS*

**AUDITING SKILLS**

(Forming the technical basis of preclear,  
co-audit and auditor classification.)

The following list of skills is a totality of processes in use in modern Scientology.

Aside from the purely philosophical side of Scientology, this represents the auditor's technology. All modern training should be built on these lines.

These processes handle all cases and take the pc from humanoid, through clear, to OT.

The auditor who has been through all these levels finds the skills under a Class VI auditor a culmination of earlier studies with some additions as to what is being handled.

This is a rapid forecast survey. It does not invalidate HGC allowed processes of current date. Several old familiar processes not mentioned, and all processes that get a pc to do a comm cycle, come under "Repetitive Processes" since they vary only in having different commands, not in technique of administration.

**SCIENTOLOGY LEVELS**

- LEVEL 0: Dangerous environment, ARC, education in basics of life. Case Improvement by education in Scientology and orientation in environment.
- LEVEL I: R1C for PTPs, R1CM (fishing with TA), Assists, R2C (discussion by lists), Listen Style and Itsa.  
Case Improvement by communication on closely interested subjects and problems, using TA Blowdowns.
- LEVEL II: Repetitive processes, Model Session, Op-Pro-By-Dup, 8-C, CCHs, Havingness, General O/W, ARC '63, Auditing Cycle.  
Case Improvement by disciplined comm cycle, awareness of mind and environment, using TA of meter and cumulative TA divisions.
- LEVEL III: Auditing by List, Sec Checking by List, Prepchecking, Problems Intensive, Mid Ruds, and Model Session. (Auditing by List is SOM-3L.)  
Case Improvement by removing psychosomatics, cleaning needle of all reads on given questions, any assessments done by upper level auditor.
- LEVEL IV: R4SC, ARC Break Assessments, R4H (R2H), and Case Analysis.  
Case Improvement by Service Facsimile, life ARC Breaks and Case Analysis, using the listing and assessment potentials of the meter, which is not done in lower levels. (Clearing this lifetime.)
- LEVEL V: Omitted.
- LEVEL VI: Locating the truncation, checking goals, running the Line Plot and Track Analysis.  
Case Improvement by running pc's own goals all the way to operating thetan.

## THINGS A CLASS VI AUDITOR SHOULD KNOW

1. Case Analysis
2. PTP
3. Psychosomatic
4. ARC Break
5. Session
6. Class VI ARC Breaks
7. Listing
8. Nulling a list
9. Auditing by list
10. Auditor's Code
11. Completing a cycle of action
12. Havingness
13. Theory of restimulation and destimulation
14. Observation of preclear
15. Reading a meter
16. Executing an auditing cycle
17. Knowing not to Q & A
18. Knowing about NO auditing
19. Symptoms of an ARC Break
20. Good indicators
21. Bad indicators
22. Not to mess up a good running preclear
23. Not to continue the preclear who isn't running
24. Knowing when to stop auditing and ending up the session
25. How to handle pc's PTPs at Level VI when they show up
26. Track analysis
27. Getting the preclear to follow a Line Plot
28. Guiding a preclear down a Goals Plot
29. Finding out where a series is truncated
30. Finding out which type of goals series the preclear is in
31. Looking good, crisp and business-like as an Auditor

The above gives the basis of three classifications.

Preclear: Has achieved the gains, knows the why and parts of the processes, and the underlying basics. No auditor performance or ability required.

Co-auditor: Can perform the process under supervision and has passed a non-professional examination on it.

Auditor: Professionally qualified in all respects in theory, practical and auditing at that level.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :gl. rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE

10 April 1964

HCO BULLETIN OF 13 APRIL 1964

Sthil  
Class VI

*SCIENTOLOGY VI PART ONE*

**TONE ARM ACTION**

(Summary of previous HCO Bulletins)

The state of case of the pc has nothing to do with getting Tone Arm Action. An auditor is in absolute control of the bank—it always does what you tell it to do. A case *must not* be run without TA action or with minimal TA action. If it didn't occur, Tone Arm Action has to have been prevented! It doesn't just "not occur".

The skill of an auditor is directly measured by the amount of TA he or she can get. Pcs are not more difficult one than another. Any pc can be made to produce TA. But some auditors cut TA more than others.

The most vital necessity of auditing at *any* level of Scientology is to get Tone Arm Action. Not to worry the pc about it but just to get TA action. Not to find something that will get future TA. But just to get TA NOW.

Many auditors are still measuring their successes by things found or accomplished in the session. Though this is important too (mainly at Level IV), it is secondary to Tone Arm Action.

1. Get good Tone Arm Action.
2. Get things done in the session to increase Tone Arm Action.

And Body Motion doesn't count, as TA.

Without Tone Arm Motion no charge is being released and no actual case betterment is observed beyond a few somatics removed. The pc's session goals stay the same. The pc's life doesn't change.

THE MOST CORRECT TRACK SIGNIFICANCES RUN BUT WITHOUT TA ACTION WILL NOT CHANGE BUT CAN DETERIORATE A CASE. It takes the right process correctly run to get TA action. So don't underrate processes or the action of the auditor.

TA MOVING SIGNALS AUDITOR NOT TO ACT. TA NOT MOVING SIGNALS AUDITOR TO ACT.

Your enemy is Over-Restimulation of the pc. As soon as the pc goes into more charge than he or she can Itsa easily the TA slows down! And as soon as the pc drowns in the over-restimulation the TA stops clank!

Unless destimulated a case can't get a rocket read or present the auditor with a valid goal.

In doing R6 the silent auditor lets the pc Itsa all over the whole track and causes Over-Restimulation which locks up the TA. But in lower levels of auditing, inviting an Itsa with silence is an ordinary action.

As soon as you get into Level VI auditing however, on the pc's actual GPMs, the auditor has to be crisp and busy to get TA and a silent, idle auditor can mess up the pc and get very little TA.

Level VI auditing finds the auditor smoothly letting the pc Itsa RIs and lists but the auditor going at it like a small steam engine finding RIs, RIs, RIs, Goals, RIs, RIs,

RIs. For the total TA in an R6 *session* only is proportional to the number of RIs found without goofs, wrong goals or other errors which rob TA action.

So the higher the level the more control of the pc's attention.

Only in R6 where you're dead on the pc's GPMs and the pc is allowed to say it is or isn't can you get TA good action out of listing and nulling. And even then a failure to let the pc say it is it can cut the TA down enormously.

In confirmation of auditors being too anxious to get in the Itsa line themselves and not let the pc is the fad of using the meter as a Ouija Board. The auditor asks it questions continually and never asks the pc. Up the spout go divisions of TA. "Is this Item a terminal?" the auditor asks the meter. Why not ask the pc? If you ask the pc, you get an Itsa, "No, I think it's an oppterm because\_\_\_\_\_" and the TA moves.

#### AUDITOR FAILURE TO UNDERSTAND

If a pc says something and the auditor fails to understand what the pc said or meant, the correct response is:

"I did not (hear you) (understand what was said) (get that last)."

To do anything else is not only bad form, it can amount to a heavy ARC Break.

#### INVALIDATION

To say "You did not speak loud enough\_\_\_\_\_" or any other use of "you" is an invalidation.

The pc is also thrown out of session by having responsibility hung on him or her.

The *auditor is* responsible for the session. Therefore the auditor has to assume responsibility for all comm breakdowns in it.

#### EVALUATION

Far more serious than Invalidation above, is the accidental evaluation which may occur when the auditor *repeats* what the pc said.

NEVER repeat anything a pc says after him, no matter why.

Repeating not only does not show the pc you heard but makes him feel you're a circuit.

But that isn't the main reason you do *not* repeat what the pc said after the pc. If you say it wrong the pc is thrown into heavy protest. The pc must correct the wrongness and hangs up right there. It may take an hour to dig the pc out of it.

#### DIRTY NEEDLES

If your pc has a *dirty needle*, its cause is CUT ITSA or an L1 *session* ARC Break.

*NO* other source such as a wrong Item or goal or earlier engrams or service fac by-passed charge can cause a dirty needle.

If it's a dirty needle its cause lies in basic auditing not in technique errors.

This rule is invariable. The *apparent* exception is the session ARC Break that keys in by-passed technique charge.

*All* dirty needles are caused by the auditor failing to hear all the pc had to say in answering a question or volunteering data.

Charge is removed from a case only by the Comm Cycle Pc to Auditor.

The auditor's command restimulates a charge in the pc. The only way this charge can be blown is by the pc telling the auditor.

### CLEANING CLEANS

The auditor who cleans a clean meter is asking for trouble.

This is the same as asking a pc for something that isn't there and develops a "withhold of nothing".

### ECHO METERING

The pc says, "You missed a suppress. It's \_\_\_\_\_" and the auditor re-consults the meter asking for a suppress. That leaves the pc's offering an undischarged charge.

NEVER ASK THE METER AFTER A PC VOLUNTEERS A BUTTON.

Example: You've declared suppress clean, pc gives you another suppress. Take it and don't ask suppress again. That's *Echo Metering*.

If a pc puts his own ruds in, don't at once jump to the meter to put his ruds in. That makes all his offerings missed charge. *Echo Metering* is miserable auditing.

DON'T ECHO INVALIDATE Echo Invalidation:

The pc gives an Item. The auditor calls it back to the pc and says it doesn't RR. If this is kept up the pc will be put into a state of sen that is appalling. The right way to do this is as follows:

Pc gives Item.

Auditor writes it down.

All Items are written down that the pc gives.

An auditor never repeats Items to the pc after the pc says them. If the auditor doesn't understand he asks pc to spell it or if it is singular or plural. Don't fake an understanding. The list *must* be accurate.

Echo Invalidation, in which pc names an Item and auditor says "That isn't it" is not just bad form but a very vicious practice that leads to a games condition. The Invalidation of each Item makes the pc very dizzy and very desperate. The pc, sick and confused, starts plunging in desperation for the right Item and goes swiftly down tone and out of session.

High pc morale is vital to blowing charge and finding RIs.

Uphold the pc's morale. Don't begin Echo Invalidation.

### METER INVALIDATION

An auditor who just sits and shakes his head, "Didn't Rocket Read" can give a pc too many loses and deteriorate the pc's ability to run GPMs.

In a conflict between pc and meter, take the pc's data. Why? Because Protest and Assert and Mistake will also read on a meter. You can get these off, but why create them? Your data comes from the *pc* and the meter always for anything. And if the pc's data is invalidated you won't get a meter's data. If the pc says he has a PTP and the meter says he doesn't, you take the pc's data that he does.

You take the pc's data. Never take his orders.

Also, minimize a pc's dependency on a meter. Don't keep confirming a pc's data by meter read with, "That reads. Yes, that's there. Yes, there's a rocket read ...."

The meter is not there to invalidate the pc.

The E-Meter registers charge. A very high or low tone arm, a sticky or dirty needle all are registrations of this charge. The “chronic meter of a case” is an index of chronic charge. The fluctuations of a meter during a session are registering relative charge in different portions of the pc’s Time Track.

More valuably the meter registers *released* charge. You can see it blowing on the meter. The disintegrating RR, the blowing down of the TA, the heavy falls, the loosening needle all show charge being released.

The meter registers charge found and then charge released. It registers charge found but not yet released by the needle getting tight, by DN, by a climbing TA or a TA going far below the clear read. Then as this cleans up, the charge is seen to “blow”.

Charge that is restimulated but not released causes the case to “charge up”, in that charge already on the Time Track is triggered but is not yet viewed by the pc. The whole cycle of restimulated charge that is then blown gives us the action of auditing. When *prior* charge is restimulated but not located so that it can be blown, we get “ARC Breaks”.

Auditing selectively restimulates, locates the charge and discharges it (as seen on the action of a moving Tone Arm).

The meter in actual fact does nothing but locate charged areas below the awareness of the pc and verify that the charge has been removed. The meter cures nothing and does not treat. It only assists the auditor in assisting the preclear to look and verify having looked.

#### METER DEPENDENCE

A pc can be made more dependent upon the meter or can be made more independent of the meter, all in the way a meter is used by the auditor.

*Meter dependence* is created by invalidation by or poor acknowledgement of the auditor. If the auditor seems not to accept the pc’s data, then the pc may insist that the auditor “see it read on the meter”. This can grow up into a formidable meter dependence on the part of the pc.

A pc must be carefully weaned of meter dependence, not abruptly chopped off.

If a pc’s case is improving the pc becomes more independent of the meter. This is the proper direction.

Build up the pc’s confidence in his own knowingness and continuously and progressively reduce the pc’s dependence on a meter.

As the pc gets along in running Time Track and GPMs with their goals and Reliable Items he or she often becomes better than the meter as to what is right or wrong, what is the goal, what RI still reads.

#### CHARGE

Charge, the stored quantities of energy in the Time Track, is the sole thing that is being relieved or removed by the auditor from the Time Track.

When this charge is present in huge amounts the Time Track overwhelms the pc and the pc is thrust below observation of the actual track.

The mechanism of permanent restimulation consists of opposing forces of comparable magnitude which cause a balance which does not respond to current time and remains “timeless”.

Such phenomena as the overt act-motivator sequence, the problem (postulate counter-postulate), tend to hold certain portions of the Time Track in “permanent



creation” and cause them to continue to exist in present time as unresolved masses, energies, spaces, times and significances.

The intention of the physical universe (and those who have become degraded enough to further only its ends) is to make a thetan solid, immobile and decisionless.

The fight of the thetan is to remain unsolid, mobile or immobile at will, and capable of decision.

This in itself is the principal unresolved problem and it itself creates timeless mass which accomplishes the basic purpose of a trap.

## BY-PASSED CHARGE

By-passed Charge does not always = ARC Break.

But ARC Break always = By-passed Charge.

By-passed Charge always exists in a session—it isn’t until it is keyed in by some communication failure in session that it causes an ARC Break.

The source of all ARC Breaks is By-passed Charge. There is no other source of ARC Breaks.

People do *not* ARC Break on known charge. It is always the hidden or the earlier charge that causes the ARC Break.

The pc *never* knows why the ARC Break. He may think he does and disclaim about it. *But* the moment the actual reason is spotted (the real missed area) the ARC Break ceases.

All by-passed charge is in some degree a missed withhold, missed by both auditor and pc.

In a session or handling the living lightning we handle, people can be hit by a forceful charge of which they are only minutely aware but which swamps them. Their affinity, reality and communication (life force) is retarded or cut by this hidden charge and they react with what we call an ARC Break or have an ARC Broken aspect.

Everything on the whole Know to Mystery Scale that still lies *above* the pc finds the pc at effect. These are all on Automatic.

Therefore the pc in an ARC Break is in the grip of the reaction which was in the incident, now fully on automatic.

The pc’s anger in the incident is not even seen or felt by the pc. But the moment something slips the pc is in the grip of that emotion as an automaticity and becomes furious or apathetic or whatever toward the auditor.

As soon as the *actual* by-passed charge is found and recognized as *the* charge by the person, up goes Affinity and Reality and Communication and life can be lived.

## THE ARC BREAK

### THE CYCLE OF THE ARC BREAK

#### STAGE ONE:

The ARC Break starts always in the same way. The pc finds something wrong with the auditor, the subject, or tools of auditing or the auditing room. He does this in varying intensity, ARC Break to ARC Break.

#### STAGE TWO:

This is followed by misemotion, also directed at the auditor, subject, tools or room.

### STAGE THREE:

If the auditor continues on with auditing the pc will drop into grief, sadness or apathy.

This is an inevitable cycle and may be followed by the pc with greater or lesser intensity of emotion, or loudness or lack of response.

IN R6 WHEN THE PC CRITICIZES OR ATTACKS THE AUDITOR OR GOES INTO GRIEF OR APATHY, AN R6 ERROR HAS *JUST* OCCURRED. THE AUDITOR MUST IGNORE THE PC'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE CAUSE OF THE ARC BREAK AND QUICKLY REMEDY THE R6 AND DO *NOTHING ELSE*.

THE COMMON DENOMINATOR OF ALL R6 ARC BREAKS CONSISTS OF A MISSED OR WRONGLY DESIGNATED GPM, GOAL OR RELIABLE ITEM. THERE ARE NO OTHER SOURCES OF R6 ARC BREAKS.

Bad sessioning, poor auditing, ordinary life missed withholds are only contributive to R6 ARC Breaks and are incapable of doing more than keying in and intensifying the magnitude of the ARC Break which has already been caused by errors in R6.

ARC BREAK RULE 1: IF THE PC ARC BREAKS, ISSUE NO FURTHER AUDITING COMMANDS UNTIL BOTH PC AND AUDITOR ARE SATISFIED THAT THE CAUSE OF THE ARC BREAK HAS BEEN LOCATED AND INDICATED.

Do not issue more orders, do not run a process, do not offer to run a process, do not sit idly letting the pc ARC Break. Follow this rule:

ARC BREAK RULE 2: WHEN A PC ARC BREAKS OR CAN'T GO ON FOR ANY REASON, DO AN ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT AND LOCATE AND INDICATE TO THE PC THE BY-PASSED CHARGE.

If you know you've missed a goal or RI, just saying so prevents any ARC Break. DON'T BY-PASS CHARGE UNKNOWN TO THE PC.

### ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT

The meter is invaluable in locating by-passed charge and curing an ARC Break.

The trick is TO FIND AND INDICATE the RIGHT By-passed Charge to the pc and to handle it when possible but never fail to indicate it. It is then up to the auditor to *locate* it more precisely as to character and time and *indicate* it to the pc. The pc will feel better the moment the right type of by-passed charge is identified by assessment and indicated by the auditor. If the pc does *not* feel better but further ARC Breaks then the assessment is either incomplete or incorrect.

If the pc blows up in your face on being given a type of charge, *keep going*, as you have not yet found the charge.

You can, however, undo a session ARC Break Assessment by continuing beyond the pc's cognition of what it is. Continuing an assessment after the pc has cognited, invalidates the pc's cognition and cuts the Itsa Line and may cause a *new* ARC Break.

Several by-passed charges can exist and be found on one list.

Sometimes in trying to locate the by-passed charge causing an ARC Break, the pc's needle is so dirty that it almost can't be read.

However there is a way to read it. When the correct by-passed charge is located and indicated the needle will go beautifully clean.

But it can be done without a meter, just by letting the pc think over each line read to him or her from the ARC Break Assessment and say whether it is or isn't and if it is, spotting the thing by-passed.

Don't *ever* be "reasonable" about an ARC Break and think the pc is perfectly right to be having one "because ". If that ARC Break exists, the pc doesn't know what's causing it and *neither do you* until you and the pc find it! If you and the pc knew what was causing it, there would be no further ARC Break.

ARC Breaks are inevitable. They will happen.

## Q AND A ARC BREAKS

Q and A causes ARC Breaks by BY-PASSING CHARGE.

How? The pc says something. The auditor does not understand or acknowledge. Therefore the pc's utterance becomes a By-passed Charge generated by whatever he or she is trying to release. As the auditor ignores it and the pc reasserts it, the original utterance's charge is built up and up.

Finally the pc will start issuing orders in a frantic effort to get rid of the missed charge. This is the source of pc orders to the auditor.

Understand and Acknowledge the pc. Take the pc's data. Don't pester the pc for more data when the pc is offering data.

Learn to see if the pc has said everything he or she wants to say before the next auditor action, never do a new auditor action while or if the pc wants to speak and you'll get superior TA action. Cut the pc off, get in more actions than the pc is allowed to answer and you'll have a Dirty Needle, then a stuck TA and then an ARC Break.

Realize that the answering of the process question is senior to the asking of another process question.

Watch the pc's eyes. Don't take auditing actions if the pc is not looking at you.

Don't give acknowledgements that aren't needed. Over-acknowledgement means acknowledging before the pc has said *all*.

## PC TONE

The pc rises in tone up to the lower levels of the tone scale. He or she comes up to degradation, up to apathy.

And it often feels horrible and, unlike an ARC Break and the Sad Effect, is not cured except by more of the same processing.

Then suddenly they realize that they have come up to being *able* to feel bad. They even come up to feeling pain. And all that is a *gain*.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

14—16 April 1964

** 6404C14	SHSBC-15	The Classification-Gradation Programme
** 6404C16	SHSBC-16	Auditing by Lists

**MODEL SESSION**

**LEVELS III TO VI**

(Cancels previous issues)

**SESSION PRELIMINARIES**

All auditing sessions have the following preliminaries done in this order.

1. Seat the pc and adjust his or her chair.
2. Clear the Auditing room with "Is it all right to audit in this room?" (not metered)
3. Can squeeze "Put your hands in your lap." "Squeeze the cans, please." And note that pc registers, by the squeeze on the meter, and note the level of the pc's havingness. (Don't run hav here.)
4. Put in R Factor by telling pc briefly what you are going to do in the session.

***START OF SESSION:***

5. "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"

"START OF SESSION." (Tone 40)

"Has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No", say again, "START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No", say, "We will cover it in a moment."

***RUDIMENTS:***

6. "What goals would you like to set for this session?"

Please note that Life or Livingness goals have been omitted, as they tend to remind the pc of present time difficulties and tend to take his attention out of the session.

7. At this point in the session there are actions which could be undertaken: the running of General O/W or the running of Mid Rudiments using "Since the last time I audited you", or pull missed W/Hs as indicated. But if pc cheerful and needle smooth, just get down to work.

One would run General O/W if the pc was emotionally upset at the beginning of the session or if the session did not start for the pc, the latter being simply another indication of the pc's being upset or ARC broken, but these symptoms must be present, as sometimes the session hasn't started merely because of poor Tone 40 or because the pc had something he wanted to say before the auditor started the session.

***RUNNING O/W:***

"If it is all right with you, I am going to run a short, general process." "The process is: 'What have you done?', 'What have you withheld?' " (The process is run very permissively until the needle looks smooth and the pc is no longer emotionally disturbed.)

“Where are you now on the time track?”  
“If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process.” (After each command, ask, “When?”) “That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?”  
“End of process.”

### ***RUNNING THE MID RUDIMENTS:***

One would use the Middle Rudiments with, “Since the last time I audited you”, if the needle was rough and if the Tone Arm was in a higher position than it was at the end of the last session.

#### **ORDER OF BUTTONS**

Here is the correct wording and order of use for the big Mid Ruds.

- “\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suppressed?”
- “\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been careful of?”
- “\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have failed to reveal?”
- “\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been invalidated?”
- “\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suggested?”
- “\_\_\_\_\_ has any mistake been made?”
- “\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been protested?”
- “\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been anxious about?”
- “\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been decided?”

In using the first three buttons (Suppressed, Careful of and Failed to Reveal), the rudiment question should be asked directly of the pc off the meter (repetitive). When the pc has no more answers, check the question on the meter. If the question reads, stick with it on the meter like in Fast Rud checking until it is clean.

The last six buttons are cleaned directly on the meter as in Fast Ruds.

### ***PULLING MISSED WITHHOLDS:***

- Use: “Since the last time you were audited has a withhold been missed on you?”
- “Since the last time you were audited is there anything someone failed to find out about you?”
- “Since the last time you were audited has someone nearly found out something about you?”

### ***BODY OF SESSION:***

8. Now go into the body of the session.

### ***END BODY OF SESSION:***

9. “Is it all right with you if we end the body of the session now?” “Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I do?”  
“End of the body of the session.”

### ***SMOOTH OUT SESSION:***

10. Smooth out any roughness in the session if there has been any, favouring Suppress, Failed to Reveal, Protest, Decide, Overts, Assert, using prefix "In this session\_\_\_\_\_?"

### ***GOALS & GAINS:***

11. "Have you made any of these goals for this session?" "Thank you for making these goals for this session" or "Thank you for making some of these goals for this session. I'm sorry you didn't make all of them" or "I'm sorry you didn't make these goals for this session."

"Have you made any gains in this session that you would care to mention?"  
"Thank you for making these gains for this session" or "I'm sorry you didn't make any gains for this session."

### ***HAVINGNESS:***

12. (After adjusting the meter) "Put your hands in your lap." "Please squeeze the cans." (If the squeeze test was not all right, the Auditor would run the pc's Havingness process until the can squeeze gives an adequate response.)

### ***ENDING SESSION:***

13. "Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?"
14. "Is it all right with you if I end this session now?"
15. "END OF SESSION." (Tone 40) "Has this session ended for you?" (If the pc says, "No", repeat, "END OF SESSION." If the session still has not ended, say, "You will be getting more auditing. END OF SESSION.") "Tell me I am no longer auditing you."

Please note that Havingness is run after Goals and Gains as this tends to bring the pc more into present time and to take his attention to a degree out of the session.

Wording for the above follows the tradition of earlier model sessions.

Adhere severely to this session form. It is nearly an irreducible minimum and is very fast, but it is all necessary.

The Random Rudiment here is "What happened?"

Session Mid Ruds are simply "Protest, Assert and Decide".

RI rudiments are "Suppress and Invalidate".

ARC Break handling is in accordance with HCO Bulletin of March 14, 1963. Don't continue a session until you find out why the ARC Break.

LRH:dr.bh  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L RON HUBBARD

### **SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE**

21 April 1964

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 APRIL 1964

Central Orgs  
Franchise

*SCIENTOLOGY III*  
**AUDITING BY LISTS**

The earlier genus of this process was Sec Checking on the Joburg. With no reference to these, I recently developed for Level III a process called Auditing by Lists. Any list can be used.

As a preview to the process I asked staff member Roger Biddell to use List One and List Four, normally used for ARC Breaks at Level IV. Their questions were generalized. Instead of "Have I \_\_\_\_\_", "Has there been \_\_\_\_\_" was used. Otherwise the question remained the same as given in the HCO Bulletin for L. 1 and L.4. He ran the process for some hours on a preclear with excellent results and summarized my verbal and written instructions as applied.

**AUDITING BY LISTS**  
**L. 1 AND L.4**

Use meter at sensitivity 16.

Use ARC Break assessment Lists 1 and 4. The questions asked are generalized and without time limiters.

i.e. Has a withhold been missed?  
Have you been given a wrong goal? etc.

Begin with List 1. Ask the first line of this list while watching the meter for an instant read.

If the line does not read, say "That's clean" and move on to the next line of the list and do the same action with this new line.

If the pc has something to say about a line that is clean, let him say it, acknowledge it and then you ask the next line. Don't Q and A.

If the line when asked has an instant read say "That reads" then "What do you consider this could be?" or "What considerations do you have about this?"

Let the pc answer all he wants to. While he is giving his considerations, mark down any blowdowns of the TA and what he was talking of at the moment of the blowdown.

When the pc has given all his considerations say "Thank you. I'll check the line on the meter" and call the line again. If it instant reads say "There's another read here" then again ask for considerations, etc.

Continue these actions until the line goes clean.

When clean say "That's clean" then—

"Of what you have told me on this line, what do you consider the main thing to be here?" (A)

When pc has answered say "Thank you."

Then, “I want to indicate that the meter gave us our biggest blowdown on\_\_\_\_\_and that charge had been bypassed on this.” And in the blank, state the subject that gave the biggest blowdown when the pc talked about it.

If no blowdown then “It seems that the main thing here is \_\_\_\_\_” and give what pc stated in answer to (A).

Then move on to the next line.

When List 1 is completed, do List 4, then List 1, then List 4 and so on.

If running correctly, the TA total should increase from session to session. The pc should get more and more blowdowns on his considerations. Then he should get blowdowns on what he considers the main thing is and finally get blowdowns on your indication of the bypassed charge.

Don’t Q and A. Don’t take up or do anything with the pc’s considerations. Don’t ever say “That *still* reads.” It’s always “*Another* read” as “It *still* reads” makes the pc feel he has not answered the question.

This process gets charge off the case.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :gl.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B was replaced by HCO B 22 May 1965, *Auditing by Lists*, Volume VI-41, which was in turn replaced by HCO B 27 July 1965, same title, Volume VI-64. HCO B 3 July 1971, *Auditing by Lists*, Volume VII-316, replaced this and 22 May 1965 issues, and canceled the 27 July 1965 issue.]

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

28—30 April 1964

** 6404C28	SHSBC-18	Wisdom as an Auditor
** 6404C30	SHSBC-19	Effectiveness of Processing



## **The Workability of Scientology**

**by L. Ron Hubbard**

IT'S THE LITTLE THINGS THAT MAKE SCIENTOLOGY WORK, not the big crashing reasons why the preclear's mind isn't perfect.

It isn't finding what's wrong with the preclear that really counts, it's the auditor's craftsmanlike attention to the little points of auditing that makes for big gains.

Just one effective, received acknowledgment that makes the preclear *know* he's been acknowledged may be worth a dozen processes!

An auditor becomes an auditor when he or she finds out that it's the basics that count.

And this can be very hard to teach. The auditor who is *so* sure that all the errors are explained by the condition of the preclear seldom gets results. And it's results that count. You *can* get results with Scientology and get them rather easily, too, so long as you know that the way the auditing is administered to the preclear is more important than the process run.

An auditor who consistently fails to get results is always the auditor who is most sure that *all* the errors for failure lay with the preclear or Scientology, and never with the auditor's own basics.

How difficult it is to see oneself! How easy it is to blame the other fellow.

When I first started to teach by self-appreciation of one's own auditing here on the Saint Hill Course, even the most veteran auditors were completely baulked. They have surmounted this now, but it was a mighty high hurdle for a while. The saga of it was quite funny. I had the auditor give a session which was recorded on tape. Then I had the auditor listen to his own session to find out his or her errors in basics.

Well! You should have seen some of the early reports I got! I even did an HCO Bulletin to show what to look for, but to no avail!

Some reports gave the session command by command. Some gave all the preclear's errors. Some went Russianesque in "How horrible I am." But at first nobody, just nobody, caught on.

Let me give you the example of the first test made to show what I mean. I taped a session noting needle action and condition of the preclear during session. Then I listened to the tape. And I found that every time the auditor had gotten a dirty needle or a bad reaction from the preclear, the auditor some minutes or seconds *before* had slipped up on his basics. In other words I found that these basic errors were causing all the bad preclear reactions.

I found that *the auditor made the session always and the preclear never*. The preclear got better because the auditor audited with smooth basics or got roughed up

Copyright © 1964 by L. Ron Hubbard. All Rights Reserved.

because the basics skidded a bit—a slip-up on an acknowledgment, an over-hasty command, a failure to let the preclear fully answer the question. Seconds or minutes later, a bad reaction appeared in the preclear.

As a result of such studies of taped sessions, my complete conclusion is that it is only the auditor's handling of the session that makes the session. There is nobody and nothing else to blame. Because the preclear's bad reaction comes *later* than the auditor's skid in the basics, the auditor often does not connect his error with the preclear's reaction and thinks it is just the way the preclear is.

You'd think this would be easy to learn; but no, student reports continued to come in about their taped sessions that completely avoided the point. These reports described anything and everything except the Auditor as Cause.

Examples: "The session went badly because the preclear had had no sleep." "The session was slow because the preclear had a present time problem." "It was late in the evening, and the preclear always has a high tone arm after 9:00 p.m." "The Instructor had given me another process, so when I tried to change the preclear got upset." "This preclear is always critical of auditors." "I had to end off because the preclear was upset."

Horrible. In no case was the auditor making the session. The session always depended on outer influences. Next thing I'd have heard, "We didn't have a good session because the stars were not in the preclear's favor."

Then some light began to dawn here and there and they started to make it. The students began to see that the failure of the preclear to progress was due to auditor errors, not preclear meanness. And these are the things the students learned:

The preclear's upset is traced back to a failure to acknowledge well, to chopping the preclear's communication, to a failure to give the preclear something to answer, to evaluation, to invalidation—not to the late hour or the position of Saturn.

An auditing session is made. It doesn't just happen. ARC Breaks are constructed out of bad basics. Failures to improve a preclear begin with failures to do good TRs.

An auditing session gets wins only when the auditor is right there running it and running it smoothly.

The whole essence of auditing is *not* finding what is wrong with the preclear and hammering at it. That's a medical-surgical approach, not a way to betterment. The essence of auditing is ARC handled and controlled by the auditor.

The auditor gives the preclear something to answer. The preclear answers it and when the preclear has answered it to his or her satisfaction, the auditor acknowledges it. That's auditing. That's why auditing works. That's why the tone arm moves. That's why the preclear gets better.

But that simple cycle can have a thousand ways to go wrong. The auditor gives the preclear something the preclear doesn't understand and can't answer. The preclear isn't permitted to complete his or her answer. The preclear answers fully and then never gets acknowledged for it and rambles on.

*Those* are the things self-appreciation of one's auditing should reveal.

Scientology has been getting fine results for a dozen years. In the hands of a good auditor, there are no big case failures. So it isn't the techniques.

It's this: What *is* a good auditor?

A good auditor is one who knows Scientology and its techniques and who *audits with all basics in*. That's a primary thing we stress in training here at Saint Hill.

A good auditor gives the preclear something to do that the preclear can do, lets the preclear do it, and, when the preclear has, acknowledges well that the preclear has done it and promptly gives the preclear something to do. A good auditor never evaluates or invalidates. A good auditor understands what the preclear has said and never goes on until he or she *has* understood what the preclear said.

A technically skilled auditor can choose the very best processes, but unless these are run with all basics in, the wins are few.

That's why I started the Saint Hill Course—to make good auditors become good auditors who could also make good auditors.

It's been successful in the extreme here at Saint Hill.

But it's still a battle with basics.

For whatever else an auditor must know about the mind, however valid the technology, it takes plain down-to-earth good auditing to pull preclears through.

For the *only* reason *any* process works is the auditor's handling of the session and the basics of the auditing cycle.

Record some of a session you give, on tape. Note the rough spots for the preclear in the session while you give it. Play back the tape in private and spot exactly where and how each subsequent rough spot was caused by the failure of the auditor to observe basics.

Suddenly it shows up like a crashed airplane at a picnic. The auditor caused those rough bits the preclear went through—and the auditor caused them by failing to observe the simple basics.

There may be lots of other reasons, too, but these don't give the preclear a rough time. They only make the pc's progress fast or slow.

Preclears don't fail because Scientology doesn't work. Preclears fail only when Scientology isn't administered with all basics in.

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 MAY 1964

Central Orgs  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

**CLASS II MODEL SESSION**

(Amends and cancels HCO Bulletin of 4 March 1964.)

The Class II Model Session has the benefit of requiring no other Rudiments process (except in the Havingness Questions) than the question itself. There are, therefore, no additional processes except Havingness.

Beware of *any* Q and A in using this script (HCO Bulletin 24 May 1962 [1] ).

Don't stray off Model Session into unusual questions or processes. Use Model Session as the surround for processes to be run on the pc. Don't use it as a process.

Questions are asked of the pc and not checked on the needle. Auditor watches meter and records TA.

**SESSION PRELIMINARIES**

All auditing sessions have the following preliminaries done in this order.

1. Seat the pc and adjust his or her chair.
2. Clear the Auditing room with "Is it all right to audit in this room?" (not metered).
3. Can squeeze, "Put your hands in your lap." "Squeeze the cans, please." And note that pc registers on the meter by the squeeze read on the meter, and note the level of the pc's havingness. (Don't run hav here.)
4. Put in R Factor by telling pc briefly what you are going to do in the session. (What you intend to run.)

***START OF SESSION:***

Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

START OF SESSION.

Has this session started for you? (If pc says, No, say again, START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you?)

***BEGINNING RUDIMENTS:***

*GLL:* What goals would you like to set for this session?

*O/W:* One would run General O/W if the pc was emotionally upset at the beginning of the session or if the session did not start for the pc, the latter being simply another indication of the pc's being upset or ARC broken, but these symptoms must be present, as sometimes the session hasn't started merely because of poor Tone 40 or because the pc had something he wanted to say before the auditor started the session.

***RUNNING O/W:***

If it is all right with you, I am going to run a short, general process. The process is: "What have you done?", "What have you withheld?" (The process is run very

permissively until the needle looks smooth and the pc is no longer emotionally disturbed.)

Where are you now on the time track?

If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process. (After each command, ask, "When?")

That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?

End of process.

*Aud:* Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?

*W/h:* Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? (If pc says, Yes) What was it?

*PTP:* Do you have a present time problem? What is the problem?

#### ***START OF PROCESS:***

Now I would like to run this process on you (name it). What would you say to that? (Get pc's agreement; if not obtainable, choose another process unless old process is not complete.)

#### ***MIDDLE RUDIMENTS:***

In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal, or been careful of? What was it?

#### ***END OF PROCESS NON-CYCLICAL:***

If it is all right with you, I will give this command two more times and then end this process. (Gives command two more times.)

Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process? End of process.

#### ***END OF PROCESS CYCLICAL:***

Where are you now on the time track?

If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process. (After each command, ask, "When?")

That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?

End of process.

#### ***END RUDIMENTS:***

*1/2-UnT:* In this session, have you told me any half-truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me, or tried to damage anyone? What was it?

*? or C:* In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command? What question or command did you fail to answer?

*Dec:* In this session, is there anything you have decided? What was it?

*W/h:* In this session, have you thought, said, or done anything I have failed to find out? What was it?

*Aud:* In this session, has anything been misunderstood? What was it?

#### ***GOALS & GAINS:***

Have you made any of these goals for this session? "Thank you for making these goals for this session," or "Thank you for making some of these goals for this

session. I'm sorry you didn't make all of them," or "I'm sorry you didn't make these goals for this session."

Have you made any gains in this session that you would care to mention? "Thank you for making these gains for this session," or "I'm sorry you didn't make any gains for this session."

*Env:* In this session, was the room all right? (If can squeeze denotes down havingness, run hav.)

### **END OF SESSION:**

Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?

Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

END OF SESSION. Has this session ended for you? (If pc says, No, repeat, END OF SESSION. If session still not ended, say, "The session has been ended.")

Most flagrant errors that can be made:

1. Fumbling with script, not knowing Model Session.
2. Failing to get in the R Factor by telling pc what you are going to do at each new step.
3. Doing only what the pc suggests.
4. Adding unusual questions or remarks or making sudden irrelevant statements.
5. Using parts of Model Session as repetitive processes which deter the completion of auditing cycles already begun.
6. Failure to complete the Auditing Comm Cycle on any part of Model Session.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### **SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

19 May—2 July 1964

** 6405C19	SHSBC-20	The Preclear and Getting Auditing to Work
6406C04	SHSBC-21	R6 Auditing Skills
** 6406C09	SHSBC-22	The Cycle of Action—Its Interpretation on the E-Meter
** 6406C16	SHSBC-23	"Communication" Overts and Responsibility
** 6406C18	SHSBC-24	Studying, Introduction; also issued as ST-1
** 6406C30	SHSBC-25	Cause Level, OT and the Public
** 6407C02	SHSBC-26	O/W Modernized and Reviewed

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 MAY 1964

Sthil Course

**AUDITING ASSIGNMENTS**

(If this bulletin contradicts any existing practice,  
this bulletin is the correct practice to follow.)

Student auditing assignments are outlined by Auditing Supervisors and checked off by the Case Supervisor on the Auditing Check Sheet.

In general, any student on arrival progresses rapidly up from Level I to Level IV auditing in the general auditing periods, remaining in a level only long enough to demonstrate ability to get TA at that level and perform it beneficially on the pc and get a check out.

Difficult pcs are given special examination and reorientation on O/Ws and the workability of "treatment" or "processing".

The student then passes into the comm cycle processes of the Level VI check sheet and all further auditing prior to Classification examination (before entering Level VI Co-Audit) is devoted to the skills and drills required of a Level VI Auditor.

After Classification examination, upon passing, the student enters into the Level VI Co-Audit.

The first action in the Level VI Co-Audit is to find parts of existence the pc may be hung up in and somewhat release the pc from them by *this lifetime* considerations of the part of existence found. It does not matter if these parts found are in the GPMs or not. The action here is destimulative in intent not restimulative.

The student is then entered upon Actual GPMs and auditing progresses on these exactly as directed and in no other way until the completion of the case.

**SUMMARY**

It is no part of instruction to hang the student auditor up at Levels I to IV or to unnecessarily prolong stays in "Level Units". The entire matter is one of demonstrated skill not time spent.

Students on course, by the general one-upmanship, may knock about lower level students with high-powered material for which the lower student is not ready. This sometimes causes restim at lower levels. This restim is *not* to be handled in any other way than getting BMRs in upon the week or by considerations during a certain specified time such as "This week, what considerations have you had about\_\_\_\_" whatever the restim was.

Students trying to do Track Analysis during sessions in lower units than the Level VI Co-Audit or generally prepchecking any of the materials of Level VI should be given heavy technical infractions.

Lower level materials, Itsa, repetitive processes, and particularly General O/W are quite adequate to handle any student case difficulty. Dabbling with goals or Items or GPMs at these levels is expressly forbidden. The only exception is a prepcheck at Level IV on known wrong goals previously found on the pc, and this is done only when ordered by an Auditing Supervisor.

It is to be particularly noted by the Case Supervisor that students trying to "blow" do so only after the matter has *not* been confronted and handled in routine supervision. Left unhandled, situations become blows.

Rapidity of course progress depends in large measure on rigid adherence to the Auditing levels as above.

LRH: dr.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

CenOCon  
Not MA  
HCO Secs: Check  
out on all staff

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 JUNE 1964

*SCIENTOLOGY II TO IV*  
*STAR RATED IN ALL ACADEMIES & SAINT HILL*

**CENTRAL ORG AND FIELD AUDITOR TARGETS**

It has been quite dicey keeping an organization or a practice running with all this talk of OTs at Saint Hill and nobody to make OTs in orgs or field.

I have been giving a lot of thought to this matter and have resolved it.

However, when all the publicity is "Go OT" and nobody in orgs or field at this writing has the data or classification to process to OT, the public loses its target and it becomes pretty hard to sell auditing or training at lower levels.

Part of the fault is that the public desires to "go all the way instantly" and cannot see gradient progress. They "go for broke" always. *But* part of the fault, if there is any, lies in the org or field activity that *permits* this to happen and even forwards it.

There's an awful lot of technology south of Six. I could take almost any chunk of it and be entirely successful in running an org or a field practice. Shucks, I had no shadow of what we have now below IV when I was running a howling success of a practice in Hollywood. I didn't even have a name, was indeed anonymous. So I know it isn't quantity of knowledge or even fame that makes success. *It's using AND PLUGGING* what you've got. You sell what you can do. And as that's more, in Dianetics and Scientology, than anyone else could ever do, you can't help but succeed.

It isn't using a lot of things indifferently that counts. It's using something you know well very well indeed.

And it isn't putting people's attention on 40 dozen targets that gets them to be trained or processed, it's getting their attention on one thing that can become *real* to them *soon*.

So any reason beyond pure admin goofs that anybody in the field or an org would do poorly lies in just two things:

1. Not doing one technical thing well and
2. Not keeping people's attention directed at it *and nothing else*.

When an auditor knows seventy processes indifferently he knows none.

When one directs people's attention at 40 dozen targets one disperses them and they don't want training or processing as they *don't know what to have*, since they can't tell what's there.

You have to be skilled on one process at least and know all about it before you can do two. If anyone were to make a good study of 8C and do it well, and do nothing else for any case, a high percentage of pc wins would occur.

If one told his pcs or public that "the reason they were unable to cope was that they were flinching from their environment" and then did only 8C one would get a heavy flow of traffic. By pounding the same drum and doing the same thing one is finally heard. There's an old rule "What I tell you three times is true." If people don't hear the same thing being said at least three times, they believe it is impermanent.

One can easily become possessed of an urge for "newness". That way one need not finish any action cycles or go through the same motions twice. But this is actually a deadly disease, the disease of "the latest". It is non-duplication extremis. When one does only the latest one never gets a chance to understand or become skilled in anything.



So we suffer, where we do, in orgs and field by a failure to master one action and centre people's attention upon it as a desirable result.

So if we can get this one point well agreed upon and utilized we will be able to:

1. Master a beneficial skill in Scientology and
2. Centre people's attention on one definite result.

Now, of course, I am talking from strength since Level VI is as wrapped up as a Christmas present. All the patterns and ways to run and the discipline of auditing it are all there. Pcs here change before your very eyes. Man G, Man K. Girl G on Monday becomes super girl K on Friday. The drawbacks of this Level are:

1. The ardours of training even a skilled auditor up to it
2. The vast quantity of material to be run
3. The dazzling aspect of it, often too great for belief until one experiences it, and
4. The impatience of people to attain it before they're ready for it.

It will take 2 or 3 years before orgs can deliver it routinely. Meanwhile their public is all distracted by it. And in the very grasp of success the hamburger vanishes from view for the Central Org and the field auditor, "Beside the fountain's brink they die of thirst."

Two things must be done:

1. Close the delivery gap *fast*. Get auditors to Saint Hill and get them trained. (Your best, please, not those that can be spared. For the poor ones can't reach the bottom rung in under a year of *below VI* training, so it's uneconomical not to send the whizzes.)
2. Brighten up a skill that *can* be locally done on purely local training, and
3. Centre the public's interest on a target that can be locally delivered.

This is the proposed programme, then, just 1, 2 and 3 above.

It would be an error to pound "OT the only target" into people's skulls. Announce it with a hurrah, yes. But *pound* in another shorter target they already have and can attain reality on.

Now fortunately for the org and field auditor there is a vital preparation necessary for Level VI. It is a real, true technical preparation.

**EVEN WHEN YOU ARE DELIVERING R6 TO THE PUBLIC ROUTINELY YOU WILL BE RUNNING PCs ON THIS FIRST FOR HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS OF HOURS.**

You had better learn to profit by it.

The preparation is this:

Those preclears who are insufficiently *Cause* in their daily lives cannot as-is the bank. You could throw them in to GPMs but nothing would happen to the GPMs—only to the pc.

We have a true tiger by the tail. Take Man X off Times Square, pitch him into GPMs and he wouldn't go OT, he'd go rheumatic. Why? He can't as-is the significances and masses.

This will be found exclamationarily true of some 99 percent of the pcs.

Auditors are different. They can confront more. But nine out of twenty-five auditors break a leg over commas in GPMs when they are pc-ing. One sneeze and the

meter locks up. One error in sequence and it's a ten auditing hour battle to find and get the charge off that error.

In carefully studying this I found there were pcs Type A and Type B. Type A runs easily even across errors. Type B packs up the meter on a cough. NINETY-NINE PERCENT OF YOUR PRECLEARS ARE OR WERE ORIGINALLY TYPE B.

There are special differences in these two types.

Type A: Has few personal problems. Even when they occur isn't upset by them. Handles life easily. Is energetic generally and able to work efficiently at things. Takes setbacks optimistically. Feels good most of the time.

Type B: Is deluged with personal problems. Can't see any way out. Gets upset easily or is just in plain apathy and is never upset because things aren't real anyway (like a boulder wouldn't get upset). Has a hard time in life. Is generally tired and can't work very long at anything. Takes setbacks emotionally or just collapses. Feels ill most of the time.

Those are two types of people. There are of course shades of grey in between.

If you were to take a Type B and throw him or her to the GPMs you'd *not get anything as-ised*.

What is the basic difference, then, between these two types of condition? It isn't native or inherent. It can change.

If you tire a Type A out you can make him or her *behave* on GPMs like a Type B. If you audit a Type A with the Auditor's Code clauses of food and rest wildly disobeyed, you would be auditing, suddenly, a Type B pc. The Type A will spring back faster of course but still he or she during that period will have a packed up meter.

You could also inexpertly audit a Type A on wrong goals or sequences and get a Type B pc reaction.

A difference between these two types of people is that one is more rested (Type A) and one is tired (Type B). You can see this at any level of processing. It registers in the amount of TA you get or don't get. A chronically tired pc who is not eating won't get TA for there's no as-is of locks. That's why the Auditor's Code has those clauses in it. *Make your pc rest and eat* and keep him or her out of a tiring environment and you'll get a *lot* more TA. If a pc gets *no* TA, just make him or her eat and sleep and leave the world alone for a bit and bang—TA!

But it isn't only physical weariness. The other, main factor we're interested in is why they're also tired.

A Type B *can't be Cause!*

Life flows in, in, in. The pc can't flow out. Here is the pc who can only *receive* auditing. Never give any. Here is the pc who has to be HELPED but never really helps. Here is the pc who has motivators but *never* any overts.

Now, you see?

It takes those lower grades to raise the pc's Cause Level so that the pc, on reaching Grade VI *can* as-is the bank. ONLY CAREFUL LOWER LEVEL AUDITING CAN MAKE A TYPE B PC INTO A TYPE A!

We are running into this problem at Saint Hill now. Even an occasional auditor, arriving here, is found to be below Cause. They can't as-is. Also they can't put an examination answer back on the sheet. So they are here for quite a while and all that time we now work on raising their Cause Level so they can:

1. Use what they learn (that takes outflow)
2. As-is their PTPs (that takes the ability to be Cause)
3. Get up to Level VI materials without fainting at the sight of them and

4. As-is GPMs.

That's the fight of the Supervisors at Saint Hill. Well, it's also our fight all over the world.

The state of high Cause is also *Keyed Out Clear*.

So your programme is to:

1. Become very skilled with and successfully use processes which lead toward Keyed Out Clear and
2. Centre the attention of your public on "A Keyed Out can be Cause". Get trained. Be Cause. And in small type "You have to attain a high Cause Level before you can even begin to think about OT processing."

*That puts* their feet on the bottom rung of OT. And so help me how true, *it's* the only way they'll ever make that bottom rung!

From time to time I will give you more concise data on old materials which bring this beneficial condition about. This one we have done well, can do and will do—to increase Cause in a person.

Suffice to say that 8C, and O/W in particular run alternately:

"In this lifetime, what have you done?"

"In this lifetime, what haven't you said?"

or just Itsa on *any* action (not just bad actions) will start your pc up toward that bottom rung.

*Only realization of actions done will key out a GPM.* That's worth a million words. Suffice it in that sentence. Not evil actions. Not confessions. Not just social unwillingness to let one's deeds be known. *Any* action. *Any* not speaking.

And a person's Cause Level will rise. Their psychosomatics key out (for what is a psychosomatic but an inability to hold life off?). They feel better. They begin to live. Their needles get floppy.

*This is* destimulative auditing.

If you learn it well and do it well, your pc will thrive.

If you centre your public's attention on becoming cause you will have bodies in the shop.

And that's the *approach* to the bridge. Without that approach they don't make it *at all*.

So you're in business. And it isn't a business you'll cease to be in just because you can "do R6 on a pc". You'll only make the mistake once and take the pc back to exactly what I'm describing in this HCO Bulletin. So learn to do this well. We'll be doing it for a long time. And doing it right now can save your practice or org.

LRH:gl.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

[On 30 June 1964 another HCO B was issued titled *Field Auditor Targets* which had the same text as this HCO B, except for the following: The distribution was only to "Franchise"; instead of the seven lines after "Two things must be done:" on the second page of this issue, it said, "1. Close the delivery gap *fast*. Get to Saint Hill and get trained. 2. Brighten up a skill that you can do with your current training and centre the public's interest on a target that you can deliver now on the lower levels. This is the proposed programme, then, just 1 and 2 above." Also, the word "Org(s)" was omitted or replaced by the word "Field" throughout.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 JULY 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

*SCIENTOLOGY III & IV*

**JUSTIFICATIONS**

The reasons overts are overts to people is JUSTIFICATIONS.

If you ask a pc what overt he has committed, and then ask him why it wasn't an overt, you will find that it wasn't an overt and therefore didn't relieve as an answer because it was all justified.

One of the powerful new overt processes (as given by me on recent tapes) is:

1. In this lifetime what overt have you committed?
2. How have you justified it?

2. is run flat until the overt given in 1. is knocked out. Then a new overt is found and 2. is done thoroughly and repetitively on it.

This is not a new form of process but these are very new commands.

Note it is *not* an alternate command. Note that a cycle of action is completed with question 2. or 1. before you leave off processing this particular overt. Only when you have all the justifications and cognitions possible on 1. do you ask for a new overt from the pc.

This cracks the general irresponsibility the auditor is met with in trying to get O/W to benefit the irresponsible case.

"In this lifetime" is added because the pc who can't face his overts not only justifies them but goes way back into his past lives to find overts instead of getting off the simple this lifetime ones.

This is not the same process as plain "What have you done?" in which any action done by the pc is accepted as the answer.

However in simple general O/W you will find the pc is *not* answering the auditing question but is answering "What have I done that caused my trouble?" The pc is running "What action that I have done explains what has happened to me? "

Therefore running justifications off is a further south process than any earlier version of O/W and is very effective in raising the Cause Level of the pc.

LRH:nb.rd  
Copyright ©1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

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  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JULY 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Franchise

**OVERTS—ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING**

*(STAR RATED except for Forbidden Words List)*

It will be found in processing the various case levels that running overts is very effective in raising the cause level of a pc.

The scale, on actual tests of running various levels of pc response, is seen to go something like this:

I ITSA — Letting a pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about self with little or no auditor direction.

I ITSA — Letting a pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about others, with little or no auditor direction.

II REPETITIVE O/W — Using merely “In this lifetime what have you done?”  
“What haven’t you done?” Alternate.

III ASSESSMENT BY LIST — Using existing or specially prepared lists of possible overts, cleaning the meter each time it reads on a question and using the question only so long as it reads.

IV JUSTIFICATIONS — Asking the pc what he or she has done and then using that one instance (if applicable) finding out why “that” was *not* an overt.

Advice enters into this under the heading of instruction: “You’re upset about that person because you’ve done something to that person.”

Dynamics also permissively enter into this above Level I but the pc wanders around amongst them. In Level III one can also direct attention to the various dynamics by first assessing them and then using or preparing a list for the dynamic found.

**RESPONSIBILITY**

There is no reason to expect any great pc responsibility for his or her own overts below Level IV and the auditor seeking to make the pc feel or take responsibility for overts is just pushing the pc down. The pc will resent being made feel guilty. Indeed the auditor may only achieve that, not case gain. And the pc will ARC break.

At Level IV one begins on this subject of responsibility but again it is indirectly the target. There is no need now to run Responsibility in doing O/Ws.

The realization that one has *really* done something is a return of responsibility and this gain is best obtained only by indirect approach as in the above processes.

**ARC BREAKS**

The commonest cause of failure in running overt acts is “cleaning cleans” whether or not one is using a meter. The pc who really has more to tell doesn’t ARC Break when the Auditor continues to ask for one but may snarl and eventually give it up.

On the other hand leaving an overt touched on the case and calling it clean *will* cause a *future* ARC Break with the auditor.

“Have you told all?” prevents cleaning a clean. On the unmetered pc one can see the pc brighten up. On the meter you get a nice fall if it’s true that all is told.

“Have I not found out about something?” prevents leaving an overt undisclosed. On the unmetered pc the reaction is a sly flinch. On a metered pc it gives a read.

A pc’s *protest* against a question will also be visible in an unmetered pc in a reeling sort of exasperation which eventually becomes a howl of pure bafflement at why the auditor won’t accept the answer that that’s all. On a meter protest of a question falls on being asked for: “Is this question being protested?”

There is no real excuse for ARC Breaking a pc by

1. Demanding more than is there or
2. Leaving an overt undisclosed that will later make the pc upset with the auditor.

### FORBIDDEN WORDS

Do not use the following words in auditing commands. While they can be used in discussion or nomenclature, for various good reasons they should be avoided now in an auditing command:

Responsibility	(ies)
Justification	(s)
Withhold	(s)
Failed	(ures)
Difficulty	(ies)
Desire	(s)
Here	
There	
Compulsion	(s) (ively)
Obsession	(s) (ively)

No unusual restraint should be given these words. Just don’t frame a command that includes them. Use something else.

### WHY OVERTS WORK

Overts give the highest gain in raising cause level because they are the biggest reason why a person restrains himself and withholds self from action.

Man is basically good. But the reactive mind tends to force him into evil actions. These evil actions are instinctively regretted and the individual tries to refrain from doing *anything* at all. The “best” remedy, the individual thinks, is to withhold. “If I commit evil actions, then my best guarantee for not committing is to do *nothing* whatever.” Thus we have the “*lazy*”, inactive person.

Others who try to make an individual guilty for committing evil actions only increase this tendency to laziness.

Punishment is supposed to bring about inaction. And it does. In some unexpected ways.

However, there is also an inversion (a turn about) where the individual sinks *below* recognition of *any* action. The individual in such a state cannot conceive of *any* action and therefore cannot withhold action. And thus we have the criminal who can’t act really but can only re-act and is without any self direction. This is why punishment

does not cure criminality but in actual fact creates it; the individual is driven below withholding or any recognition of any action. A thief's hands stole the jewel, the thief was merely an innocent spectator to the action of his own hands. Criminals are very sick people physically.

So there is a level below withholding that an auditor should be alert to in some pcs, for these "have no withholds" and "have done nothing". All of which, seen through *their* eyes is true. They are merely saying "I cannot restrain myself" and "I have not willed myself to do what I have done."

The road out for such a case is the same as that for any other case. It is just longer. The processes for levels above hold also for such cases. But don't be anxious to see a *sudden* return of responsibility, for the first owned "done" that this person *knows* he or she has done may be "ate breakfast". Don't disdain such answers in Level II particularly. Rather, in such people, seek such answers.

There is another type of case in all this, just one more to end the list. This is the case who never runs O/W but "seeks the explanation of what I did that made it all happen to me".

This person easily goes into past lives for answers. Their reaction to a question about what they've done is to try to find out what they did that earned all those motivators. That, of course, isn't running the process and the auditor should be alert for it and stop it when it is happening.

This type of case goes into its extreme on guilt. It dreams up overts to explain why. After most big murders the police routinely have a dozen or two people come around and confess. You see, if they had done the murder, this would explain why they feel guilty. As a terror stomach is pretty awful grim to live with, one is apt to seek any explanation for it if it will only explain it.

On such cases the same approach as given works, but one should be *very* careful not to let the pc get off overts the pc didn't commit.

Such a pc (recognizable by the ease they dive into the extreme past) when being audited off a meter gets more and more frantic and wilder and wilder in overts reported. They should get calmer under processing, of course, but the false overts make them frantic and hectic in a session. On a meter one simply checks for "Have you told me anything beyond what really has occurred?" Or "Have you told me any untruths?"

The observation and meter guides given in this section are used during a session when they apply but not systematically such as after every pc answer. These observations and meter guides are used always at the end of every session on the pcs to whom they apply.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: nb. cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B was reissued on 5 December 1974, as Integrity Processing Series 6R, which was canceled by HCO B 9 December 1974, *Effectiveness of Overts in Processing*, Integrity Processing Series 6RA. HCO B 9 December 1974 was taken from HCO B 10 July 1964 which remains as originally issued.]

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE**  
9 July 1964

\*\* 6407C09      SHSBC-28      Studying—Data Assimilation; also issued as ST-2



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JULY 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

*SCIENTOLOGY I to IV*

**MORE ON O/Ws**

The Itsa processes for O/W are almost unlimited.

There is, however, the distinct *must not* at Level I, as at upper Levels, **DON'T RUN A PROCESS THAT MAKES THE PC FEEL ACCUSED.**

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

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

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

Here are some varied Level I Processes:

“Tell me some things you think you should not have done.”

“Tell me what you’ve done that got you into trouble.”

“What wouldn’t you do over again?”

“What are some things a person shouldn’t say?”

“What gets a person into trouble?”

“What have you done that you regret?”

“What have you said you wish you hadn’t?”

“What have you advised others to do?”

There are many more.

These at Level II all convert to repetitive processes.

At Level III such processes convert to lists.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
14—15 July 1964

** 6407C14	SHSBC-29	Track and Bank Anatomy
** 6407C15	SHSBC-30	Organizational Operation

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 JULY AD14

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Franchise

*SCIENTOLOGY III & IV*

**TA COUNTERS, USE OF**

With the advent of the TONE ARM COUNTER new problems arise in Auditing and Auditing supervision.

Without an adequate written record of time and "TA" (by which is meant the total number of divisions down a tone arm has moved accurately in a unit of time such as 20 minutes or a 21/2 hr session) one does not know whether or not a process was flattened. A process is considered "flat" when it produces no more than .25 div of TA in 20 minutes. The auditor can't recheck the last 20 minutes because he has no time noted and no Tone Arm notations. Therefore he or she audits by guess and leaves process cycles of action on the case either unflat or overflattened. This alone is enough to upset pcs.

Further, when two processes have been run in a session and only a counter was used, an auditing supervisor has no idea at all of whether one was flattened before the other was begun.

Also "TA" for a session can be a gross error by reason of poor handling of the Tone Arm. If an auditor fails to set the Tone Arm accurately each time the needle moves from "set" on the dial, *less* TA is shown for the session.

If the auditor habitually overworks the Tone Arm, setting it further than it should have gone to bring the needle to "set", either up or down, then the TA Counter will show far more TA for the session than really happened.

The way to handle this dilemma is to use the TA Counter only for a rough estimate of TA for a session (or process) and to continue to record Tone Arm action at Levels III and IV. (One is too busy at Levels V and VI and by that time should be able to rely on the counter as TA in such sessions is very large.)

The Tone Arm is *never* touched during sneezing, body motion, etc, and no recording is made. But if the TA blew down because of it, the fact is noted in the worksheet column and the new reading entered.

All meter auditing below Level V should be recorded by Time and Tone Arm position.

To so record TA it is not necessary to use several pounds of Auditor's Report forms. One uses one Auditor's Report form to report on the session and similar sized rough work sheets to record Time, TA position and what is going on. These rough work sheets are divided into two or three vertical columns with a ball-point pen and each one of these is split in half vertically. In the first column enter time, in the second enter TA notes of where the Tone Arm is at that time. Take Tone Arm readings only with the needle at "set". If something noteworthy occurs write it across these two columns, using the spaces of Time and TA position for a brief note and below it going on with the Time and TA position notes.

One writes down the TA position with the time it happened only when the Tone Arm needs to be moved to bring the needle back to "set". A needle that moves but comes back at once (within 1 or 2 seconds) to "set" is not recorded. Point One (.1) division changes are not recorded as too minute.

One fills up these three double columns, turns over the sheet and does the same on the back.

Printed Auditor's Reports are *never* used as work sheets. They give the details of the beginning of the session, condition of pc, what's intended, the wording of the process, etc. Then one goes to work sheets and only returns to the Auditor's Report, which is half empty, to complete the session and end it off with pc goals and gains and all that. The TA Counter is then read and written on the report.

This is all so written that one can see the whole session at a glance, including TA total, just by looking at the one side of the Auditor's Report form. On that one side the session begins, ends, and by seeing how the pc *was* at start and is at the end, and the TA Counter read, what was done and the success or failure of the session is grasped at a glance.

In trying to analyze the session and help the pc more, one inspects the *work sheets*.

When the session is completed, the work sheets are put in proper sequence (sequence quite visible because of the time notations), the Auditor's Report is put face up on top and the lot are all stapled together by the left-hand corner. If an ordinary stapler won't do it easily for a 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> hr session, far too many notations are being made, for no III or IV pc is *that* active.

Faults of Tone Arm handling (over or under setting of it by the auditor) show up, process flattening can be traced, changes of process can be seen and the auditor or the auditing supervisor can find out what really happened.

I myself wouldn't know how to guide the next session at Levels III and IV if I didn't have a record of TA of the last session to inspect, whether the session were mine or another's. Such delicate judgements as "was the TA just working into the process" or "was the processing dying down" or "was it being overflattened" just can't be answered by the auditor himself, much less an auditing supervisor if no Time-TA record exists.

Also, don't take a Tone Arm reading "every 2 minutes" or "every minute". That's poor because such timed readings tell nothing. When the TA has to be moved more than .1 divisions to keep the needle at set, one notes Time and the new Tone Arm reading. That's the only answer to how often one reads and notes TA action.

Changes of process are noted across both Time and Tone Arm columns but also at session ending noted on the Auditor's Report. One doesn't often change processes and only when the old one has (1) had time to get the TA worked *into* it (2) had the TA worked out of it and (3) the old one produces only .25 divisions of TA action in a consecutive 20 minutes of auditing.

The Tone Arm Counter is a must or one spends ages adding up his session TA when he needs lunch or a break. But it jolly well never can supplant a work sheet. Automation can only go so far. Tone Arm Counters can't think. The Auditors I train can.

LRH:nb.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

**SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**  
28—30 July 1964

** 6407C28	SHSBC-31	Campaign to Handle Psychosomatic Ills
** 6407C30	SHSBC-32	Psychosomatic—Its Meaning in Scientology

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 JULY 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil

*SCIENTOLOGY I to IV*

**GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS**

The following list of good indicators was compiled from my lecture tapes by John Galusha. An additional three are added at the end.

*Lower Level Good Indicators.*

1. Pc cheerful or getting more cheerful.
2. Pc cogniting.
3. Fundamental rightnesses of pcs asserting themselves.
4. Pc giving things to auditor briefly and accurately.
5. Pc finding things rapidly.
6. Meter reading properly.
7. What's being done giving proper meter response.
8. What's being found giving proper meter response.
9. Pc running rapidly and flattening by TA or cognitions.
10. Pc giving auditor information easily.
11. Needle cleanly swinging about.
12. Pc running easily and if pc encounters somatics they are discharging.
13. Tone Arm goes down when pc hits a cognition.
14. Further TA blowdown as pc continues to talk about something.
15. Expected meter behaviour and nothing unexpected in meter behaviour.
16. Pc gets warm and stays warm in auditing or gets hot and unheats while in auditing.
17. Pc has occasional somatics of brief duration.
18. Tone Arm operating in the range 2.25 to 3.5.
19. Good TA action on spotting things.
20. Meter reading well on what pc and auditor think is wrong.
21. Pc not much troubled with PTPs and they are easily handled when they occur.
22. Pc stays certain of the auditing solution.
23. Pc happy and satisfied with auditor regardless of what auditor is doing.
24. Pc not protesting auditor's actions.
25. Pc looking better by reason of auditing.
26. Pc feeling more energetic.
27. Pc without pains, aches or illnesses developing during auditing. Does not mean pc shouldn't have somatics. Means pc shouldn't get sick.
28. Pc wanting more auditing.
29. Pc confident and getting more confident.
30. Pc's Itsa free but only covers subject.
31. Auditor easily seeing how it was or is on pc's case by reason of pc's explanations.
32. Pc's ability to Itsa and confront improving.
33. Pc's bank getting straightened out.
34. Pc comfortable in the auditing environment.
35. Pc appearing for auditing on his own volition.
36. Pc on time for session and willing and ready to be audited but without anxiety about it.
37. Pc's trouble in life progressively lessening.
38. Pc's attention becoming freer and more under pc's control.
39. Pc getting more interested in data and technology of Scientology.
40. Pc's havingness in life and livingness improving.
41. Pc's environment becoming more easily handled.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nb.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 AUGUST AD14

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

*SCIENTOLOGY TWO*

**PREPCHECK BUTTONS**

(Cancels previous issues)

The following order and number of Prepcheck Buttons should be used wherever “an 18 button Prepcheck” is recommended. Do not use the old order of buttons.

The full command is usually “(Time Limiter) (on subject) has anything been\_\_\_\_\_” or “Is there anything you have been\_\_\_\_\_” for some of them which don’t fit with “Has anything been\_\_\_\_\_”. The (on\_\_\_\_\_) may be omitted. The Time Limiter is seldom omitted as it leads the pc to Itsa the Whole Track. On an RRing goal found and used in R3SC the Time Limiter “In this Lifetime” can be used with good effect. All Service Fac questions or Prepchecks must have a Time Limiter.

In running R4 (R3M2), pc’s actual GPMs, the goal and RIs are Prepchecked without a Time Limiter as pc is on the whole track anyway. But in all lower levels of auditing, particularly when using a possible goal as a Service Fac, the Time Limiter, usually “In this Lifetime\_\_\_\_\_”, must be used or pc will become OverRestimulated.

In order to avoid most GPM words, for all uses the 18 Prepcheck Buttons now are:

SUPPRESSED  
CAREFUL OF  
DIDN’T REVEAL  
NOT-ISED  
SUGGESTED  
MISTAKE BEEN MADE  
PROTESTED  
ANXIOUS ABOUT  
DECIDED  
WITHDRAWN FROM  
REACHED  
IGNORED  
STATED  
HELPED  
ALTERED  
REVEALED  
ASSERTED  
AGREED (WITH)

**BIG MID RUDS**

It will be noted that the first 9 are the Big Mid Ruds used as “Since the last time I audited you has anything been\_\_\_\_\_?”

## A USEFUL TIP

To get the Meter clean on a list during nulling the list the easiest system is to show the pc the list and just ask “What happened?” This saves a lot of Mid Ruds.

## TWO USEFUL PAIRS

When trying to get an Item to read, the two buttons *Suppress* and *Not-Ised* are sometimes used as a pair.

To get a pc easier in session the buttons *Protested* and *Decided* are sometimes used as a pair.

## DIRTY NEEDLE

Mid Ruds (called because Middle of Session was the earliest use + Rudiments of a Session) are less employed today because of the discovery that all Dirty Needle phenomena is usually traced to the auditor having *cut* the *pc*'s communication. To get rid of a Dirty Needle one usually need ask only, “Have I cut your Communication?” or do an ARC Break assessment if that doesn't work. A Dirty Needle (continuously agitated) always means the auditor has cut the pc's Itsa Line, no matter what else has happened.

Chronically comm chopping auditors always have pcs with Dirty Needles. Conversely, pcs with high Tone Arms have auditors who don't control the Itsa Line and let it over-stimulate the pc by getting into lists of problems or puzzlements; but a high Tone Arm also means a heavy Service Fac, whereas a Dirty Needle seldom requires Mid Ruds or Prepchecks. It just requires an auditor who doesn't cut the pc's Itsa Line.

## THE OLD ORDER OF PREPCHECK BUTTONS

The following buttons and order were the original buttons and may not be used, as they include GPM words which would make the pc uncomfortable in some cases if over-run.

SUPPRESSED  
INVALIDATED  
BEEN CAREFUL OF  
SUGGESTED  
WITHHELD  
PROTESTED  
HIDDEN  
REVEALED  
MISTAKE (BEEN MADE)  
ASSERTED  
CHANGED (OR ALTERED)  
DAMAGED  
WITHDRAWN (FROM)  
CREATED  
DESTROYED  
AGREED (WITH)  
IGNORED  
DECIDED

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

## **MODEL SESSION**

### **LEVELS III TO VI**

(Cancels previous issues)

#### **SESSION PRELIMINARIES**

All auditing sessions have the following preliminaries done in this order.

1. Seat the pc and adjust his or her chair.
2. Clear the Auditing room with "Is it all right to audit in this room?" (not metered).
3. Can squeeze "Put your hands in your lap." "Squeeze the cans, please." And note that pc registers, by the squeeze, on the meter, and note the level of the pc's havingness. (Don't run hav here.)
4. Put in R Factor by telling pc briefly what you are going to do in the session.

#### ***START OF SESSION:***

5. "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"

"START OF SESSION." (Tone 40)

"Has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No", say again, "START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No", say, "We will cover it in a moment."

#### ***RUDIMENTS:***

6. "What goals would you like to set for this session?"

Please note that Life or Livingness goals have been omitted, as they tend to remind the pc of present time difficulties and tend to take his attention out of the session.

7. At this point in the session there are actions which could be undertaken: the running of General O/W or the running of Mid Rudiments using "Since the last time I audited you", or pull missed W/Hs as indicated. But if pc cheerful and needle smooth, just get down to work.

One would run General O/W if the pc was emotionally upset at the beginning of the session or if the session did not start for the pc, the latter being simply another indication of the pc's being upset or ARC broken, but these symptoms must be present, as sometimes the session hasn't started merely because of poor Tone 40 or because the pc had something he wanted to say before the auditor started the session.

#### ***RUNNING O/W:***

"If it is all right with you, I am going to run a short, general process. The process is: 'What have you done?', 'What have you not done?' " (Another process that could be used is: "What have you said?", "What have you not said?" The process



is run very permissively until the needle looks smooth and the pc is no longer emotionally disturbed.)

“Where are you now on the time track?” “If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process.” (After each command, ask, “When?”) “That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?” “End of process.”

### ***RUNNING THE MID RUDIMENTS:***

One would use the Middle Rudiments with, “Since the last time I audited you”, if the needle was rough and if the Tone Arm was in a higher position than it was at the end of the last session.

#### **ORDER OF BUTTONS**

Here is the correct wording and order of use for the big Mid Ruds.

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suppressed?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been careful of?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you didn’t reveal?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been not-ised?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been suggested?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has any mistake been made?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been protested?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ is there anything you have been anxious about?”

“\_\_\_\_\_ has anything been decided?”

In using the first three buttons (Suppressed, Careful of and Didn’t Reveal), the rudiment question should be asked directly of the pc off the meter (repetitive). When the pc has no more answers, check the question on the meter. If the question reads, stick with it on the meter like in Fast Rud checking until it is clean.

The last six buttons are cleaned directly on the meter as in Fast Ruds.

### ***PULLING MISSED WITHHOLDS:***

Use: “Since the last time you were audited has someone nearly found out something about you?”

### ***BODY OF SESSION:***

8. Now go into the body of the session.

### ***END BODY OF SESSION:***

9. “Is it all right with you if we end the body of the session now?” “Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I do?” “End of the body of the session.”

### ***SMOOTH OUT SESSION:***

10. Smooth out any roughness in the session if there has been any, favouring Suppress, Didn’t Reveal, Protest, Decide, Overts, Asserts, using prefix “In this session\_\_\_\_\_?”

## **GOALS & GAINS:**

11. “Have you made any of these goals for this session?” “Thank you for making these goals for this session” or “Thank you for making some of these goals for this session. I’m sorry you didn’t make all of them” or “I’m sorry you didn’t make these goals for this session.”

“Have you made any gains in this session that you would care to mention?”  
“Thank you for making these gains for this session,” or “I’m sorry you didn’t make any gains for this session.”

## **HAVINGNESS:**

12. (After adjusting the meter) “Put your hands in your lap.” “Please squeeze the cans.” (If the squeeze test was not all right, the Auditor would run the pc’s Havingness process until the can squeeze gives an adequate response.)

## **ENDING SESSION:**

13. “Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?”
14. “Is it all right with you if I end this session now?”
15. “END OF SESSION.” (Tone 40) “Has this session ended for you?” If the pc says, “No”, repeat “END OF SESSION.” If the session still has not ended, say, “You will be getting more auditing. END OF SESSION. Tell me I am no longer auditing you.”

Please note that Havingness is run after Goals and Gains as this tends to bring the pc more into present time and to take his attention to a degree out of the session.

Wording for the above follows the tradition of earlier model sessions.

Adhere severely to this session form. It is nearly an irreducible minimum and is very fast, but it is all necessary.

The Random Rudiment here is “What happened?”

Session Mid Ruds are simply “Protest, Assert and Decide”.

RI rudiments are “Suppress and Not-Ised”.

ARC Break handling is in accordance with HCO Bulletin of Mar. 14, 1963. Don’t continue a session until you find out why the ARC Break.

LRH:jw.bh  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

## **SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES**

4—13 August 1964

** 6408C04	SHSBC-33	A Summary of Study; also issued as ST-3
** 6408C06	SHSBC-34	Study—Gradients and Nomenclature; also issued as ST-4
** 6408C11	SHSBC-35	Evaluation of Information; also issued as ST-5
** 6408C13	SHSBC-36	Study and Education; also issued as ST-6

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

*SCIENTOLOGY I TO IV*

**CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING AND PROCESSING**

Covered in this HCO Bulletin are:

1. The Construction of Clay Tables.
2. Clay Table use in Training.
3. Clay Table Definition Training.
4. Clay Table Use in the HGC.
5. Clay Table HEALING.
6. Clay Table IQ Processing.

**CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING**

THE ONLY REASON ANY STUDENT IS SLOW OR BLOWS LIES IN FAILURE TO UNDERSTAND THE WORDS USED IN HIS OR HER TRAINING.

You will find that students at any level in any course will benefit greatly from Clay Table work on *definitions*.

The importance of this will become apparent as you study our new educational technology, now mainly to be found on the tapes of the few weeks before this date.

A Clay Table is any platform on which a student, standing or sitting, can work comfortably. In an Academy it may be 3 feet by 3 feet or 5 feet by 3 feet or any larger size. Smaller sizes are not useful. In the HGC it is about 21/2 feet by 4 feet.

The surface must be smooth. A table built of rough timber will serve but the top surface where the work is done should be oilcloth or linoleum. Otherwise the clay sticks to it and it cannot be cleaned and will soon lead to an inability to see clearly what is being done because it is stained with clay leavings.

In the Academy castors (wheels) can be put on the legs of both the clay table and the clay container where they will be moved a lot.

Several different colours of clay should be procured. The best source is a school supply house where educational supplies are sold. Artists' clay is not as good as the school type. (Ask for kindergarten clay.)

A receptacle, also of wood or metal and having a separate stand of its own of any type is also valuable. It should have subdivisions in it for the different coloured clays.

The amount of each colour is not important so long as there is at least a pound or two of each colour in a small class or an auditing room.

In the Academy colours are only used to make a student see the difference between one object and another and have no other significance as the objects in the mind are not uniformly coloured. While "ridges" are black, they can become white. Engrams may be a number of colours all in one engram, just as Technicolor is a coloured motion picture. However, some persons see engrams only in black and white. So the colour in the Academy is for instruction only, assisting to tell the difference between one object or another. (In the HGC it may be very significant to the pc, as covered later.)

The instructor works with the table before classes at times, so it is of benefit to have a table so arranged that it will tilt toward the class at about a 30° angle with the floor. This can be done as easily as putting the back legs of the table on temporary wooden blocks or as

complicatedly as using a large engineer's drawing table which tilts its whole top. If a table is to tilt, the lower edge during the tilt must have a one or two inch guard board to keep the covering or the clay from falling to the floor if it slips. It doesn't slip, usually, on a linoleum table surface but sometimes a bit is dropped and an instructor can more gracefully recover it if it hasn't rolled off on the floor. A loose linoleum top is also prevented from sliding off by a guard board.

Any part of the mind can be represented by a piece of clay or a white card. The mass parts are done by clay, the significance or thought parts by label.

A piece of clay and a label are usually *both* used for any part of the mind. A thin-edged ring of clay with a large hole in it is usually used to signify a pure significance.

The labels used by Instructors (but *not* by students) are done on white cards, inked with a heavy black inking means such as a china marking pencil or a "GemMarker" where a metal cylinder holds ink and the point is made of felt. The inked label is mounted on a small stick two to four inches long of the kind used by nurses for swabs or metal ones used to hold meat together. Scotch tape or Sellotape will bind a label to a stick.

*Everything* is labelled that is made on the clay table, no matter how crude the label is. Students usually do labels with scraps of paper written on with a ball-point. An Instructor would use the fancier kind so that these would easily be visible to others.

The main clay table and its clay container is set up in the lecture room of a course in such a way so that it can be moved up in front of a class, or over in the corner out of the way, or to an area in the room where two or three students can gather around it or work. More than one clay table must be made for large classes but the additional tables need not tilt. In the HGC a clay table is narrower and longer and one is placed in each auditing room. Any HGC clay table can be used to train staff auditors. The clay tables in auditing rooms are used for processing. In the HGC there is not just one table for everyone's use. There is one in each auditing room.

## USE ON COURSES

*Any part of the mind or any term in Scientology can be demonstrated on a Clay Table.*

This is an important point to grasp. The use of the table is not just for a few terms. It can be used for all definitions.

The ingenuity of the instructor or the student *and* their understanding of the terms being demonstrated are the only limits on a Clay Table.

Simplicity is the keynote. Nothing is too insignificant or unimportant to demonstrate on a clay table. The first mistake is to believe that only R6, for which the lower grade student is *not* ready, can be demonstrated on a clay table.

*Anything* can be so demonstrated if you work at it. And just by working on *how* to demonstrate it or make it into clay and labels brings about renewed understanding.

In the phrase "how do I represent it in clay" is contained the secret of the teaching. If one can represent it in clay one understands it. If one can't, one really doesn't understand what it is. So clay and labels work only if the term or things are truly understood. And working them out in clay brings about an understanding of them.

Therefore one can predict that the clay table will be most used in a practice or organization which understands the most and will be least used in an organization that understands the least (and is least successful).

Let us look over the level of simplicity of the terms to be used in a course of instruction.

Let us take BODY. All right, make a few lumps and call it a body and put a sign on it "BODY".

Now that doesn't seem to be much to do. But it is a lot to do to forward understanding.

Let us make a yellow ring of clay beside the body or on it or in it and label it "A Thetan".

We can thereupon see the relationship between the two most used terms in Scientology, "Body" and "Thetan". And cognitions will result. The student's attention is brought right to the room and the subject.

Getting the student to do this by himself, even when he's seen it done by the Instructor, produces a new result. Getting the student to do it 25 times with his own hands almost exteriorizes him. Getting the student to contrive how it can be done *better* in clay or how many ways it can be done in clay drives home the whole idea of the *location* of the thetan in the body.

*ART* is no object in clay table work. The forms are crude.

Take a large lump of clay of any colour, and cover up both "thetan" and "body" with it and you have MIND.

Take every part of the mind and make it in clay by making a thetan, making a body and making one or more parts of the mind (Machine, facsimile, ridge, engram, lock, what have you—all Scientology terms) and get the student to explain what it is and we begin to clarify what we're about.

Get a student to make a Present Time Problem. Make him put in all its parts represented in clay (boss, mother, self) and have each one done with a body, a thetan and a mind and some rather remarkable insights begin to occur.

The quantity of things that can be made has no limit.

The principal thing is to GET EVERY SCIENTOLOGY TERM MADE IN CLAY AND LABELS by the individual student.

You will see a new era dawn in training. You will see Academy blows vanish and time on course cut to one fifth in many instances. These are desirable attainments in any course so Clay Table work is serious Academy business.

Ingenuity and understanding are the only limits on the use of the clay table and the attainment of excellent results with it.

#### CLAY TABLE WORK IN PROCESSING

The Clay Table presents us with a new series of processes.

The preclear is made to make in clay and labels whatever he or she is currently worried about or hasn't understood in life.

Scientology terms such as the Present Time Problem can also be graphed but this is a specialized (if very beneficial) use.

But the essence of CLAY TABLE PROCESSING is to get the *pc* to work it out.

In training you mostly tell the student.

In auditing the *pc* tells the auditor.

This is still true in clay table processing.

#### CLAY TABLE HEALING

The preclear shows the auditor the objects and significances of his difficulty.

Example: *Pc* has a continual pain in the right leg. A perfectly ordinary clay table and clay container as above are used but the table is narrower and longer than a training clay table. The auditor seats the *pc* on one side of the table and the auditor sits on the other side. There is no meter between them. The auditor report is kept on a side table or the auditing table nearby *not* on the clay table. The container is handy to the *pc* and contains several

colours of clay. The pc under the auditor's direction *but with no coaching as to how* then makes the leg of any colour the pc chooses and a label "my right leg" and puts it on the clay leg. This done, the auditor asks the pc to say what should go near the leg. The pc then makes it crudely and rapidly in clay (again of any colour the pc chooses) and makes a label for it and puts it on the new object. The auditor wants to know what else should be near the leg. The pc says what and makes it in clay and labels it. Usually the pc chooses colours which are significant to him or her but which in fact need have no significance to the auditor.

Under the auditor's brief questioning or voluntarily the pc tells the auditor all about each and every object he or she makes as it is made and labelled.

The full auditing comm cycle is observed but the auditor acknowledges more often than he or she commands.

The representation in mass and label form *and* the pc's explanation of each mass and label as made constitute the valuable actions. The pc can put aside or re-use the clay of objects already made, but not the leg, which must remain.

If this is done well, and completely, the pc's right leg will alter in condition.

You could assign several words to this activity to explain it. You could call it "symbolism" or "healing by projection of one's troubles into mass". You could call it "remedy by duplication". But you really don't have to explain it with a new term, because it works. This type of healing is very old. In fact it is the first recorded effective healing recorded in the dawn of man. But when we add to it what we really know of the mind, when we add to it the auditing comm cycle, when we use it with the pc telling the auditor, not the practitioner telling the pc, we move into zones of healing never dreamed of before.

This is in fact one of the new healing processes I have been promising levels I to IV. Its name is CLAY TABLE HEALING.

The pc's havingness stays up while the significance comes off, which is a chief value.

## INTELLIGENCE

IQ (intelligence quotient or the relative brightness of the individual) can be rocketed out of sight with HGC use of a clay table.

### CLAY TABLE IQ PROCESSING

This is another process than Clay Table Healing. Don't mix them.

This is done with the following steps:

1. Find out where the pc is trying to get brighter. It won't do any good to try to make the pc brighter in fields or zones of knowledge where the pc doesn't know he or she is stupid. So it is of great interest to find out where the pc is trying to become smarter and then using only that subject. If you as the auditor select the zone, it has been inferred that the pc is stupid in the area the auditor chooses and usually you get an ARC Break even if it doesn't show in the session. So choose a zone of knowledge where the pc is striving to become *more informed* and the process works.
2. Trace back (with no meter) what *word* or term the pc failed to grasp in the subject chosen in 1. above. Trace one word, early in that training that the pc didn't understand. (Never ask for the *first* word—merely an early one.)
3. Get the pc to make up the mass represented by the word in clay and any related masses. Get them all labelled and explained.
4. Repeat 2 and 3, (but not Step 1 until Step 1 is flat).

The process for any one subject can be considered flat when the pc is alert and interested in the subject of 1. It may take several sessions to flatten Step 1.

Once one subject has been straightened up and pc is bright about it we get Step 5 which consists of doing 1, 2 and 3 again, rather than just 2 and 3. But flatten Step I before finding a new subject or the pc will be just as confused as ever.

Clay Table IQ Processing is a clay table version of one of the new educational processes. If the clay table version is used don't use the other Itsa or Meter versions. If the other Itsa or Meter versions are used, don't use the clay table version. This is called, for purposes of reference, Clay Table IQ Processing. That is different than Clay Table Definition *Training*. And it is different than Meter Definition Processing. And different also from Coffee Shop Definition Processing. All these are different activities and the others named will be issued in due course. Suffice at this time to cover Clay Table Definition Processing. It is fantastic in producing results and in raising IQ.

In all clay table processing the pc handles the mass. The auditor does not suggest subjects or colours or forms. The auditor just finds out what should be made and tells the pc to do it in clay and labels. And keeps calling for related objects to be done in clay ("Do it in clay," is the phrase. Avoid using "*Make it*," because it's a GPM word.)

A good clay table auditor takes it very easy, is very interested, acknowledges when it is expected, is very sure to understand what it is and why, and lets the pc do the work.

It is particularly important that the auditor grasp what the clay objects are and what the label means. An auditor tends to blow or become critical of the pc when the auditor glosses over his own understanding of what the pc is making and why. So when the auditor understands perfectly he or she simply acknowledges and when the auditor *doesn't* understand completely, he or she asks and asks until he or she *does* understand. The auditor *never* asks a question "so the pc understands" when the auditor already does, as this makes a false ARC in the session.

## HANDLING CLAY

Clay is messy. Until we find or unless we find a totally non-oily clay, precautions must be taken to keep students and particularly pcs clean, and if not clean, cleaned up afterwards.

Clay can get on E-Meter cans and insulate them from the hands. Clay can get on clothes and papers and walls and doors in a most alarming way.

Therefore, students and pcs using it can provide smocks for themselves and the instructor and auditor can provide liberal quantities of cheap cleaning tissue and solvent.

Several cheap solvents work. The least odorous and easiest handled are best. Odorous solvents should be guarded against as Academies, HGCs and private practice rooms will soon begin to smell like cleaning shops or mortuaries. This can become serious in restimulating pcs. So use odourless solvents.

*And* provide baskets for used cleaning tissues. And empty them.

The clinging quality of clay and the odour of bad solvents could put an end to the great value of Clay Table work. So safeguard against this.

Good hunting.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[The sections entitled "Clay Table Work in Training" and "Use on Courses" have been reissued verbatim as HCO B 10 December 1970, Issue I, *Clay Table Work in Training*.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 18 AUGUST AD14

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

*SCIENTOLOGY III TO IV*

(This HCO Bulletin is preceded by HCO Bulletin of August 17, AD14. The process covered in the present bulletin CLAY TABLE CLEARING was called "Clay Table IQ Processing" in the earlier HCO Bulletin.)

**CLAY TABLE WORK  
COVERING CLAY TABLE CLEARING IN DETAIL**

NOTE: CLAY TABLE CLEARING IS A RECOMMENDED HGC PROCESS AT LEVELS III & IV.

One of the most compelling urges below Level VI is the desire to achieve an incomplete purpose.

This will be found to be a remarkable dissemination factor.

Below Level VI one is striving to complete his or her goals. At Level VI, GPMs are run out. But before that can be achieved, one is thrust into the GPMs by the effort to accomplish.

Further, one does have wishes-to-do of his or her own having nothing to do with GPMs but only being blocked by them.

Usually someone wanted to attain an improvement when he or she came into Scientology. This wished-for improvement, until achieved, remains as a hidden standard (by which one judges whether or not he has improved). If the wish is attained, then one "knows Scientology works". If the wish is not attained, then one isn't sure Scientology works.

Wishes fall into two broad classes.

- I. Mental achievement.
- II. Physical achievements (including relief from illness).

The Clay Table Process most likely to give the preclear his wish to accomplish some purpose is CLAY TABLE CLEARING.

This is one of four Clay Table activities, the other three being Clay Table Definitions, Clay Table Healing, and Clay Table Track Analysis, the last being a training activity for Class VI.

One must differentiate amongst these four activities as they are not the same things.

Clay Table Definitions are done only in training and are not auditing. Clay Table Track Analysis is done in training for Level VI and again is not auditing.

The two Clay Table *auditing* activities are

- I. Clay Table Clearing, used to achieve the pc's rehabilitation and raised IQ in various fields, and



- II. Clay Table Healing, used to get rid of physical discomfort of psychosomatic origin.

The above pair are the *two* HGC uses of Clay Table as of this writing. One does not use Clay Table Definitions or Clay Table Track Analysis in auditing sessions.

### CLAY TABLE CLEARING

As one Scientology remedy for increased IQ and destimulation, Clay Table Clearing is audited by an auditor in a session. A meter may or may not be used depending on the training level of the auditor. But regardless of level, no metering is done during actual work on the Clay Table.

Where the auditing space is limited, the equipment used may be as meagre as a biscuit can full of clay and a two-foot square piece of linoleum to lay on the auditing table, the meter and auditor's report being taken off the table, and the auditor's report written on a clipboard in his or her lap during the auditing session. To end the session on the meter the linoleum is simply set aside and the meter put back on the table. More elaborate arrangements can be used as time and finance permit. But so long as one takes precautions not to get clay all over everything and everybody, the two-foot square lino scrap will suffice.

The entire effort by the auditor in a session of Clay Table Clearing is to help the pc regain confidence in being able to achieve things by removing the misunderstandings which have prevented that achievement.

To process only Scientology terms and call it Clay Table Clearing would be a gross error. The pc's upsets with the mind seldom began with Scientology. If the pc, in answering the auditor's questions, gets into Scientology terms, that is perfectly all right. But to sit down and concentrate on Scientology terms while calling it Clay Table Clearing would be an error for these two reasons:

1. Scientology terms are a training activity called Clay Table Definitions and
2. The pc did not become aberrated only after he or she got into Scientology.

Early on in an intensive one gets into Scientology terms now and then as these may be locks on an earlier misunderstanding with a similar subject.

Here is an example of this:

A psychologist has a terrible time understanding Dianetics and Scientology. In being run on Clay Table Clearing, the psychologist gives as his chief desire in life, gaining an ability to understand people. The first few terms chosen for Clay Table work may well be Scientology terms. *But* the auditor steers the pc back a bit, and lo! it was *psychology* the psychologist didn't understand. And the Clay Table work would then be concentrated on psychology terms or childhood misunderstandings about people until the pc felt he had *regained the ability* to understand people—or, as such a pc would look at it, had begun to understand them. Now, with the first desire chosen (to understand people) flat, the auditor would search for a new zone where the pc wished to become able.

So you see, the auditor is handling the chief urges of the pc in Clay Table Clearing. The auditor is not trying to teach the pc a thing.

We have for long spoken of:

- (a) "Ability regained"
- (b) "Make the able more able"
- (c) "Help the pc achieve his goals in life".

These, and other aims in processing, are strictly *processing* aims, they are not training activities.

The action is de-stimulation of those things which bar the pc's progress in life.

By handling broadly the pc's bafflement about life we:

1. Unleash his theta by de-stimulating confusions, and
2. We eventually *clear* the pc.

We are directly removing the "Held Down Fives" (see *Dianetics, Evolution of a Science*) and clearing the pc's ability to think, see and understand.

We do *not* remain long on Scientology terms if we get into them because of the evidence that the pc was *not* clear before he came into Scientology.

Further it is up to the pc to choose the zone to be explored. Just as you'd be in trouble setting goals for the pc, so you would be in trouble telling the pc what he wanted to do in life. He's had too much of that from others to also get it from his auditor.

In using Clay Table Clearing we do not go into physical ills. These are handled faster by other processes. If these physical ills were the reason the pc wants to be processed then

1. You should have the pc given a competent physical examination as there may be some simple remedy for his condition or some condition present that needs physical treatment, and
2. If you process the pc and want to do Clay Table work, then you should be running Clay Table Healing, not Clay Table Clearing.

If you start to run a pc on Clay Table Clearing, and discover the pc is being audited only to be cured of something, not to be mentally improved, you carry on to an early point where you can gracefully shift over and end off Clay Table Clearing and begin Clay Table Healing. (How to do Clay Table Healing will be covered more fully in a later bulletin.)

## THE STEPS OF CLAY TABLE CLEARING

**STEP ONE:** Find a subject or activity where the pc has desired to improve himself. This could be anything from athletics to "not to be frightened of goats". In essence this is a stated goal. The pc's auditor's reports, if he or she has been audited before, will be found to abound with these. Further examination will discover that one is repeated very often. One may take up these earlier session "life and livingness goals" *if* the pc still wants to and does not have one on hand in which he or she is more interested. The current interest of the pc is the safest point with which to start. One establishes this by simple discussion of what the pc wants to do in life. This step is as brief as "What are you trying to do in life?" One finds something the pc wants to achieve or do, whether it is happy or unhappy, beneficial or suicidal, and one uses this. Do *not* linger on Step One once this is done. Do not challenge or question it. The auditor's job here is to assist the pc to attain his goal and if it's "to commit suicide", that's what the auditor uses. The auditor uses *any* sincere life and livingness goal the pc expresses as what he wants to do. Only one word of warning--do not accept a sarcastic or critical goal. That means the pc has an ARC Break, a PTP, overts or withholds or is being audited under duress and the auditor must handle the attitude with the usual means. But it is also an error to challenge a purpose the pc really has just because it sounds crazy or anti-social.

**STEP TWO:** Having established the purpose, the auditor now establishes something about it the pc didn't understand. This will be some generalized idea usually. It will seldom be a word. It will be some idea expressed in several words or gestures.

However it is expressed by the pc, the auditor accepts this as what the pc has not understood about 1 above. It may take a while to sort out this concept or idea but when it is sorted out, that's it. Example: The pc has understood an afterlife in hell as a punishment for committing suicide. The question asked to get the pc to dredge up this idea would be something like, "What about suicide haven't you grasped?" assuming the pc's desire was to commit suicide. It's always "What about \_\_\_\_ (the purpose expressed in 1 above) haven't you \_\_\_\_ (grasped, dug, been clear about, etc)?" or even "What was there in \_\_\_\_ (purpose expressed in 1 above) that baffled you?" When the pc has one go on to 3. It is a mistake to get the pc to try to clarify it any further than his first statement of what it is, as that isn't accepting the pc's answer and you must always accept a pc's answer so long as it is an answer according to the pc. One gets the point of bafflement stated any old way by the pc and goes on to Step Three. It is a good idea to write the idea or concept the pc didn't understand on your work sheet.

**STEP THREE:** Get pc to reduce that idea to a single term. This may be one word or a composite word. This step may involve a lot of groping or discussion. It may go on for quite a while. The purpose of the auditor here is just the auditing question, gently but firmly and even insistently put, "Put that concept about (the idea found in 2) into one word." "Express that idea you had in a single term." Coax, bully, insist, plead, but finally get it done. It is this step that tests the auditor's comm cycle ability. For if the auditor has no control over the session, the pc will shift the idea in Step Two or try to discuss the whole subject of Step One. The pc will squirm, may try to beg off, may declare it's impossible. But the auditor recognizes this action of the pc as charge blowing off and presses on with the command, "Express the idea \_\_\_\_ (can be read off work sheet) in one word." Eventually the pc will deliver up one word. And *that's* one of the words in the original subject (as given in Step One) that the pc never understood and some of the reason why the pc has stayed confused about the subject (as given in Step One), with consequent aberration. You may not believe it at times while doing Step Three that the pc *can* do it. You may even be prone to agree it's impossible to do so. But if you do, you'll lose the session and may lose the pc. You *must* get the idea in Step Two expressed as a *word* in Step Three. And the pc must eventually be satisfied that the word he now gives does express the idea given in Step Two. The auditor must make sure of that. The question may be, "Are you satisfied that the word (give word pc has come up with) does express the idea (read the idea of Step Two off the work sheet)?" You'll easily see if the pc thinks it does or doesn't. Relief attends his realizing it does express the idea in Step Two. Vague confusion attends his feeling that the word he has given does *not* express the idea in Step Two. As this whole step borders on challenging a pc's answer, care must be taken not to really ARC Break the pc. He or she can be driven very close to the brink of an ARC Break and very possibly may be by the insistence on an answer. But the by-passed charge is the lost word and as soon as it comes up and is given to the auditor the pc becomes all smiles. If a session ARC Break occurs, use the List One ARC Break Assessment List or, if it's not a Grade III session, have a Class III auditor do the ARC Break Assessment. (You can see by this why Clay Table Clearing is really for HGCs or professionals.) The only major error the auditor can make in Step Three is to fail to get the pc to do the step and give a word for there is where the charge is on the word that represents the idea of Step Two. Sometimes Step Three is very easy. Often not. The greatest danger lies in an auditor going wishy-washy and letting the pc change the idea of Step Two, or just letting the session collapse into endless Itsa. In Step Three, as in Step Two, the auditor is there to get a job done and does it. Having gotten the word that represents the idea given in Step Two, the auditor goes on to Step Four. CAUTION: DON'T LET PC CHOOSE A WORD THAT SOLVES STEP TWO.

**STEP FOUR.** This is the true Clay Table Step. And one might say "this is where the fun begins". This is usually the longest step by far. The auditing command is, "Represent the word \_\_\_\_ (as given in Step Three) in clay." The auditor's purpose in Step Four is to (a) acknowledge the pc's ideas and comments and protests, (b) understand (by questions where the auditor doesn't really understand) what the pc is trying to do and (c), and chiefly (c), get the pc to represent the word's meaning in clay and (d) make sure the pc is completely satisfied he or she has represented the meaning of the word in clay. The command "Represent \_\_\_\_ (the word) in clay" may have to be repeated many, many times. If the command is executed the auditor must ask gently, "Are you satisfied

you have done it?" The pc may do it over and over, or protest how it can't be done and all that, but the auditor must get the pc to do it. The auditor may *never* suggest how it can be done, even when it is obvious. Truth is, it's always obvious how to do it *to the auditor*, but the auditor isn't aberrated on that point and the pc is. So the pc struggles until he or she really does represent the word in clay in a way that brings the dawn of comprehension, a lovely thing to see. Any word can be represented in clay. The auditor must realize that. Words that are confusing to the pc are harder for the pc to represent in clay. Again, the major mistake is to fail to get the pc to do it. Another gigantic error is to agree it can't be done. And yet another error is for the auditor to fail to understand himself what the pc *has* done. If the auditor can't understand it, the pc can't either. Never be polite about not understanding what the pc means. Pcs ARC Break harder on a faked understanding than on repeated auditor efforts to understand. Pcs will explain for long periods when the auditor is still trying to grasp it. Pcs blow up when auditors fake a comprehension they have not obtained from what the pc said or did. To the auditor the clay representation and the pc's explanation of it *must* be seen to easily represent the word found in Step Three. An added command is, "How does that represent the word?" This has nothing to do with art. It has to do only with good sense. There may be one or several clay forms that represent the word. What the pc does with it or some action with it may also be part of the representation of the word. When the auditor is sure the pc has represented the word of Step Three in clay and is sure the pc is sure, the auditor leaves this step.

**STEP FIVE.** Still keeping the subject found in Step One the auditor goes to Step Two and finds a new confused idea the pc has about the subject of Step One.

The subject of Step One is left only when the pc is very satisfied he has either regained his ability or confidence or has no concern about it. This may take many sessions.

Then one gets the pc to choose a new subject and proceeds with that, using the exact steps above with no shortcuts or failures to get the pc to do what he is supposed to do in each step. **DON'T LEAVE A SUBJECT CHOSEN IN STEP ONE UNFLAT BY FAILING TO CLEAR THE PC ON THAT SUBJECT STEP BY STEP OVER AND OVER.**

-----

It may be supposed that CLAY TABLE CLEARING is the only process needed to clear a pc. This is untrue. Pcs have overts and withholds. They get PTPs and have had ARC Breaks with Life. They are sometimes too hard to control and need CCHs. And sometimes they are so bad off they "have no faults of any kind" and say so while sitting right there in a body.

But for the pc who can be audited on it, Clay Table Clearing is strawberries and cream, a soft berth, spring flowers and exit from the nightmare into life.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw jh  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[The steps of Clay Table Clearing in this HCO B are cancelled by HCO B 27 September 1964, *Clay Table Clearing*. ]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 AUGUST AD14

Remimeo

*SCIENTOLOGY II*

**HQS COURSE**

THIS HCO BULLETIN CHANGES EXISTING CHECKSHEETS

This is the general outline of the Hubbard Qualified Auditor Course. If the HQS Course being taught by a field auditor, a Franchise Holder, City Office, or a Central Organization does not conform to this general outline and specifications it must be changed at once.

Any student who has had an item checked out and initialled on his or her checksheets prior to this HCO Bulletin is to be considered as having passed that item. If an HQS certificate has been applied for by the instructor, the student having completed the course, the certificate must be issued regardless of these changes. All HQS certificates already issued remain in force.

**PURPOSE OF THE HQS COURSE**

Personal gain to be expected: to be able to study and learn.

Auditing skills to be acquired: (a) To be able to run the CCHs on a pc without ARC Breaking the pc and to achieve case gain. (b) To be able to sit down as an auditor and run a session on repetitive commands on a pc with gain.

Wisdom to be acquired: (a) The basic purposes of Scientology; (b) the technology of study; (c) gradient scales; (d) tone scales; (e) the Auditor's Code; (f) the Code of a Scientologist; (g) ARC (the logics and axioms come at Level III now).

Texts: *Scientology, The Fundamentals of Thought, Notes on Lectures*. Others to be issued.

Tapes: Lists to be issued from time to time but to include three general divisions, (a) general discussion tapes about Scientology that I have done; (b) tapes covering study in full; (c) tapes on ARC.

Practical Actions: TRs 0 to 9. Op Pro by Dup. Other minor TRs as needful.

Processes to be adept in: 8C, ARC Straight Wire, Repetitive Processes.

What must NOT be taught: Subjects and tapes containing words not defined at this level.

**"THERAPEUTIC" TRs**

There is no model session, no meter. Those belong in III.

There must be no slightest search for or thought of the TRs being "therapeutic". *Processing is* unflat, not TRs. TRs are just learned with *no* other consideration. The student can or can't do them.

There may not be *any* 75 ratings or 0 rating. Everything *must* be *star* rated or, according to more modern technology, you will lose your student. 75 ratings are prohibited. Questions irrelevant to a student's actual need from a tape or HCO Bulletin

are forbidden. Definitions of words dominate in all checkouts as per recent article on checkouts in “The Auditor”. Not only Scientology words must be defined by the student.

This is the full course. Anything on existing checksheets contrary to the above must be deleted. Where the above is missing in checksheets it must be added.

You are making an auditor. Not processing a student. The auditor will be able to audit if he knows his definitions and materials and can do the drills easily.

If a student is well trained on these courses, we can then say of an HQS: This being can

1. Study Scientology or anything else.
2. Run 8C.
3. Run repetitive processes (including O/W but only as a repetitive process).
4. Audit within the framework of the Auditor’s Code.
5. Can tell you what Scientology is all about.

And that’s all we expect. And we will have full confidence in the students’ being able to do the above.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.jh  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 AUGUST 1964

Sthil Students  
Franchise

*SCIENTOLOGY I TO VI*  
**SESSION MUST-NOTS**

Not that you would do such a thing—you undoubtedly already know better. But just as a matter of record, the following session must-nots should be taught in letters of fire to any new auditor.

**I**

NEVER tell a pc what his present time problem is.

*The pc's PTP is exactly and only what the pc thinks or says it is.*

To tell a pc what his PTP is and then audit what the auditor said it was will inevitably ARC Break the pc.

This of course is under the heading of Evaluation in the Auditor's Code and is one way of evaluating, a very serious way too.

**II**

NEVER set a goal for a pc.

Don't set a session goal, a life or livingness goal or any other kind of a goal.

Auditors get tangled up on this because everybody has the same R6 goals and when you call out the next goal from the list it appears you are giving the pc a goal. But an R6 educated pc knows that and it isn't evaluation.

Other goals are highly variable. The pc's life and livingness goals and session goals are especially variable pc to pc and even within one session on the same pc.

To tell a pc what goals to set for a session or for life is to upset the pc.

If you don't believe it, trace some pc's upsets with their parents and you will find these usually trace back to the parents' setting life and livingness goals for the child or youth.

The pc's session and life and livingness goals are the pc's and for an auditor to deny, refute, criticize or try to change them gives ARC Breaks; and for an auditor to dream up a brand new one for the pc is especially evaluative.

**III**

NEVER tell a pc what's wrong with him physically or assume that you know.

What's wrong with the pc is whatever the pc says or thinks is wrong physically.

This applies of course only to processing, for if you *weren't* auditing the person, and if the person had a sore foot and you found a splinter in it and told him so, it would be all right. But even in this case the person would have had to tell you he had a sore foot.

The main reason society has such a distaste for medical doctors is the MDs' continuous "diagnosis" of things the person has *not* complained of. The violence of

surgery, the destruction of lives by medical treatment rather educates people not to mention certain things. Instinctively the patient knows that the treatment may leave him or her in much worse condition and so sometimes hides things. For the medical doctor to cry “Aha” and tell the person he or she has some undefinable ill is to drive many into deep apathy *and accounts for the high frequency of operational shock* wherein the person just doesn’t recover.

So NEVER tell a pc what is physically wrong with him. If you suspect something is physically wrong that some known physical treatment might cure send the pc for a physical check-up just to be safe.

In the field of healing by mental or spiritual means, the pc is sick because he or she has had a series of considerations about being sick. Deformity or illness, according to the tenets of mental healing, traces back to mentally created or re-created masses, engrams or ideas which can be either de-stimulated or erased completely. Destimulation results in a temporary recovery for an indefinite period (which is nonetheless a recovery). Erasure results in permanent recovery. (De-stimulation is the most certain, feasible and most rewarding action below Level VI; erasure below Level VI is too prone to error in unskilled hands as experience has taught us.)

The reality of the auditor is often violated by a pc’s statement of what ails him. The pc is stone blind—but the pc says he has “foot trouble”. Obviously, from the auditor’s viewpoint, it is blindness that troubles this pc. BUT IF THE AUDITOR TRIED TO AUDIT THE AILMENT THE PC HAS *NOT* OFFERED, AN ARC BREAK WILL OCCUR.

The pc is ailing from what the pc is ailing from, not from what the auditor selects.

For it is the statement of the pc that is the first available lock on a chain of incidents and to refuse it is to cut the pc’s communication and to refuse the lock. After that you won’t be able to help this pc and that’s that.

#### PERMITTED AUDITOR STATEMENTS

There are, however, two areas where the auditor must make a statement to the pc and assume the initiative.

These are in the OVERT—MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE and in the ARC BREAK.

#### A

When the pc is critical of the auditor, the organization or any of many things in life, this is *always* a symptom of *overts* priorly committed by the pc.

The pc is looking for motivators. These criticisms are simply justifications *and nothing more*.

This is a sweeping fully embracive statement—and a true one. There are *no* criticisms in the absence of *overts* committed earlier by the pc.

It is quite permissible for the auditor to start looking for the overt, providing the auditor finds it and gets it stated by the pc and therefore relieved.

But even here the auditor only states there is an overt. The auditor NEVER says what the overt is for that’s evaluation.

You will be amazed at what the pc considered was the overt. It is almost never what we would think it should be.

But also, an auditor whose pc is critical of him or her in session who does not say, “It sounds like you have an overt there. Let’s find it,” is being neglectful of his job.



The real test of a professional auditor, the test that separates the unskilled from the skilled is: CAN YOU GET AN OVERT OFF THE PC'S CASE WITHOUT ARC BREAKING THE PC AND YET GET IT OFF.

The nice balance between demanding the pc get off an overt and getting it off and demanding the pc get off an overt and failing to get it off but ARC Breaking the pc is the border line between the unskilled and the professional.

If you demand it and don't do it you'll ARC Break the pc thoroughly. If you fail to demand it for fear of an ARC Break you'll have a lowered graph on the pc. The pro demands the overt be gotten off only when necessary and plows on until it's gotten off and the pc brightens up like a lighthouse. The amateur soul-searches himself and struggles and fails in numerous ways—by demanding the wrong overt, by accepting a critical comment as an overt, by not asking at all for fear of an ARC Break, by believing the pc's criticism is deserved—all sorts of ways. And the amateur lowers the pc's graph.

Demanding an overt is not confined to just running O/W or some similar process. It's a backbone auditing tool that is used when it has to be used. And not used when it doesn't have to be.

The auditor must have understood the whole of the overt-motivator theory to use this intelligently.

## B

Indicating by-passed charge is a necessary auditor action which at first glance may seem evaluative.

However, the by-passed charge is *never* what the pc says it was if the pc is still ARC Broken.

By-Passed Charge is, however, found by the meter and the pc has actually got it or it wouldn't register. So the pc has really volunteered it in a round-about way—first by acting like he or she has by-passed charge and then by bank reaction on the meter.

Always indicate to the pc the by-passed charge you *find on the meter*.

Never tell a pc what the by-passed charge is if you don't know.

A Class VI auditor knows all goals but *the* goals are wrong and often sloppily just tells people at random they have “a wrong goal” knowing this to be probable. But it's very risky.

If you find it on the meter, telling the pc what the by-passed charge is is not evaluation. Telling the pc “what it is” without having found it is evaluation of the worst sort.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

1—3 September 1964

** 6409C01	SHSBC-37	The PE Course
** 6409C03	SHSBC-38	Clearing—What It Is

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

### CLAY TABLE LEVELS

Until such time as accumulated data may otherwise indicate, and to prevent a beautifully effective area of processing being messed up by inept use on pcs, the following policies are in force for all uses of the Clay Table:

*Clay Table work is Level III.* This means that it can be used by any HCA/HPA. Any student in training for HCA/HPA in an Academy may use, by general policy, HCA/HPA processes *in* the Academy while undergoing training. It can be used *on* any HQS student by an HCA/HPA student. It cannot be used by or taught to HQS students.

Only the student who has completed his HCA training may use it on outside pcs or in an HGC.

No Clay Table work of *any* kind may be used in PE work or in HAS Co-audits or in public co-audits of any kind where the co-auditors are not already trained in an Academy on Clay Table work.

By recent policy relaxing pc gradation, pcs at any level may be run on Clay Table but only by a Level III (HCA/HPA) trained auditor or in an Academy by someone being trained in Level III processes.

Clay Table work looks simple, works fast. But it is essentially a listing type process where things are being selected to run and that makes it solidly Level III.

Expert handling of the auditing Comm Cycle and other fine points are vital to working with a pc on a Clay Table. One has to understand the theory of clearing as given in the Saint Hill tape lecture of 3 Sept '64.

Clay Table evolves Homo Sapiens into Homo Novis, the new man. Clearing in its earliest, original sense, is *easily* obtained by Clay Table work in the hands of the auditor trained at Level III.

That is a marvelous thing. There is no reason to wreck it in pcs and spoil it for them by letting it be badly used by untrained persons.

Clay Table training will be available in Academies across the world. R6 auditors leaving Saint Hill and heading for key points in international central organizations have been carefully trained on Clay Table work and even as this is being written, it is being set up for teaching in most Academies. There is therefore no excuse to use it incorrectly.

Clay Table work handles:

1. The longstanding goal of getting clear, without exceptions or only minor percentages making it—with it comes broad, general clearing. It may have been overdue for a while, but it is here: clearing for anybody;
2. Improvement of work accomplishment by staffs;
3. Rapid, certain gains in HGCs as a routine activity by HCA/HPAs;

4. A penetration of the world of healing and a definite change in our attitude toward healing;
5. More rapid progress through upper courses.

There are other gains attainable in Clay Table work. But the above five are the ones you will soon get the full benefit of technically and organizationally.

The only things which can inhibit these gains are:

- (a) Trying to use Clay Table work without complete briefing;
- (b) Use of it by auditors below Level III.

I sought for a long while for the technology up to Level IV. We have now achieved it. Let's go at it right, get it correctly applied, and succeed with it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

*ALL LEVELS*

**PTPs, OVERTS AND ARC BREAKS**

Just to remind you, other auditing is not possible in the presence of Present Time Problems and Overts. No auditing is possible in the presence of an ARC Break.

These are data like “Acknowledge the pc”, “An auditor is one who listens” etc. These belong in the ABCs of Scientology.

**PRESENT TIME PROBLEMS**

When a pc has a PTP and you don’t handle it, you get *no* gain. There will be no rise on a personality test graph. There will be little if any TA action. There will be no gain in the session. The pc will not make his session goals. Etc. Etc. So you don’t audit pcs who have PTPs on anything but the PTPs *the pc has*.

And you don’t audit PTPs slowly and forever. There are numerous ways of handling PTPs. One of them is “What communication have you left incomplete about that problem?” A few answers and poof! no PTP. Another is “What doesn’t (that person or thing pc is having PTP with) know about you?” Other versions of overts and withholds can be used. These are all fast PTP handling methods and they get rid of the PTP and you can audit what you started to audit.

The mark of a ruddy amateur in auditing is somebody who can always do successful assists but can’t do a real session. The secret is: in an assist you are handling the PTP, aren’t you? So you never audit over the top of (in the presence of) a PTP!

Another circumstance is “can’t get down to real auditing because the pc always has so many PTPs”. This is only a confession that one can’t *handle* a PTP and then get on with the session. One fumbles with the PTPs so badly as an auditor one never really handles the pc’s PTPs so of course one never gets on with the job at hand—auditing the pc.

The pro, in a real session, just handles the PTPs quickly, gets the pc into session and gets on with whatever should be run.

**OVERTS**

Overts are the other principal source of getting no gain.

Here we really can tell the goony birds from the eagles professionally.

No pro would *think* of auditing a pc on other processes in the presence of overts.

1. The Pro would recognize by the pc’s natter, or lack of previous gain, that the pc had overts;
2. The Pro would know that if he tried to do something else besides pull these overts, the pc would eventually get critical of the auditor; and
3. The Pro wouldn’t (a) fail to pull the real overts or (b) ARC Break the pc in getting the overts off.

If one gets “reasonable” about the pc’s condition and starts agreeing with the motivators (“look at all the bad things they did to me”), thus ignoring the overts, that’s the end of gains for that pc with that auditor.

If one is clumsy in recognizing overts, if one fails to get the pc to give them up, if one fails to properly acknowledge the overt when given, or if one demands overts that aren't there, overt pulling becomes a howling mess.

Because, then, getting the pc overts off is a tricky business auditors sometimes become shy of doing it. And fail as auditors.

Sometimes pcs who have big overts become highly critical of the auditor and get in a lot of snide comments about the auditor. If the overt causing it is not pulled the pc will get no gains and may even get ARC broken. If the auditor doesn't realize that such natter *always* indicates a real overt, when pcs do it, eventually over the years it makes an auditor shy of auditing.

Auditors buy "critical thoughts" the pc "has had" as real overts, whereas a critical thought is a *symptom* of an overt, not the overt itself. Under these critical thoughts a *real* overt lies undetected.

Also, I love these pcs who "have to get off a withhold about you. Last night Jim said you were awful ....." An experienced auditor closes the right eye slightly, cocks his head a bit to the left and says, "What have you been *doing* to me I haven't known about?" "I thought ....." begins the pc. "The question is", says the old pro, "What have you been doing to me that I don't know about. The word is *doing*." And off comes the overt like "I've been getting audited by Bessy Squirrel between sessions in the Coffee Shop."

Well, some auditors are so "reasonable" they never really learn the mechanism and go on getting criticized and getting no gains on pcs and all that. I once heard an auditor say "Of course he was critical of me. What he said was true. I'd been doing a terrible job." The moral of this story is contained in the fact that this auditor's pc died. A rare thing but a true one. The pc had terrible overts on Scientology and the auditor, yet this auditor was so "reasonable" those overts were never cleaned up. And that was the end of those auditing sessions.

It's almost never that drastic, but if an auditor won't pull overts, well auditing gets pretty unpleasant and pretty pointless too.

A lack of grasp of the overt-motivator sequence (when somebody has committed an overt, he or she *has* to claim the existence of motivators—the Ded-Dedex version of Dianetics—or simply when one has a motivator he is liable to hang himself by committing an overt) puts an auditor at a very bad disadvantage. Howling pcs and no pc wins.

## ARC BREAKS

You can't audit an ARC Break. In fact you must *never* audit in the presence of one. Auditing below Level III, the best thing to do is find an auditor who can do ARC Break Assessments.

At Level III and above, do an ARC Break Assessment on the pc. An ARC Break Assessment consists of reading an ARC Break list appropriate to the activity to the pc on a meter and doing *nothing* but locate and then indicate the charges found by telling the pc what registered on the needle.

That isn't auditing because it doesn't use the auditing comm cycle. You *don't* ack what the pc says, you *don't* ask the pc what it is. You don't comm. You assess the list between you and the meter, same as no pc there. Then you find what reads and-you tell the pc. And that's all.

A by-passed charge assessment is auditing because you clean every tick of the needle on the list being assessed. The pc is acked, the pc is permitted to Itsa and give his opinions. *But you* never do a *by-passed charge assessment* on an ARC Broken pc. You do an ARC Break Assessment as per the paragraph above this one.

These two different activities unfortunately have the word "assessment" in common and they use the same list. Therefore some students confuse them. To do so is sudden death.

You can really clobber a pc by doing a by-passed charge assessment on an ARC Broken pc. And also you can ARC Break a pc by doing an ARC Break Assessment on a pc who isn't (or has ceased to be) ARC Broken.

So unless you have these two separate and different actions—the ARC Break Assessment and the by-passed charge assessment—clearly understood and can do both of them well and never get too rattled to know which one to use, you can get into plenty of trouble as an auditor.

Only auditing over the top of an ARC Break can reduce a graph, hang the pc up in sessions or worsen his case. So it's the next to the most serious blunder that an auditor can make. (The most serious error is to deny assistance either by not trying to get the pc into session or not using Scientology at all.)

Auditing an ARC Broken pc and never realizing it can lead to very serious trouble for the auditor and will worsen the pc's case—the only thing that will.

## SUMMARY

It is elementary auditing knowledge that no gains occur in the presence of PTPs or overts and that cases worsen when audited over the top of an ARC Break.

There aren't "lots more conditions that can exist". Given an auditing session there are only these three barriers to auditing.

When you do Clay Table auditing or any other kind of auditing the rules all still apply. A change of process or routine doesn't change the rules.

In doing Clay Table auditing off a meter one still handles the elements of a session. One puts the pc on the meter to start off and checks for PTPs, overts, withholds, even ARC Breaks, handles them quickly and then goes into the body of the session. Much the same as the oldest model session rudiments. One doesn't use Mid Ruds or buttons to get started. One just knows the things that mustn't be there (PTPs, overts, ARC Breaks) and checks for them, handles if found and goes on with the main session activity. If a PTP or an overt or an ARC Break shows up one handles them, putting the pc back on the meter if necessary. When they are handled, the pc is put back into the main activity of the session.

It's true of any auditing that gets done. It isn't likely to alter and actually no new data is likely to be found that controverts any of this. The phenomena will still be the same phenomena as long as there are pcs. Ways of handling may change but not these basic principles.

They're with the auditor in every session ever to be run. So one might as well stay alert to them and be continuously expert in handling them.

They are the only big reefs on which an auditing session can go up high and dry, so their existence, causes and cures are of the greatest possible importance to the skilled auditor.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH jw.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

*LEVELS II to IV*

**OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?**

I recently made a very basic discovery on the subject of overts and would like to rapidly make a note of it for the record.

You can call this the "Cycle of an Overt".

4. A being appears to have a motivator.
3. This is because of an overt the being has done.
2. The being committed an overt because he didn't understand something.
1. The being didn't understand something because a word or symbol was not understood.

Thus all caved-in conditions, illness, etc, can be traced back to a misunderstood symbol, strange as that may seem.

It goes like this:

1. A being doesn't get the meaning of a word or symbol.
2. This causes the being to misunderstand the area of the symbol or word (who used it whatever it applied to);
3. This causes the being to feel different from or antagonize toward the user or whatever of the symbol and so makes it all right to commit an overt;
4. Having committed the overt, the being now feels he has to have a motivator and so feels caved in.

This is the stuff of which Hades is made. This is the trap. This is why people get sick. This is stupidity and lack of ability.

This is why Clay Table Auditing works.

Clearing a pc then consists only of locating the area of the motivator, finding what was misunderstood and getting the word made into clay and explained. The overts blow. Pure magic.

The trick is locating the area where the pc has one of these.

This is discussed further in Saint Hill lecture of 3 Sept 1964, but is too important a discovery to leave only in tape form.

The cycle is Misunderstood word or symbol—separation from ARC with the things associated with the word or symbol—overt committed—motivator felt necessary to justify the overt—decline of freedom, activeness, intelligence, well being and health.

Knowing this and the technology of auditing one can then handle and clear these symbols and words and produce the gains we have described as being clear, for the things causing the decline are cleared out of the being.

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Scientology Staff

*LEVEL III*

**CLAY TABLE HEALING**

The purpose, actions and the auditor commands of Clay Table Healing are completely different from those of Clay Table Clearing.

When undertaking Clay Table Clearing one can also from time to time do Clay Table Healing on the pc. In fact one commonly starts out Clay Table Clearing by doing Clay Table Healing to get the hidden standards (things the pc uses to tell if the process is working) out of the way.

However, when one is working on pcs to heal, not to clear, and when the sole object of auditing is healing, then one does not move over into clearing during a given series of sessions but only uses Clay Table Healing.

Example: Mrs. G comes to be audited to heal her bad arm. On her, only Clay Table Healing is used. Mrs. Y comes to improve her ability. On her, Clay Table Clearing is used and as sessions progress, some sessions of Clay Table Healing also become necessary in the general course of auditing. Mrs. G would have to alter her reasons for being processed on her own say-so before one would move her into Clearing. This point is made to clarify for auditors the fact that when people want to be healed, they are given healing and one doesn't force them into living better lives also. This takes care of case levels.

Clay Table Healing uses a different, more repetitive, easier approach than Clay Table Clearing. One completes cycles of action over and over on the pc.

The steps are:

- STEP 1. Get the pc to name the condition *the pc* requires to be healed.
- STEP 2. Make sure the pc is satisfied this is the condition he or she wants to be healed, (this and 3 can be meter steps).
- STEP 3. Get the pc to name a body part that seems most closely associated with the condition.
- STEP 4. Make sure the pc is satisfied he or she has given the correct part.
- STEP 5. Get the pc to represent the named body part in clay or whatever modelling substance is being used.
- STEP 6. Make sure the pc is satisfied the body part has been represented.
- STEP 7. Get the pc to state "what should be near" the body part just made.
- STEP 8. Make sure the pc is satisfied he or she has stated the correct thing for 7.
- STEP 9. Get the pc to represent whatever is named in 7 in clay.
- STEP 10. Make sure the pc is satisfied he or she has represented it.



STEP 11. Begin with 5 again and do not re-do 1 to 4 inclusive until the upsets in No. 3 have vanished.

STEP 12. Begin with 3 again.

STEP 13. Begin with 1 again when condition vanishes.

Caution: To re-do the condition every time or to change the body part to be healed every time are failures to flatten the process before beginning another.

The whole process is flat only when No. 1 is flat by which is meant the condition has vanished. But one doesn't even test for the condition again until the afflicted body part is recovered.

So there are two things to flatten. One first flattens the body part, or several body parts before choosing a new condition to handle.

To be explicit, when one has done 5 onward over and over until there is no difficulty in the body part left, one checks the condition and if it has not vanished one finds a new body part (3) to fit the condition and using this does 5 onward over and over until that is flat. Then one checks the condition (1) again and if it is still there, one finds a new body part and uses it for doing 5 onward over and over. One does this until the condition (1) has vanished.

You get a session then that looks like this in terms of the above step numbers.

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,  
11, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,  
7, 8, 9, 10, 11     5, 6 . . . . and so forth.

This is very easy auditing providing you do not do the following goofs.

- A. To touch the pc's clay is fatal. Never touch the pc's clay.
- B. Tell the pc what is wrong with him or her. Never evaluate.
- C. Fail to flatten a body part. Never leave a body part until it is O.K.
- D. Choose another condition before the original condition is gone. Always get another body part to do if the pc's attention is at all on the condition.
- E. Fail to get the pc to make up the affected body part each time. Always get the pc to make up the body part being used newly.
- F. Fail to follow the Auditor's Code. Always follow it.
- G. Fail to use the Auditing Comm Cycle every time the pc does or says anything he or she wants you to understand.

- H. Pass over something the pc did or said that you didn't understand. Always get it so you the auditor understand it.
- I. Audit a pc with a PTP. Always clean up PTPs.
- J. Audit a pc who has an undisclosed overt Always clean up the overt.
- K. Audit over the top of an ARC Break. Handle ARC Breaks properly on the meter.

## SUMMARY

Clay Table Healing is a study in repetition and simplicity for an auditor. It is easy. It is very successful. But it is very simple auditing. However that simplicity has to be done right. Therefore it is a very precise series of actions.

An auditor who can't handle the auditing comm cycle shouldn't ever be let near Clay Table Healing as the pc will be made ill by constant ARC Breaks.

The above A to K precautions are all but one (don't touch the clay) basic standard auditing. They must be well done skills each one before Clay Table Healing can be *routinely* successful. Failure to have these skills of auditing well in hand will give very uneven results—one pc gets better, another pc no change, another gets worse. Uniform results come from uniform auditing skill.

The pc is put on the meter only at session beginning and end and is not metered during Clay Table work unless PTPs, overt or ARC Breaks become apparent at which time the pc is put on the meter for as long as is necessary to handle the matter.

No auditing occurs when the auditor takes up too much time with non-Clay Table activities in Clay Table Auditing.

Caution: The pc sometimes names some very peculiar body parts and sometimes says conditions are body parts. It is not for the auditor to argue, he or she is just to make sure that the pc is sure. Sometimes, going into Clay Table Clearing, you find yourself really doing Clay Table Healing. In such a case the auditor should use the healing approach, not the clearing approach. Example: Pc wants to improve his "walking" and we find this, according to the pc is a body part, so we use Clay Table Healing, not Clearing. Clay Table Clearing is a process of clearing words and symbols. Clay Table Healing is a process of taking ailments out of objects. The processes therefore can both be used, in clearing. But when you use one or the other you flatten it before returning to the other. And you keep the steps separate—don't mix the steps. Use the steps of one or the steps of the other.

It should be noted in passing, as a point of interest, that a pc's trouble with any *object* in addition to a body part, responds to Clay Table Healing. Where the object is not a body part but is still an object (like a car or a typewriter) you can use the Clay Table Healing steps. These Healing steps, however, unlike the Clearing steps, will not work well on a condition only. Healing steps become less workable when you try to audit "worry" or "being afraid". They work best on "a leg" or "clumsy fingers". Extending them beyond their purpose, to any part of any of the eight dynamics, the Healing steps drop in workability. Clearing steps, however, work on almost anything whether an object or a condition, but work better on conditions than upon objects.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
 Copyright © 1964  
 by L. Ron Hubbard  
 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 SEPTEMBER 1964  
Issue II

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil

## CLAY TABLE CLEARING

Now the goofs start coming in as how to not do Clearing.

If you don't get a word asked for in Step III in HCO Bulletin Aug 18, '64 that expresses the "didn't understand" in Step II you don't get anywhere in Clay Table Clearing.

Example of a wrong one: Step I, pc says, "I want to improve my mind." Step II (what pc hasn't understood), "What the hell it is." So far so good. Now the goof. Auditor gets Step III (word to represent the difficulty in II) as "Mind" and then does Step IV (modelling in Clay) using *Mind*. Of course the session goes nowhere. Pc has not answered question in Step III. "What the hell it is," is not answered by "Mind". "Mind" does not *mean* "What the hell it is."

The original Aug 18 HCO Bulletin covers this. It says don't let the pc *solve* II in the answer in III.

Pc in the "Mind" example is just answering his own question "What the hell is it" and there's just one more solution on the case.

The auditor here could not possibly have grasped the overt-motivator cycle of 1. word—2. misunderstood idea—3. overt—4. motivator.

The correct answer for III here would never be *Mind* as that doesn't package the thought "What the hell is it?" It answers the question "What the hell is it?" and so could never be accepted in III.

III in this example would be "Bafflement" or "Curiosity" or "Mystery" and that would be used in IV. Only these words mean "What the hell is it?"

Now don't anybody hereafter avoid the word "Mind" in Clay Table because it's used in this wrong example or they'll destroy my faith in students.

Clay Table *done right* works. So when pcs don't get better it hasn't been done right. That's the complete reason.

The word accepted by the auditor in Step III *must mean* the thought or difficulty given by the pc in Step II.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Staff

**CLAY TABLE, MORE GOOFS**

GOOF NO. 2

The auditor gets the body part in Clay Table Healing as “my fat body” and then insists on running “body”. Pc ARC Breaks.

The goof: When pc *insists* on a wording, run it. Don’t shove a pc into an ARC Break by contradicting.

Correct Action: Run “my fat body”.

GOOF NO. 3

The pc, in Clay Table Clearing, says he wants to improve his memory.

The auditor asks, of course, what difficulty the pc has had with “memory”.

The pc does not give a several-worded condition as is usual but says, “Remembering! “

The goof: The auditor then spends the next hour trying to get a word which represents “remembering”, not realizing the pc has already given it.

Correct Action: Run “Remembering”.

GOOF NO. 4

The coach in Clay Table Definitions complains bitterly to an Instructor that “the pc’s definitions are so far out the pc refuses to run Clay Table Definitions or do any Clay Table work at all”.

The goof: Forcing the student into an auditing-like activity when the student is *ARC Broken*.

One of the principal indicators of an ARC Break is refusing auditing or co-operation.

The Correct Action: Get an ARC Break Assessment done on the pc.

GOOF NO. 5

The auditor can’t get into Clay Table Work on the pc because the pc “has so many overts one has to spend all the session getting the pc to get off overts”.

The goofs:

- (a) Not getting Clay Table work done in Clay Table sessions;
- (b) Being too slow in getting a pc to get his overts off;
- (c) Auditing off overts that would probably blow anyway on definitions;
- (d) Not knowing the full definition—misunderstanding—overt—motivator cycle.

Correct Action: Get the pc to tell the auditor “something you’ve done that you’ve never told anybody else”. Get it. Check for missed withholds and if clean on the needle get on with Clay Table work.

#### GOOF NO. 6

The auditor in Clay Table Clearing gets “To improve my memory”, then as the difficulty step “What the hell is it?”

Then the auditor spends the next 2 1/2 hours doing a sort of perpetual list trying to get the pc to answer, “What word would represent ‘What the hell is it’ “ and finally ARC Breaks the pc.

The goofs:

- (a) Turning the get-the-word into a kind of listing session;
- (b) Not accepting the word the pc thinks it is.

Correct Action: Take the first word that gives TA action and in which the pc is interested and use it for the thing to represent in clay. Step is usually about 3 or 4 minutes long.

#### GOOF NO. 7

In Clay Table Definitions the coach must get the student to write a label and put it on each clay object made.

The goof: Failure to get a label written and placed on the object.

Correct Action: Label everything on paper, in writing, in all Clay Table work.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 15—22 September 1964

- |            |          |  |
|------------|----------|--|
| ** 6409C15 | SHSBC-39 | Scientology and Tradition              |
| ** 6409C22 | SHSBC-40 | A Review of Study; also issued as ST-7 |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Instructors  
HCO Hat Check on  
all Acad Instructors

**INSTRUCTION & EXAMINATION:  
RAISING THE STANDARD OF**

The basic reason students remain long on courses stems from inept criticism by Instructors regarding what is required.

There is a technology of criticism of art, expressed beautifully in the Encyclopaedia published by Focal Press.

In this article it stresses that a critic who is also an expert artist tends to introduce unfairly his own perfectionism (and bias and frustrations) into his criticism.

We suffer amazingly from this in all our courses. I had not previously spotted it because I don't demand a student at lower levels produce results found only in higher levels.

You can carelessly sum this up by "letting the student have wins" but if you do you'll miss the whole point.

Example: A student up for a pass on his Itsa is flunked because he or she couldn't acknowledge.

But a student at the Itsa level hasn't been *taught* to acknowledge.

This student hasn't even read the data on acknowledgement.

So the student can't pass Itsa level and so never does get to the level where acknowledgement is taught-and if he does, really never passed, in his own mind, Itsa and so hasn't advanced.

And we catch all our students this way and they don't therefore learn.

How is this done? How could this be?

The Instructor is an expert auditor. That's as it should be. But as an expert auditor, bad execution *of a level above* where the student is studying pains the Instructor. So he flunks the student because the auditing looks *bad*.

But look here. The student wasn't being checked out as an *auditor*. The student was only being checked out on *Itsas*.

Further, the action of auditing as a whole is so easy to an Instructor who is an expert auditor that he fails to take it apart for instruction.

If I say the following, it will look ridiculous and you'll get the point better: The student is up to pass TR 0. The Instructor on checkout looks the student over and says, "You flunked the test." The student says, "Why?" The Instructor says, "You didn't take the Class VI actions to clear the pc of all his GPMs." All right, we can all see that that would be silly. But Instructors do just that daily, though on a narrower band.

The Instructor puts in additives. As an expert auditor it seems natural to him to say, "You flunked your test on Itsa because you never acknowledged the pc." You get the point. This really is as crazy wide as the ridiculous example above. What does Ack have to do with Itsa? Nothing!

Because the Instructor is an expert auditor, auditing has ceased to have parts and is all one chunk. Okay. A good auditor regards it that way. But the poor student can grasp any of the pieces because the whole chunk is being demanded.

What's Itsa? It's Listen. Can the student listen? Okay, he can listen but the expert says, "He didn't get 15 divisions of TA per hour." On the what? "On the meter of course." What meter? That's Level II and Itsa is Level 0. "Yes," the expert protests, "but the pc didn't get any better!" Okay, so what pc is supposed to get better at Level 0. If they do it's an accident, usually. Now does this student pass? "No! He can't even look at the pc!" Well, that's TR 0 of Level I. "But he's got to look like an auditor!" How can he? An auditor has to get through a comm course before you can really call him that. "Okay, I'll drop my standards \_\_\_\_\_" the expert begins. Hell no, expert. You better pick up your standards for *each Level* and for each small *part* of auditing.

What's it say at Level 0? "It says 'Listen'." Okay, then, damn it, when the student is able to sit and listen and not shut a pc down with yak, the student passes. "And the meter?" You better not let me catch you teaching meters at Level 0.

And so it goes right on up through the Levels and the bits within the Levels.

By making Itsa mysterious and tough, by adding big new standards to it like TA and Ack you only succeed in never teaching the student Itsa! So he goes on up and at Level IV audits like a bum. Can't control a pc. Can't meter, nothing.

So the expert tries to make a student do Class VI auditing the first day and that *student is never trained to do any auditing* at Level 0.

This nonsense repeated at Level I (by adding a meter, by purist flunking "because the pc couldn't handle an ARC Break") and repeated again at Level II ("because the pc couldn't assess") and at Level III.....etc. etc.

Well, if you add things all the time out of sequence and demand things the student has not yet reached, the student winds up in a ball of confusion like the cat getting into the yarn.

So we're not instructing. We're preventing a clear view of the parts of auditing by adding higher level standards and actions to lower level activities.

This consumes time. It makes a mess.

The new HCA always tries to teach his group a whole HCA course his first evening home. Well, that's no reason seasoned veterans have to do it in our courses.

If you never let a student learn Level 0 because he's flunked unless he does Level VI first, people will stay on courses forever and we'll have no auditors.

Instructors must teach not out of their OWN expertise but out of the textbook expected actions in the Level the student is being trained in. To go above that level like assessment in Level II or Ack and meters at Level 0 is to deny the student any clean view of what he's expected to do. And if he never learns the parts, he'll never do the whole.

And that's all that's wrong with our instruction or our Instructors. As expert auditors they cease to view the part the student must know as itself and do not train and pass the student upon it.

Instead they confuse the student by demanding more than the part being learned.

Instruction is done on a gradient scale. Learn each part *well* by itself. And only then can assembly of parts occur into what we want--a well trained student.

This is *not* lowering any standards. It's raising them on all training.

## BULLETIN CHECKOUTS

The other side of the picture, theory, suffers because of a habit. The habit is all one's years of formal schooling where this mistake is the whole way of life.

If the student knows the words, the Theory Instructor assumes he knows the tune.

It will never do a student any good at all to know some facts. The student is expected only to *use* facts.

It is so easy to confront thought and so hard to confront action that the Instructor often complacently lets the student mouth words, ideas that mean nothing to the student.

**ALL THEORY CHECKOUTS MUST *CONSULT* THE *STUDENT'S UNDERSTANDING*.**

If they don't, they're useless and will ARC Break the student eventually.

Course matter stems entirely from the students' non-comprehension of words and data.

While this can be cured by auditing, why audit it all the time when you can prevent it in the first place by adequate theory checkout?

There are two phenomena here.

## FIRST PHENOMENON

When a student misses understanding a word, the section right after that word is a blank in his memory. You can always trace back to the word just before the blank, get it understood and find miraculously that the former blank area is not now blank in the bulletin. The above is pure magic.

## SECOND PHENOMENON

The second phenomenon is the overt cycle which follows a misunderstood word. When a word is not grasped, the student then goes into a non-comprehension (blankness) of things immediately after. This is followed by the student's solution for the blank condition which is to individuate from it—separate self from it. Now being something else than the blank area, the student commits overts against the more general area. These overts, of course, are followed by restraining himself from committing overts. This pulls flows toward the person and makes the person crave motivators. This is followed by various mental and physical conditions and by various complaints, fault-finding and look-what-you-did-to-me. This justifies a departure, a blow.

But the system of education, frowning on blows as it does, causes the student to really withdraw self from the study subject (whatever he was studying) and set up in its place a circuit which can receive and give back sentences and phrases.

We now have "the quick student who somehow never applies what he learns".



The specific phenomena then is that a student can study some words and give them back and yet be no participant to the action. The student gets A+ on exams but can't apply the data.

The thoroughly dull student is just stuck in the non-comprehend blankness following some misunderstood word.

The "very bright" student who yet can't use the data isn't there at all. He has long since ceased to confront the subject matter or the subject.

The cure for either of these conditions of "bright non-comprehension" or "dull" is to find the missing word.

But these conditions can be prevented by not letting the student go beyond the missed word without grasping its meaning. And that is the *duty* of the Theory Instructor.

### DEMONSTRATION

Giving a bulletin or tape check by seeing if it can be quoted or paraphrased proves exactly nothing. This will not guarantee that the student knows the data or can use or apply it nor even guarantees that the student is there. Neither the "bright" student nor the "dull" student (both suffering from the same malady) will benefit from such an examination.

So examining by seeing if somebody "knows" the text and can quote or paraphrase it is completely false and *must not be done*.

Correct examination is done only by making the person being tested answer:

- (a) The meanings of the words (re-defining the words used in his own words and demonstrating their use in his own made-up sentences), and
- (b) Demonstrating how the data is *used*.

The examiner need not do a Clay Table audit just to get a student to pass. But the examiner can ask what the words *mean*. And the examiner can ask for examples of action or application.

"What is this HCO Bulletin's first section?" is about as dull as one can get. "What are the rules given about \_\_\_\_\_?" is a question I would never bother to ask. Neither of these tell the examiner whether he has the bright non-applier or the dull student before him. Such questions just beg for natter and course blows.

I would go over the first paragraph of any material I was examining a student on and pick out some uncommon words. I'd ask the student to define each and demonstrate its use in a made-up sentence and flunk the first "Well ... er ... let me see ...." and that would be the end of that checkout. I wouldn't pick out only Scientologese. I'd pick out words that weren't too ordinary such as "benefit" "permissive" "calculated" as well as "engram".

Students I was personally examining would begin to get a hunted look and carry dictionaries—BUT THEY WOULDN'T BEGIN TO NATTER OR GET SICK OR BLOW. AND THEY'D USE WHAT THEY LEARNED.

Above all, I myself would be sure I knew what the words meant before I started to examine.

Dealing with new technology and the necessity to have things named, we especially need to be alert.

Before you curse our terms, remember that a lack of terms to describe phenomena can be twice as incomprehensible as having involved terms that at least can be understood eventually.

We do awfully well, really, better than any other science or subject. We lack a dictionary but we can remedy that.

But to continue with how one should examine, when the student had the words, I'd demand the music. What tune do these words play?

I'd say, "All right, what use is this bulletin (or tape) to you?" Questions like, "Now this rule here about not letting pcs eat candy while being audited, how come there'd be such a rule?" And if the student couldn't imagine why, I'd go back to the words just ahead of that rule and find the one he hadn't grasped.

I'd ask, "What are the commands of 8-C?" And when the student gave them, I'd still have the task of satisfying myself that the student understood *why* those were the commands. I'd ask, "How come?" after he'd given me the commands. Or "What are you going to do with these?" "Audit a pc with them," he might say. I'd say, "Well, why these commands?"

But if the student wasn't up to the point of study where knowing *why* he used those commands was part of his materials, I wouldn't ask. For all the data about not examining above level applies very severely to Theory Checkout as well as to Practical and general Instruction.

I might also have a Clay Table beside my examiner's desk (and certainly would have if I were an HCO hat checker, to which all this data also applies) and use it to have students show me they knew the words and ideas.

Theory often says, "Well, they take care of all that in Practical." Oh no they don't. When you have a Theory Section that believes *that*, Practical *can't function at all*

Practical goes through the simple motions. Theory covers *why* one goes through the motions.

I don't think I have to beat this to death for you.

You've got it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[The above HCO PL is modified by HCO PL 4 October 1964, reissued 21 May 1967, *Theory Checkout Data*, on page 488.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

*LEVEL IV*

**CLAY TABLE CLEARING**

(This HCO Bulletin cancels the steps of  
Clay Table Clearing in HCO Bulletin of Aug 18 AD14.)

The original issue of "Clay Table Clearing" was called "Clay Table IQ Processing".

The materials were not broadly released pending the outcome of pilot projects I conducted.

I find now that the HCO Bulletin of Aug 17, AD14 which covered Clay Table IQ Processing was the better process. HCO Bulletin of Aug 18, AD14, Clay Table Clearing, was not as good as the first process I released as auditors had more trouble with it.

In using Clay Table Clearing as per the HCO Bulletin of Aug 18, AD14, auditors asking for the answer in Step II (what about the subject the pc hadn't grasped) always got a *question* as the pc's answer. Example of the error: Auditor: "What do you want to improve?" Pc: "My memory." Auditor: (Step Two) "What about memory haven't you grasped?" Pc: "What it is." Auditor: "Reduce that to a single term." Pc: "Remembering." End of Example of error.

You see that the auditor's question was answered by a pc's question about the subject. (What it is.)

Therefore, the pc answered his own question for the next step, Step III. (Remembering.)

You now have a *solution* to get the pc to represent in clay. It has restimulated the real earlier missed word. The pc's solution to the pc's question won't lead anywhere in being processed.

So this isn't correct to get a pc question as the answer to II or a pc's solution to the pc's question as the answer to III. This takes clearing nowhere. And also, restimulating an earlier word in the pc's bank that *is* misunderstood, puts by-passed charge into the session, leading to a possible ARC Break.

We learn then that

1. We mustn't ask the pc a question about what he wants to improve that will cause the pc to answer with his own question, and
2. We must not take a new solution to the pc's difficulty to represent in Clay.

A solution is later in time than the upset about the subject. The cause of the upset is always an *earlier* misunderstood term. The term is therefore restimulated in trying to represent the solution. The term then becomes by-passed charge.

Therefore we also learn this phenomenon:

IF YOU GET THE WRONG THING TO REPRESENT IN CLAY IT WILL RESTIMULATE THE RIGHT THING THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN REPRESENTED AND THE WRONG THING WILL NOT ITSELF BLOW IF REPRESENTED IN CLAY AS IT IS NOT EARLY ENOUGH.

Therefore, done wrong, Clay Table Clearing will not seem to work and will also ARC Break the pc.

Clay Table *Clearing* is then relegated to Level IV and only Clay Table Healing (where the chance of wrong words is remote) is placed at Level III. At Level IV the auditor has been trained to do ARC Break Assessments. Obviously, Clay Table work needs its own ARC Break Assessment list.

The Important things are

1. Don't let the pc answer "what about it he wants to improve" with a question, and
2. Don't let the pc give you a new solution to his difficulty as the thing to represent in Clay.

In Clay Table IQ Processing as per HCO Bulletin of Aug 17, AD14, this didn't arise because the auditor's question was asking only for a *term*.

These are other things I've learned about this process from watching other auditors use it and with the above these are incorporated into the following brief rundown of Revised Clay Table Clearing.

## CLAY TABLE CLEARING ISSUE 2

STEP I: Find an area where the pc is trying to get smarter or wants to Improve, or wants to become more able. This we will call THE SUBJECT. It must not be a physical body part as that is Clay Table Healing. If the pc gives a physical body part or Health, change to Clay Table Healing.

STEP II: The caution here is don't let the pc toss this off carelessly. It must be some subject in which the pc really wants to improve or some subject in which the pc really is trying to get smarter. If pc is sarcastic do an ARC Break Assessment from an appropriate list. Establish that the pc sincerely wants to improve in the subject or get smarter about it or become more able in it. Write the Subject in the Auditor's Report.

STEP III: Trace back (no meter, make no lists) a word or term the pc has had difficulty with in the Subject. This is called THE TERM. The usual question would be "What word or term have you had difficulty with in (subject name)?"

STEP IV: Satisfy yourself that this is the word or term the pc has had difficulty with. But do not make lists or go on and on getting the pc to change terms for hours as Step III and Step IV require only a few minutes or even seconds usually. Write the term in the Auditor's Report.

STEP V: Tell the pc "Represent that term in clay." Pc may represent it and any related masses in Clay and may work on it as long as he or she likes.

STEP VI: Make sure pc labels with paper and pen or in some similar way each thing the pc represents. Make sure you do not touch or take away the pc's clay. Be honest if you don't understand what the pc is doing and get the pc to make you understand it, using labels and clay (not long verbal dissertations not related to the clay and labels). Make sure you don't evaluate for the pc or tell the pc what his models or difficulties are all about. Make sure the pc is satisfied he has represented the TERM in Clay. Don't ARC Break the pc by refusing the obvious or by letting the pc quit while the pc is still dissatisfied he has done it—a nice balance to maintain. Make sure the pc is satisfied he has represented the term in Clay.

STEP VII: Have the pc do the TERM in Clay again. This is repetitive representation in Clay. Do not do or continue to do this step after the pc has had a *big*

cognition about the TERM which blows it (or blows the whole subject). In this step the TERM can be done over and over many times. The test is whether or not the pc has fully understood it. (Note: With terms on which the pc has no definition at all, the pc can look them up in the dictionary or the auditor can look them up for him. But the term must still be done in Clay as there was some reason the pc missed it.)

STEP VIII: When the TERM is flat, go back to the SUBJECT and ask the pc how he feels about it. If there is the least hesitation or any evidence of discomfort or doubt about the SUBJECT, continue to use the same Subject and go on with STEP III above, locating a new TERM for the same Subject. Be very careful however that the pc's attitude stems from the Subject itself and not an ARC Break. Go on down the Steps with this new Term for the same Subject.

STEP IX: When you have handled enough Terms to produce a very obvious change and when the *Subject* is obviously flat by reason of cognitions or abilities regained, go to Step I for a new SUBJECT and carry it through the steps as above.

CAUTION: Pcs with PTPs, Overts, Missed Withholds and ARC Breaks will not progress under ROUTINE auditing. These must be handled. See *The Book of Case Remedies* and other sources for data on how to handle PTPs, Overts, Missed Withholds and ARC Breaks.

### ROUTINE USE REMEDIES

Note the new expanded definition for the old word Routine and the new word REMEDY. This special use of the word ROUTINE accidentally fits the way it was formerly used. But it was used more loosely then to mean any combination of processes in a package whereas it now means "that which advances the usual case that is in session and has no PTPs, Overts or ARC Breaks in restimulation."

A Routine such as Clay Table Clearing is for *routine* use. It is for normal case advance. Pcs with PTPs, Overts, Missed Withholds, Hidden Standards, etc, as well as ARC Breaks do not advance on a Routine. These require a *Remedy*.

A Remedy is "something you do to get the pc into condition for Routine auditing".

This concept is new and is very much needed. It constitutes a bit of a breakthrough in itself.

When you attempt Routine auditing such as Clay Table Clearing on a pc who has longstanding PTPs or has just got one for the session, or has overts or withholds or an ARC Break, you will get no advance from *routine* auditing. You have to *Remedy* the case by rudiments or special processes. Then when the case is ready to run *rudinely*, you can do or resume Clay Table Clearing.

There is no process that handles PTPs and rapidly advances the whole case also. There is no process that handles an immediate ARC Break and also advances the general condition of the case. Overt and withhold processes are excellent *remedies* but slow case advancers.

The mark of the skilled auditor is the ability to *remedy* a case and then get on with *routine* auditing. The auditor who only audits remedies will never really advance a case permanently and an auditor who can handle only routines and cannot remedy a case are alike in that they won't make clears.

It is upon the dual ability of the auditor that clearing depends—the ability to spot the non-advancing case, spend a few sessions remedying it and then get on with routine auditing—the ability to get those fresh PTPs and overts in the first few minutes of the session and get on with the routine—these are two different auditing actions. The auditor who can observe which of these actions (the Remedy or the Routine) needs to be done and who can judge when they should be done and who knows the Remedies and who also knows the Routines can clear pcs.

The answer to clears now depends on the skill and training of the auditor far more than on the state of the pc's case.

## FUTURE ERRORS

After the pilot run on getting Clay Table Clearing ironed out in *use* in the auditor's hands, and the blunders that will be made before auditors become familiar with the HCO Bulletins and these processes, I think the main errors will be found to be Gross Auditing Errors such as failing to get the pc to answer the auditing question and such like.

## METER

Clay Table Clearing sessions are started with a meter. The meter is laid aside when the routine is actually begun. Checks for "Tone Arm Action" can be made mainly by observing the pc's good indicators. If they're in, the pc is getting TA. If they're not observable, the pc isn't getting TA. However, as Clay Table Clearing is at Level IV, NO PC WHO HAS NOT GOTTEN TA ACTION ON LOWER LEVEL PROCESSES SHOULD BE RUN ON CLAY TABLE CLEARING UNTIL HIS CASE IS REMEDIED. (Note: It has been observed in one pc who did not get TA action that correcting just *one* word the pc had misdefined in his bank brought about good indicators, but this was done merely by A Case Remedy using TWO-WAY COMM, not by Clay Table Clearing. The pc thereafter got good TA—but would have done so after the Remedy on any process. Clay Table work is not for cases who get no TA in general. See *The Book of Case Remedies*. Do not confuse getting one word defined by two-way comm with Clay Table Clearing. They aren't the same thing.)

The Meter is used at the beginning and end of session to handle rudiments and give data on state of needle and TA and is used during session only when pc has an ARC Break and then only to locate and indicate the charge on ARC Break Lists. When a remedy such as mid ruds is undertaken during the session the meter is also used.

## SESSION FORM

Model Session as amended is used as the session form of Clay Table Clearing.

In using Model Session be careful not to restimulate overts and PTPs the pc obviously does not have in restimulation at session start.

If the pc is eager and talking about the Clay Table, give the usual Start of Session procedure, note down the TA and state of needle, give the Start of Session and swing at once into the body of the session.

When a session has been successful do an equally brief End of Session procedure and end it.

Only if the pc seems preoccupied at the start of session or the TA is found to be much higher than at the end of the last session or something seems wrong should you go into a full Model Session beginning rudiments.

And only if the session was rough should you do the end of session rudiments.

These uses of Model Session are for Levels III, IV and VI.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 SEPTEMBER 1964

BPI Remimeo

**CLAY TABLE USE**

Clay Table auditing is for use by Central Organizations, City Offices and field auditors who have received training in it.

Clay Table is for Levels III and IV. Clay Table Healing is Level III and Clay Table Clearing is Level IV where the auditor is also trained to handle ARC breaks.

Central Orgs are to use only on HGC pcs or in the *stuff* co-audit but may permit use by an auditor only where that auditor has been fully checked out on its HCO Bulletins and is supervised.

Clay Table public use or use on public co-audits or HAS courses will bring about casualties.

These Clay Table processes are extremely powerful and therefore very restimulative. To give lectures on them to uninformed persons may have repercussions in their cases.

Clay Table is also deceptively simple. It appears so easy to read about that one is likely to miss. It's simple but only if you consider driving between two ravines at a hundred miles an hour is simple.

It looks easy until you run off the road by failing to locate the steering wheel before you drive.

A Central Organization may teach Classification Courses at Level III for Clay Table Healing as soon as it has Instructors trained in it at Saint Hill. It may teach Classification Courses at Level IV in Clay Table Clearing to students who took the Class III Course.

Staffs may be trained and checked out in Clay Table work but preferably by Saint Hill graduates.

There is no penalty attached to misusing Clay Table work except the penalty of coping then with a messed up process and messed up pcs.

Used right Clay Table is the fastest thing we ever had. But Clay Table Auditing isn't just fooling about with Clay. It's simple, powerful technology and requires expert usage to produce results and protect pcs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.pm.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

** 6409C29	SHSBC-41	Gradients
** 6410C13	SHSBC-42	Cycles of Action

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 OCTOBER 1964

Remimeo  
All staff  
All Students  
Tech Hats  
Qual Hats

Reissued on 21 May 1967

**THEORY CHECK-OUT DATA**

(Modifies HCO Pol Ltr of Sept 24, '64)

In checking out technical materials on students or staff, it has been found that the new system as per HCO Pol Ltr of Sept 24, '64 is too lengthy if the whole bulletin is covered.

Therefore the system given in Sept 24, '64 Pol Ltr is to be *used* as follows:

1. Do not use the old method of covering each bit combined with the new method.
2. Use only the new method.
3. Spot check the words and materials, do not try to cover it all. This is done the same way a final examination is given in schools: only a part of the material is covered by examination, assuming that if the student has this right the student knows all of it.
4. Flunk on comm lag in attempts to answer. If the student "er....ah....well..." flunk it as it certainly isn't known well enough to use. (Doesn't include stammerers.)
5. Never keep on examining a bulletin after a student has missed.
6. Consider all materials star-rated or not rated. Skip 75%'s. In other words, the check-out must have been 100% right answers for a pass. 75% is not a pass. When you consider a bulletin or tape too unimportant for a 100% pass, just require evidence that it has been read and don't examine it at all. In other words, on those you check out, require 100% and on less important material don't examine, merely require evidence of having read.

**THE "BRIGHT" ONES**

You will find that often you have very glib students you won't be able to find any fault in who yet *won't* be able to apply or use the data they are passing. This student is discussed as the "bright student" in the Sept 24, '64 Pol Ltr.

*Demonstration* is the key here. The moment you ask this type of student to *demonstrate* a rule or theory with his hands or the paper clips on your desk this glibness will shatter.

The reason for this is that in memorizing words or ideas, the student can still hold the position that it has nothing to do with him or her. It is a total circuit action. Therefore, very glib. The moment you say "*Demonstrate*" that word or idea or principle, the student *has* to have something to do with it. And shatters.

One student passed "Itsa" in theory with flying colours every time even on cross-check type questions, yet had never been known to listen. When the theory instructor said, "Demonstrate what a student would have to do to pass Itsa," the whole subject blew up. "There's too many ways to do Itsa auditing!" the student said. Yet on the bulletin it merely said "Listen". That given as a glib answer was all right. But "demonstration" brought to light that this student hadn't a clue about listening to a pc. If *he* had to demonstrate it, the non-participation of the student in the material he was studying came to light.

Don't get the idea that Demonstration is a Practical Section action. Practical gives the *drills*. These demonstrations in Theory aren't drills.

Clay Table isn't used to any extent by a Theory Examiner. Hands, a diagram, paper clips, these are usually quite enough!



## COACHING IN THEORY

There is Theory Coaching as well as Practical Coaching.

Coaching Theory means getting a student to define *all* the words, give all the rules, demonstrate things in the bulletin with his hands or bits of things, and also may include doing Clay Table Definitions of Scientology terms.

That's all *Theory* Coaching. It compares to coaching on drills in Practical. But it is done on bulletins, tapes and policy letters which *are* to be examined in the future. Coaching is not examining. The examiner who coaches instead of examining will stall the progress of the whole class.

The usual Supervisor action would be to have any student who is having any trouble or is slow or glib team up with another student of comparable difficulties and have them turn about with each other with Theory Coaching, similar to Practical Coaching in drills.

Then when they have a bulletin, tape or policy letter coached, they have a check-out. The check-out is a spot check-out as above, a few definitions or rules and some demonstration of them.

## DICTIONARIES

Dictionaries should be available to students in Theory and should be used in Theory Examination as well, preferably the same publication. Dictionaries don't always agree with each other.

No Supervisor should try to define English language words out of his own head when correcting a student as it leads to too many arguments. On English words, open a dictionary.

A Scientology dictionary is available.

-----

Remember that with Courses becoming briefer in duration, the number of bulletins and tapes which the student must know on a Star-Rated basis is also less.

General written examination for classification, however, remains on an 85% pass basis.

Be sure that students who get low marks constantly are also handled in Review, preferably by definitions of words they haven't understood *in some former subject*. Scientology is never the cause of consistent dullness or glibness.

Processing of this nature can be on an Itsa basis. It does not have to be Clay Table. Just finding the prior subject by discussion and discussing its words *usually blows the condition*. I've seen it change the whole attitude of a person in just 5 or 10 minutes of auditing on a "locate the subject and word" basis.

Therefore, definitions exist at Levels 0 and I, but not with Clay Table or assessment, only by Itsa. You'd be surprised how well it works and how fast. "Subjects you didn't like", "words you haven't grasped" are the discussion questions.

The subject of "wrong definitions cause stupidity or circuits, followed by overts and motivators", is not easy to get across because it is so general amongst Mankind. There is a possibility that past lives themselves are wiped out by changing language, whether it is the same language that changes through the years or shifting nationality. But however that may be, don't be discouraged at the difficulties you may have in getting this principle understood and used in Scientology departments—the person you are trying to convince has definitions out somewhere also!

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 OCTOBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

## CLAY TABLE DATA

The only real error auditors are making on Clay Table work is *not getting their auditing question answered* at times.

When a pc answers, in reply to the question asking for what he wants to improve, “To be clear” and this is then pursued in the session, *serious* trouble occurs. Why?

“What do you want to improve?” is not answered by “To be clear.” It would be answered by “My sanity.” It would not be answered by “My aberrations” (since nobody wants his aberrations to improve).

If your pc is not trained into being in session you of course don’t get answers to your questions.

What auditor has recently (as you should to all new pcs particularly) explained what was expected in the session? “I am going to ask you something, then you are going to answer it, then I will acknowledge, then I will ask again” etc. In other words what auditor has recently explained to a new pc the auditing cycle?

Well, if he hasn’t on a new pc an auditor can’t control anything that goes wrong in the session as there’s no session.

Clay Table, like all other auditing, has to have an auditing cycle of asking or telling the pc, getting that exact question answered or command complied with, acknowledging it and so forth.

When this is omitted particularly on Clay Table work, disaster follows faster than in other types of processes as Clay Table bites deep.

So

1. Get your pc *trained* into what the auditing cycle is and
2. Get the question or command that was asked or given answered.

Pcs can say whatever *else* they please. But they *must* answer the auditing question or no auditing occurs.

More than any other sin, this one is bedeviling Clay Table work and slowing results and every upset on Clay Table so far has been traced to this.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 OCTOBER 1964  
Issue II

Remimeo  
Franchise

*ALL LEVELS*  
**GETTING THE PC SESSIONABLE**

When you start to audit new pcs the liabilities are these:

1. If you do not show him what auditing is, he does not know what is expected of him. Thus he is not only not in session but in mystery.
2. If you do not indoctrinate him into what he is supposed to do when the auditor gives him a question or command, he often does not answer the question or comply with the command and only then can things go wrong in the session.
3. If the pc is not in the auditor's control and if anything goes wrong, then the auditor can do nothing about it as he does not have any session or control of the pc.

**COVERT AUDITING**

Some, particularly HAS students, are very remiss in this and "covertly audit".

In "talking" to someone they also seek to audit that person "without the person knowing anything about it".

This of course is nonsense since auditing results are best achieved in a session and a session depends upon a *self-determined agreement* to be audited.

You can achieve changes in a person with covert auditing—I won't say you can't since I have done so. But it is uncertain and not very popular.

*You have* to audit without agreement when the pc is unconscious and can't respond.

But to make it a common practice when it is really used only in emergency (as in unconsciousness or when you have no time) would be foolish.

Further, using Scientology to handle situations in life is a whole subject in itself and it isn't auditing. (Example: Person angry, a Scientologist locates and indicates the by-passed charge. Example: On a raving psychotic, the Scientologist arranges for the person to have a rest away from his ordinary environment and associates and forbids damaging "treatments". Example: Somebody seems to have lots of problems so the Scientologist teaches him what a problem is. Example: By observing the anxiousness of a person to receive motivators the Scientologist estimates the degree of overts the person has committed. Example: One sees a difficulty in planning is not getting any better so he decides there must be a lie in the plan and locates it at which time a good plan can emerge.)

There are countless ways to use the philosophy of Scientology in direct application to life. And even hopeless physical conditions respond to just understanding more about life. For instance there are many cases on record of a bedridden person reading no more than *Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science* and becoming well and active.

So one doesn't have to "covertly audit" if any communication is possible. One can teach, advise, orient someone in existence, applying the truths and knowledge of Scientology.

The point is, when *auditing* is begun it is best done by agreement to be audited and is most successful when the preclear understands what he is supposed to do in response to auditor actions, and is only disastrous when there is not enough control in the session to set things right if they start to go wrong.

Any auditor who just sits and lets a pc ramble on and on with no regard to the subject being handled, even in Itsa, is very foolish, has no session and is wasting time.

The *wrong* thing to do is chop the pc up and cut his comm because he is so far adrift.

The right thing to do is to prevent it before it happens by not auditing preclears who have not agreed to be audited or who have no faintest idea of what's expected of them.

In the hands of an unskilled "auditor" I have seen a preclear, who was running a psycho-analytic type session, giving all the expected psycho-analytic symptoms and responses. And getting nowhere.

There are two ways it could have been handled—one is to have explained this wasn't psycho-analysis and then explained the auditing cycle. The other would have been to run O/W on the analysis the pc had had or even do a by-passed charge assessment on the analysis. Probably both would be necessary if mere information about how auditing was done did not care for the condition.

One of the rules of auditing is never to let any part of any question or command be agreed upon once and never repeated. Example: The auditor tells the pc, "When I say 'her' in this command, I mean your mother. Now what have you done to her?" The pc is always having to think back to this agreement to answer the command.

Educating a pc is not the same thing. Here one is knocking out past response patterns, as in social actions or some earlier form of treatment. One is in effect cancelling out earlier habits of response in order to get auditing to occur. Once that is done one does not of course have to do it again and what the pc says in a session is what the pc says. Sometimes he wanders all about before he answers the question. But the *auditor* in any case *must* get his question answered or the command complied with.

So auditing in general is a clean-cut agreement to be audited, a session is conducted with an auditing cycle, no matter how long or short that cycle may be.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw .cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Franchise

**CLEARING  
WHY IT WORKS  
HOW IT IS NECESSARY**

The wrap-up of Level VI this last year brought about a full explanation of why clearing works at lower levels. And it also brought about why some could not be run at once on R6.

The reasons are quite simple.

The basis of the reactive mind is the actual Goals Problem Masses (GPMs).

Life has pulled these out of position and thrust the pc into the mess.

When you find what lock words have been tied into the GPMs in this or even an earlier lifetime and key them out (destimulate them) (untie them from the main mass) the GPMs sink back into proper alignment and cease being effective.

This makes a Key-Out Clear.

This condition is valuable because the GPMs are now confrontable one by one (not dozens by dozens) and Routine 6 can be run easily on the preclear.

Once Routine 6 auditing has begun one can only handle the derangements of masses by List 6 By-Passed Charge Auditing by Lists or, in an ARC Break, by using List 6 as an ARC Break Assessment.

(If you seek to return to Clay Table Clearing after beginning R6, you get only locks on the Item the pc has been left in and cause only upset. So you never return a pc to Clay Table Clearing once he has begun R6. Moral, don't begin R6 too soon. Clear first.)

That the state of Clear is transient and impermanent does not make it less worth while. In itself it is of enormous mental value and the full results never fade—only some of the bloom. That's because the main bank is brought back into restimulation by Life or the pc's overts, etc.

It is easiest to run R6 on pcs who have at some time or another been cleared. It is also possible to run R6 immediately on some rare pcs because they are just about clear anyway. It is risky to attempt R6 on the average pc who has not been cleared. Some pcs can't be audited at all on R6 until they are cleared.

That is because they have too many lock words (words not in the GPMs but close in meaning) keeping the large chunks of the reactive mind in present time. When these lock words are handled by being found and understood the reactive mind drops out of restimulation and one can then run it out in an orderly fashion, Item by Item and GPM by GPM.

Those are the mechanics of the reactive bank itself, the real use and value of clearing in auditing, and the conditions necessary for the successful handling of Routine 6.

From the first moment he starts being audited, the pc is heading first for orientation in his environment (fewer PTPs and conflicts with others around him),

second for release (from the feeling he will only get worse and can't progress—done by giving him small wins), third by getting rid of his physical problems, fourth by clearing away the locks on the reactive bank and fifth and sixth by running out the reactive bank itself. (Note: Fifth is mentioned as it is also encountered in the form of whole track, not always necessary to handle.)

Once the reactive mind is vanquished, the pc is again capable of his full potential as a being.

If you try to short-cut it you get failed cases.

So that's the why of levels and their design and even if unpopular they are the necessary steps across the bridge.

If somebody comes along and says it can be done with a needle and syringe or whirling until one is dazed or sitting on a mountain top gazing at his navel, he has a perfect right to say it. But the road out, whatever the process followed, must overcome the obstacles listed above or it is no road but a trap.

My responsibility has been to find the way, to develop the processes by which it could be walked safely and to communicate what I know about it to the best of my ability even across barriers erected to communication and against the wishes of those who place value in slaves.

There could have been a thousand other ways, a million variations, a billion reasons why one should not go. But if there are other ways, Man has not found them and indeed has only laid more difficulties by his past efforts.

That is the way.

It can be travelled. Truth is not always popular. That is why there is so little truth for men are commonly frightened things. One can't rush from nowhere to the stars. But there is a way.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

20—27 October 1964

** 6410C20	SHSBC-43	Levels—The Reason for Them
** 6410C27	SHSBC-44	The Failed Case

# THE BOOK OF CASE REMEDIES

by  
**L. Ron Hubbard**

**Published  
November 1964**

The Book of Case Remedies, “A Manual Covering Preclear Difficulties and Their Remedies,” by L. Ron Hubbard, was first published in November 1964, at Saint Hill Manor. It is Volume II of the Clearing Series, and the first edition gave auditors necessary points of technology for the last push to the great Releasing and Clearing successes that followed.

In his instructions on how to use this book, Ron says: “This is a professional text, a part of the Clearing Series. It does not give the processes on which cases should be run to achieve higher levels. It gives the processes you have to use when the case doesn’t run on standard processes.

“To use this book properly, one does not start or run cases with the Remedies given. One uses the Table of Remedies, contained herein, when the case has not run at all or, momentarily or consistently, does not advance on general processes.

*“When the case won’t run, whether for a session or for many sessions, look the preclear up in the Table of Remedies and use the prescribed action only long enough to get the preclear running again. Then return to the regular processes for the level.”*

The 1968 expanded edition added L. Ron Hubbard’s HCO Bulletins of 9 November 1967, “Revision of Remedy A, Remedy B, and S and Ds,” and 13 January 1968, “S & Ds.” In addition, the first five chapters contain data on Clears and OTs and auditing basics. The Remedies are divided into two sections, the first having remedies applying to pcs, auditors and any person. The second part, starting with Remedy R, is mainly for Case Supervisors and the Remedies apply to any session. Chapter 8 contains technical notes including the difference between ARC Break Assessments and By-passed Charge Assessments. At the back is a handy index to the Remedies.

As Ron says at the end, “You have here the secrets of fourteen years of experience with patching up cases and keeping them going.”

60 pages, one diagram, soft-cover with plastic comb binding. Available from your nearest Scientology Organization or Mission, or direct from the publishers: Scientology Publications Organization, Jernbanegade 6, 1608 Copenhagen V, Denmark; or Church of Scientology Publications Organization U.S., 2723 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90026, U.S.A.

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 NOVEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Scn Staff

*SCIENTOLOGY III & IV*

**MORE CLAY TABLE CLEARING GOOFS**

It has come to my attention that auditors in some instances have found a new way of not getting their auditing question answered on Clay Table work.

They don't get the pc to represent the meaning of the word but let the pc do something in clay vaguely similar to the word.

Example of wrong action: Auditor has found the word "Alchemy" has been misunderstood. Says, "Represent Alchemy." Pc then does in Clay a retort and a man in a conical hat. Auditor says, "Okay." This is a goof.

In fact *two* goofs may be present. If the pc had really not understood "Alchemy" his answer in Clay would have been a more searching one. The auditor may have gotten five or six words from the pc and selected one that had no reaction and in which the pc was not interested. For a pc to be so glib means the pc isn't even puzzled about it and the auditor isn't auditing an aberration (a held-down 5) at all. (See *Dianetics Evolution of a Science* and my lecture this year on the definition of Clear, without understanding which nobody is going to clear anybody anyway.)

There may even be a third goof. The auditor has no grasp at all of what constitutes Clay Table Clearing or why it works and hasn't got the idea he is clarifying meanings and clearing up puzzles the pc has.

The actual goof is that the pc did not *represent* the word.

REPRESENT means, according to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary: "to bring into presence; to bring clearly and distinctly before the mind; to place clearly before another."

This even shows up yet another goof. The auditor had no clearer idea of "Alchemy" than before and so was a sort of disinterested party to the whole thing and, on investigation, would have been found to pay no heed habitually to pc origins. Therefore the auditor was weak on TR 2 and a catastrophe on TR 4.

But getting back to the main goof, pc really not representing the word, therefore not answering the auditing command, is obvious in that no clearer or more distinct understanding of the word emerged.

The pc, then, didn't answer the "What word or term haven't you understood in that subject?" and gave a term he really already knew, or the auditor didn't accept the right one out of several offered, leaving in fact the pc's answer unacknowledged.

Then when the auditor gave the second command, "Represent Alchemy," one auditing cycle had already been missed as above and so represent was not done either.

If an auditor runs into the trouble of a pc just doodling in Clay with no clarification of anything, then one of the following is at fault:

- (a) The auditor accepted a subject the pc didn't want to improve at all; or
- (b) The auditor accepted a "misunderstood word" which the pc had never misunderstood; or
- (c) The auditor didn't get even earlier commands answered on the pc and so had a sloppy comm cycle going already; or
- (d) The auditor had no idea of what Clay Table Clearing was all about; or



- (e) The auditor was auditing far above the pc's level and should have been working out of the Book of Remedies rather than Clay Table Clearing; or
- (f) The auditor was continuing to audit an already ARC broken pc; or
- (g) The pc hadn't enough grasp of the meaning of the word chosen to even start; or
- (h) The pc hadn't a clue what "represent" means.

Resolutions of (a) to (f) are pretty obvious to any trained auditor. But they are resolved as follows:

- (a) Get the pc in comm as pc obviously not willing to talk about personal affairs or himself to the auditor. This is the oldest "In Session" definition. "What are you willing to talk to me about?" is the commonest remedy.
- (b) Same as (a) or the auditor is just willfully choosing the wrong word out of suggestions the pc makes in which case O/W on pcs is indicated on the auditor.
- (c) Pc or auditor madly out of comm with the other and the reason should be found and remedied.
- (d) The auditor should review *Dianetics Evolution of a Science* and have a Star-Rated examination on as well as a demonstration by the auditor of the definitions and principles of the lecture on Clearing of this year, before being permitted to do any more CT work.
- (e) The pc long since should have been looked up in the Book of Remedies and the remedy applied for the pc's condition or case before ever adventuring upon routine auditing such as Clay Table Clearing.
- (f) An ARC Break Assessment should have been done if this was what was wrong.
- (g) The pc should be given a dictionary to look the term up in before representing it in Clay.
- (h) The pc should be oriented or trained as to what is expected of him in Clay Table auditing including the meaning of represent.

Also, to add a somewhat unusual solution, the command "Represent Alchemy" should be lengthened to "Represent the meaning of the word Alchemy in Clay."

#### AUDITING CYCLE

The more I see of Clay Table goofs the more impressed I am with the wisdom of keeping Clay Table Clearing at Level IV. Because the main goofs are all auditing cycle goofs. The silly ones—such as the auditor never has passed Itsa but has always only done TR 0 when asked to do so, this auditor has never listened to the pc—such as gummed up TR 1—such as the auditor acknowledging the pc before he has a *clue* what the pc said or did—such as the auditor wandering off the course of the session, Q and Aing and just not duplicating the auditing command—such as failing to handle pc originations.

Clay Table work separates the experts and amateurs like a gourmet would separate sour wine and champagne.

With sour basic auditing, it just doesn't satisfy what's required.

I think letting students putter about with Clay even on Scientology definitions before they are Class Is at least is a horrible mistake.

Every consistently done Clay Table goofing I've seen so far showed up an auditor who just didn't know his auditing cycle and couldn't get *that* done, much less CT Clearing.

CT Clearing not only can be done. It Clears. If *done*.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 NOVEMBER AD14

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

**STYLES OF AUDITING**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**LEVEL ZERO  
LISTEN STYLE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## LEVEL ONE MUZZLED AUDITING

This could also be called rote style auditing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## LEVEL TWO GUIDING STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### LEVEL III ABRIDGED STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### LEVEL IV DIRECT STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## LEVEL VI ALL STYLE

So far, we have dealt with simple actions.

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

As auditing TA for a 2 1/2 hour session can go to 79 or 125 divisions (compared to 10 or 15 for the lowest level), the *pace* of the session is greater. It is this pace that makes perfect ability at each lower level vital when they combine into All Style. For each is now faster.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### SUMMARY

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright ©1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

3—10 November 1964

** 6411C03	SHSBC-45	Programmes
** 6411C04	SHSBC-48	Comments on Clay Table TVD by LRH
** 6411C10	SHSBC-46	PTPs, Overts and ARC Breaks



HCO BULLETIN OF 12 NOVEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

*SCIENTOLOGY II*  
*PC LEVEL 0-IV*

**DEFINITION PROCESSES**

The first thing to know about DEFINITION PROCESSES is that they are separate and distinct and stand by themselves and are *not Clay Table processes*.

Because definitions are used in Clay Table work, in clearing and in instruction, it is easy to make the colossal mistake of not realizing they are themselves a distinct type of process and that they can be run with no reference whatever to Clay Table or examinations.

In *The Book of Case Remedies* we find on page 25 REMEDY A and REMEDY B.

These two remedies *are* A and B because they handle a primary source of worry to instructors *and* auditors.

Because Definitions are *also* in Clay Table Clearing and are used in Instruction one might overlook A and B as *processes*.

**AUDITING STYLE**

Each level has its own basic auditing style and its secondary style as will be found covered completely in publications after this date.

The Auditing Style of Level II is Guiding Style. The Secondary Style is GUIDING SECONDARY STYLE or Guiding S Style.

**ASSISTS**

An assist is different from auditing as such in that it lacks any model session. Assists are normally short periods of auditing but not always. I have seen a touch assist go on for months at the rate of 15 minutes a day, two or three days a week. And it may take hours to do a touch assist on an accident victim. What characterizes an assist is that it is done rapidly and informally and anywhere.

“Coffee Shop Auditing” isn’t really an assist as it is usually done over coffee too casually to be dignified by the name of auditing. The pc is never informed at all of the existence of a session.

The pc, in an assist, is however informed of the fact and the assist is begun by “Start of Assist” and “End of Assist”, so an assist, like a session, has a beginning and an end.

The Auditor’s Code is observed in giving an assist and the Auditing Comm Cycle is used.

As an Auditor one sets out in an assist to accomplish a specific thing for the pc like relieve the snivels or make the ache in the leg better. So an Assist also has a very finite purpose.

**SECONDARY STYLES**

Every level has a different primary STYLE OF AUDITING. But sometimes in actual sessions or particularly in Assists this Style is altered slightly for special purposes. The Style altered for assists or for a particular process in a regular session, is called a SECONDARY STYLE. It doesn’t mean that the primary style of the level is merely loosely done. It means that it is done a precise but different way to accomplish assists or to assist the pc in a regular session. This variation is called the SECONDARY STYLE of that level.

**REMEDIES**

A Remedy is not necessarily an assist and is often done in regular session. It is the Remedy itself which determines what auditing style is used to administer it. Some Remedies, as well as being used in regular sessions, can also be used as Assists.

In short, that a process exists as a Remedy has no bearing on whether it is used in an Assist or a Model Session.

## GUIDING STYLE

The essence of Guiding Style is:

1. Locate what's awry with the pc.
2. Run a Repetitive Process to handle what's found in 1.

In essence—steer the pc into disclosing something that needs auditing and then audit it.

## GUIDING SECONDARY STYLE

Guiding Secondary Style differs from proper Guiding Style and is done by:

1. Steering the pc toward revealing something or something revealed;
2. Handling it with Itsa.

Guiding Secondary Style differs from Guiding Style only in that Guiding Secondary Style handles the matter by Steer + Itsa. Guiding Style Proper handles the matter with Steer + Repetitive Process.

## DEFINITIONS PROCESSING

Definitions Processes, when used as Remedies, are normally processed by Guiding Secondary Style.

Both Remedies of *The Book of Case Remedies* A and B are Guiding Secondary Style in their normal application.

One would expect them to be used by a Class II Auditor.

One would expect the Assist to last 10 or 15 minutes, perhaps more, but less than a regular session would take.

One would expect that any case in a PE class, any student that was getting nowhere, would be handled by the Instructor with Guiding Secondary Style using Remedies A and B as precision processes.

## REMEDY A PATTERN

One would *not* expect the person or student in trouble to be turned over to another student for handling. It's too fast, sharp and easy to handle that trouble oneself if one is Class II or above and far more certain. You can do it while you'd be finding another student to do the auditing. It would be uneconomical in terms of time not to just do it right then—no meter—leaning up against a desk.

The auditor's patter would be something like what follows. The pc's responses and Itsa are omitted in this example.

"I am going to give you a short assist." "All right, what word haven't you understood in Scientology?" "Okay, it's pre-clear. Explain what it means." "Okay, I see you are having trouble, so what does *pre* mean?" "Fine. Now what does *clear* mean?" "Good. I'm glad you realize you had it mixed up with *patient* and see that they're different." "Thank you. End of Assist."

In between the above total of auditing patter, the student may have hemmed and hawed and argued and cognited. But one just steered the pc straight along the subject selected and got it audited and cleaned up. *If* the student gave a glib text book definition after challenging the word pre-clear, we wouldn't buy it, but would give the student a piece of paper or a rubber band and say "Demonstrate that." And then carry on as it developed.

And that would be Remedy A.

You see it is precision auditing and is a process and does have an Auditing Style. *And* it works like a dream.

You see this is Steer + Itsa as to its style. And that it addressed the *immediate subject*.

What makes A Remedy A is not that it handles Scientology definitions, but that it handles the immediate subject under discussion or study.

## REMEDY B

What makes Remedy B Remedy B is that it seeks out and handles a *former* subject, conceived to be similar to the immediate subject or condition, in order to clear up misunderstandings in the immediate subject or condition.

Remedy B, run on some person or student, would simply be a bit more complex than Remedy A as it looks into the past.

A person has a *continuous* confusion with policy or auditors, etc. So one runs B like this (the following is auditor patter only):

“I’m going to give you an Assist. Okay?” “All right. What subject were you mixed up with before Scientology?” “I’m sure there is one.” “Okay. Spiritualism. Fine. What word in Spiritualism didn’t you understand?” “You can think of it.” “Good. Ectoplasm. Fine. What was the definition of that?” “All right, there’s a dictionary over there, look it up.” “I’m sorry it doesn’t give the spiritualist definition. But you say it says *Ecto* means *outside*. What’s *plasm*?” “Well, look it up.” “All right. I see, *Ecto* means *outside* and *plasm* means *mould* or *covering*.” (Note: You don’t always break up words into parts for definition in A & B Remedies.) “Yes, I’ve got that. Now what do you think spiritualists meant by it?” “All right, I’m glad you realize that sheets over people make ghosts ghosts.” “Fine, glad you recalled being scared as a child.” “All right, what did the spiritualist mean then?” “Okay. Glad you see thetans don’t need to be cased in goo.” “All right. Fine. Good. You had Ectoplasm mixed up with engrams and you now realize thetans don’t have to have a bank and can be naked. Fine. End of Assist.” (Note: You don’t always repeat after him what the pc said, but sometimes it helps.)

Student departs still cogniting. Enters Scientology now having left Spiritualism on the back track. Doesn’t keep on trying to make every HCO Bulletin studied solve “Ectoplasm”, the buried misunderstood word that kept him stuck in Spiritualism.

## DEFINITIONS PURPOSE

The purpose of definitions processing is fast clearing of “held down fives” (jammed thinking because of a misunderstood or misapplied datums) *preventing someone getting on with auditing or Scientology*.

Remedies A and B are not always used as Assists. They are also used in regular sessions. But when so used they are always used with Guiding Secondary Style— Steer + Itsa.

As a comment, people who seek to liken Scientology to something, “Oh, like Christian Science,” are stuck in Christian Science. Don’t say, “Oh no ! It isn’t like Christian Science!” Just nod and mark them for a fast assist or a session the moment the chance offers *if they seem very disinterested or aloof* when asked to a PE Course.

There’s weapons in that arsenal, auditor. Use them.

As Remedies A and B stand as the first and second given in *The Book of Case Remedies*, so before a large number of *potential* Scientologists stands the confusion of definitions.

We are now working hard to make Scientology definitions easy for them by compiling a dictionary, using words new to people only when useful.

But those that don’t come along at all, are so wound up in some past subject they can’t hear or think when that earlier subject is restimulated. And that earlier subject is held down *only* by some word or phrase they didn’t grasp.

Some poor pawn howling for the blood of Scientologists isn’t mad at Scientology at all. But at some earlier practice he got stuck in with mis-definition of *its* terms.

You see, we inherit some of the effects of the whole dullness of Man when we seek to open the prison door and say, “Look. Sunshine in the fields. Walk out.” Some, who need Remedy B, say: “Oh no! The last time somebody scratched the wall that way I got stupider.” Why say, “Hey. I’m not

scratching the wall. I'm opening the gate"? Why bother. He can't *hear you*. But he can hear Remedy B as an assist. *That's* the channel to his comprehension.

## UNDERSTANDING

When a person can't understand something and yet goes on facing up to it, he gets into a "problems situation" with it. There it is over there, yet he can't make it out.

Infrequently (fortunately for us) the being halts time right there. Anything he conceives to be similar presented to his view is *the* puzzle itself ( $A=A=A$ ). And he goes stupid. This happens rarely in the life of one being, but it happens to *many* people.

Thus there aren't many such messes in one person in one lifetime that have to be cleaned up. But there are a few in many people.

The cycle of Mis-definition is:

1. didn't grasp a word, then
2. didn't understand a principle or theory, then
3. became different from it, commits and committed overts against it, then
4. restrained himself or was restrained from committing those overts, then
5. being on a withhold (inflow) pulled in a motivator.

Not every word somebody didn't grasp was followed by a principle or theory. An overt was not committed every time this happened. Not every overt committed was restrained. So no motivator was pulled in.

But when it *did* happen, it raised havoc with the mentality of the being when trying to think about what seem to be *similar subjects*.

You see, you are looking at the basic incident + its locks as in a chain of incidents. The charge that is apparently on the lock in present time is actually only in the basic incident. The locks borrow the charge of the basic incident and are not themselves causing anything. So you have a basic misunderstood word which then charges up the whole subject as a lock; then a subject charging up similar subjects as locks.

Every nattery or non-progressing student or pc is hung up in the above 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 cycle. And *every* such student or pc has a misdefined word at the bottom of that pile. If the condition is new and temporary it's a Scientology word that's awry. If natter, no progress, etc, is *continuous* and doesn't cease when all is explained in Scientology or when attempts to straighten up Scientology words fail, then it's an earlier subject at fault. Hence, Remedies A and B. Hence Guiding Secondary Style. Hence, the fact that Definitions Processes *are* processes. And VITAL processes they are if one wants a smooth organization, a smooth PE, a smooth record of wins on all pcs. And if one wants to bring people into Scientology who seem to want to stay out.

Of course these Remedies A and B are early-on processes, to be audited by a Class II or above on a Level 0 or I pc or student. However some in Scientology, as of this date, are studying slowly or progressing poorly because A and B haven't been applied.

One expects that very soon, now that auditors have this data, there will be nobody at upper levels with his definitions dangling.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Scien. staff

*SCIENTOLOGY III and IV*

**CLAY TABLE LABEL GOOFS**

You will find in all poor auditing situations, where something has gone wrong, that you can figure yourself half to death if you do not know that *all auditing errors* are *gross* (huge, large, and in this meaning, *basic*).

The Gross Auditing Error most commonly found in auditing is just not following the directions for the process. Not *mild* departures but big ones. This often goes undetected by Case and Auditing Supervisors because the auditing report or the statement of some student is not complete or truthful about what was done.

If Case and Auditing Supervisors don't know that sometimes reports or statements are most expressive in what they leave unsaid or even twisted to make somebody look good (safeguard reputé), then the Case or Auditing Supervisor can worry himself or herself silly trying to find out why some case isn't running.

Clay Table Healing and Clay Table Clearing, like any other processes, are subject to Gross Auditing Errors (GAEs), incomplete statements or reports or even falsified descriptions of what was or was not done.

"Unusual solutions" is a phrase describing actions taken by an auditor or a Case or Auditing Supervisor when he or she has not spotted the Gross Auditing Error. The "unusual solution" seldom resolves any case *because the data on which it is based* (the observation or report) *is incomplete or inaccurate*.

Sometimes people wonder why a certain order was given. They never ask what data was given that described the situation for which the order was given. Example: (Past pc reporting on an auditor) "The auditor was drunk." Order given as a result: "Auditors must not drink." Actual situation: Auditor was dizzy after a session and wobbled when he stood up; a whisky bottle in the office had been made into a lamp. The pc's statement was false data. Therefore the order given by the D of P was an order which remedied nothing. The D of P should have seen this as natter and located instead the pc's overt. That would have improved a case and spared an order.

Sometimes such data can be very convincing. In administration at long distances or in life one can't always get the right data and so issues an order hopefully. But in auditing, the factors are fewer and under better control. And so incomplete or false data is easy to detect.

**THE GOOF**

In Clay Table work of all kinds the pc *must* label *everything* he or she makes.

The word "everything" runs up against one of Man's favourite aberrations. Man crunches things up, condenses, goes all out for togetherness or sameness. His Epitaph should be "It's all the same." Identifying things with things causes Man to call a number of things *one* thing. (He also is fond of calling one thing a number of things when he worsens on this point.)

I'll show you how this works. Auditor's Report: "The pc labelled everything." Actual fact: The pc made a representation in Clay composed of 15 separate pieces, made *one* label giving all fifteen one name. Auditor's complaint: "The pc isn't progressing—no cognitions."

In this case the auditor conceived the clay layout to be the “one thing” the pc said it was and had the pc “label it”. The pc did. One label.

Now the auditing direction in Clay Table work is to label every *thing*. The GAE was failing to get *everything* labelled.

Instead of figuring out some new process or angle to the case, all that would have been necessary was to get a *complete*, accurate description of the session. “Exactly what did the pc do?” And it would have transpired that the pc made “a picture”. “Was it labelled?” “Yes.” “What was it labelled?” “The pc labelled it ‘Catastrophe’ which is the word we were working on, of course.” At that point a smart D of P, Case or Auditing Supervisor would have figured it out. “How many things were there in the picture?” “Oh, about twenty.”

And the correct auditing direction would have been, “Go back and have the pc make the picture again if you’ve re-used the clay. And this time have the pc label *everything*—thing, piece, item—made. Got it? One label for each different bit of clay in the picture.”

That done, the pc’s case falls apart as the pc sees this or that should or shouldn’t be in the picture or why it is.

So the biggest goof in all processes is not doing the process.

And in C.T. work, the surest way in the world not to do the process is to let the pc make *something* and not get the pc to label it. And a thing of many parts *must* have a label on each part.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE  
17 November 1964

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 DECEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Co-audit

*SCIENTOLOGY 0*

**LISTEN STYLE AUDITING**

There are two ways to run Listen Style Auditing—1. As a number of teams directly under an auditing supervisor and 2. As an individual auditor. Correct training procedure at Level 0 is to have the auditor do co-audit style until confident and then train him to do the same thing individually.

**LISTEN STYLE CO-AUDIT**

The Co-audit version is merely to get the student to do auditing without having to assume too much responsibility.

In this version it is really the instructor who is doing the auditing. He starts the session and tells the auditor to give the commands and acknowledge the answers. If this relationship is understood it makes the supervision of a Level 0 group of teams much easier.

The procedure for running a Listen Style Co-audit is as follows:

1. Instructor gets the auditors to seat their pcs in their chairs and then sit down.
2. He writes up on a board the exact wording of the process to be used.
3. He asks students if the room is alright for them to be audited in.
4. He tells them what is going to be run in the session (R Factor) and cleans up any questions on the part of pcs (obviously, stress is on getting them able to talk to anyone).
5. He tells auditors and pcs that all the auditor is permitted to do is to give the command and acknowledge the answers. If pc says anything that cannot be handled with an acknowledgement the auditor will put out his hand behind him and wait for an instructor.
6. He tells the auditors to keep their auditor's reports.
7. Instructor then says "Start of Session". And tells the auditors to give the command. No goals or rudiments are set or done.

*Notes:* Students should be taught that before they give an acknowledgement they should understand pc's answer. They are permitted therefore to ask pc to amplify an answer or to explain a word so that they (the auditors) understand the answer.

If a student puts out his hand the instructor goes to session and without ending it handles what needs handling and then lets session go on. The instructor is careful not to become the pc's auditor completely as transference will set in and pcs will invent trouble to get more attention. Instructor should have a meter handy so that in the case of an ARC Break he can quickly do an assessment. In doing the ARC Break Assessment he is of course careful not to audit the pc, only to locate and indicate the by-passed charge.

At end of period, Instructor says "Commence ending your sessions." He waits a bit and then says: "Tell your auditor any gains you've made in the session. Auditors

write them down.” Waits again and then says “Alright, I’m going to end the session now. End of Session.” Instructor then gives whatever instruction is necessary either to end the period or to get the room ready for the next period or gives a break, etc.

### LISTEN STYLE, INDIVIDUAL

This is done exactly the same as the Co-audit version but in this case of course the auditor handles the session. It goes like this:

1. The auditor seats the pc in his or her chair and then sits down across from the pc, knees a few inches from the pc’s. A table is used, or just two chairs, the auditor’s report being kept on a clip board. There is, of course, no meter.

2. The auditor takes the exact auditing command to be used from his text book, bulletin or notes.

3. He asks the pc if it is all right to audit the pc in the room and if not, makes things right by adjusting the room or location of auditing.

4. He tells the pc the purpose of such sessions (Reality Factor) “I want to get you used to talking to another.” “I want to improve your reach,” etc. It’s the auditor’s goal at this level, not the pc’s. Pcs don’t get a chance to have goals in Listen Style as they would set goals they can’t attain at this level and wouldn’t have enough reality on auditing anyway to be sensible about it. So, only an R Factor is used—no goals. The auditor also tells the pc *exactly* how long the session will be.

5. The auditor tells the pc that all he is going to do is to listen and try to understand the pc, and that all he wants the pc to do is talk on the selected subject the auditor will give him and that if he veers off, the auditor will call it to his attention.

6. The auditor then quickly starts his auditor’s report.

7. The auditor says “Start of Session”.

8. The auditor gives the command from his text, bulletin or notes. The command must have something to do with telling people things or communicating, and may also specify a subject to talk about.

9. Further commands are given only when the pc loses track of the subject and wants to know what it was (see Routines for Level 0 for exact handling of commands).

10. When the pc says something and obviously expects a response, the auditor signifies he has heard, using any normal means.

11. When the pc says something the auditor doesn’t grasp, the auditor asks the pc to repeat it or amplify it so that the auditor does *hear* it in the fullest sense of the word. (See “The Prompts” below. Only 4 are allowed.)

12. When the pc stops talking, the auditor must adjudicate whether the pc is simply no longer interested in the subject, or has become unwilling to talk about some bit of it. If the auditor believes the pc has stopped because of embarrassment or some similar reason, the auditor has The Prompts, the only things he is allowed to use.

Prompter (a) “Have you found something you think would make me think less of you?”

Prompter (b) “Is there something you thought of that you think I wouldn’t understand? “

Prompter (c) “Have you said something you felt I didn’t understand. If so, tell me again.”

Prompter (d) “Have you found something you haven’t understood? If so, tell me about it.”



(The student must know these prompts by heart.) He uses as many as needed, in the sequence given, to start the pc talking again.

The auditor must not start a new subject or process just because the pc can't bring himself to go on talking. The whole essence of Level 0 is to get the pc up to being willing *to* talk about anything to anyone. Thus any coaxing is also allowed. Threats are forbidden. (a) (b) (c) or (d) usually handle. These are the commonest reasons people cease talking. Mere forgetting is handled just by reminding the pc of the subject.

13. New Processes (or new subjects in a Routine which are in essence new processes) are started only when the pc has brightened up and become quite able by reason of getting comfortable about the last one. Realizing that the whole target of Level 0 is to get people willing to talk about anything to others, a regained ability on a subject governs when to start a new process. If the auditor can answer to himself this question in the affirmative, then he can go to a new process, "Is this pc able to talk freely to or about (subject of last process)?" If so, it's all right to select a new question from the same routine or a new Routine (more rarely) and ask it now. But it is never all right to prevent a pc from talking by butting in with a new question. One *never* asks amplifying questions at Level 0. Commentary type questions are also out. The auditor listens to the question's answers and only interrupts when he truly hasn't heard or didn't grasp some point. No over and over repetitive use of commands is made, of course, as that's Level One. The Commands are given rarely, same commands, but only to get the pc going again. Staccato repetitive commands and brief pc answers are *not* for Level 0.

14. Toward the end of the auditing period, the auditor warns, "The session time is about over. We'll have to be ending shortly."

15. When the pc has given an extra comment or two, the auditor says, "We're closing the session now. Time is up. Have you made any gains in this session?"

16. The pc's answers are *quickly* noted.

17. The auditor says, "End of Session."

Note: Pcs of course often keep on talking and make it hard to end a session. End it anyway. If this seems to shock the pc, point out the time the session ended as originally set and say also, "You'll be getting more auditing and we'll take that up in the next session." You'll *always* have trouble ending a session if you fail to put in its time in the R Factor (Reality Factor) in 4 above. As the auditor notes the time in his report (see 4 above) he must say, "This session will go until \_\_\_\_\_ (hours and minutes) precisely." Thus he has an out for ending it. An auditor must never run beyond that time set, and must, of course, audit until it is reached. This, by the way, does not just hold good for Level 0. It is very good practice for all levels in regular sessions. The only exception is the assist where one is auditing toward a definite gain. In general auditing one seeks to obtain general gains not sudden momentary spurts.

-----

The auditor, whether in co-audit or individual session at this and the next level, will soon become impressed with this fact: the more he himself says during the session, the less gain the pc gets. Therefore, aside from the above, the auditor does very little in the session and is paid handsomely for it in pc gains.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 DECEMBER AD 14

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Co-audit

*SCIENTOLOGY 0*

**CURRICULUM FOR LEVEL 0—HAS**

*Effective January 1, 1965 (AD15)*

The Hubbard Apprentice Scientologist Course for the HAS certificate is the first requisite course. It is taught in qualified Academies. It can be preceded by a personal efficiency course and for this franchise holders may issue, on the form provided-by a Central Organization, a course completion certificate. But this is not requisite to enrolling in an HAS Course.

For some years HAS courses have been very successful. However, at higher levels lack of training in basics has been a stumbling block to auditors. Therefore this course becomes a formal Academy course out of actual training need and has a proper and precise curriculum.

The HAS Course is a rigorous course. To cover its materials in 160 course hours requires great diligence and application.

**THEORY REQUIREMENTS**

The Study Materials.  
Code of a Scientologist.  
The Auditor's Code.  
The Dianetic Axioms.  
The Pre-Logics.  
The Logics.  
The Scientology Axioms.  
Scientology Vocabulary.  
The ARC Triangle.  
The Tone Scale.  
The 8 Dynamics.  
Relationship of Thetan—Body—Reactive Mind.  
HCO Bulletins on Listen Style Auditing.  
HCO Bulletins on Level 0 Processes.  
How to make out an Auditor's Report.  
The Local and Worldwide Organizations of Scientology.  
An Org Board.  
The Symbols of Dianetics and Scientology.  
A Short History of Dianetics and Scientology.  
The Gradation and Classification Programme.

**PRACTICAL REQUIREMENTS**

Listen Style Drills.  
Patter Drills for Zero Routines.  
The Prompters (responses to pcs in difficulty about talking).  
How to set up a session.

## AUDITING REQUIREMENTS

All Routines of Level Zero run and received.

### STUDY GOAL

A good familiarity with the substance and precision of Scientology.

### GOAL AS AN AUDITOR

To be able to get people to talk to him or her easily without meeting it with censure, interruptions or invalidation. To be a safe, trustworthy auditor who can listen.

### GOAL AS A PC

To be able to talk more freely to others and be more comfortable about it.

-----

This is the totality of study—and achievements.

No axioms or logics must be learned verbatim but they as well as their words must be understood and the student must be able to demonstrate what they mean.

Vocabulary should be glib and useful to the student.

Cases that are severe cases may be relegated to the HGC at student rates but only to have Remedies A and B run. Five hour or 25 hour intensives may be offered students for this purpose. No attempt should be made to get this auditing done on course and no instructor may do it. Any time spent in being audited is either added to course time or done by the week-end HGC.

Instructors may not audit students on the HAS course, but may give minor assists or demonstrations.

Instructors must be alert on the consequences of missed definitions and, due to limited course time, may not waste any time noticing a student is dragging and doing something about it in the limits given above.

Course texts and HCO Bulletins are mainly already in existence. But they may be re-compiled or condensed in future publications.

-----

This is the totality of the HAS Course.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 DECEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Co audit

## *SCIENTOLOGY 0*

### **PROCESSES**

The *whole* case gain to be expected from a pc at Level 0 is an increase of ability to talk to others.

At Level 0 we do not expect or lead people to expect any sudden miracle of physical or mental recovery. Rather, we emphasize that we are getting their feet on the ladder and as they *progress up* through levels they will achieve all they ever hoped for and more.

*Jumping* to higher levels leaves the lower level disabilities untouched and while trying to audit somebody at, say, Level III, we will find ourselves struggling with things that should have been handled at Level 0.

Further, this target is the one that beginning pcs make the most gains on in my experience. I recall one near miracle on a girl who couldn't bring herself to talk to her parents and all I did was get her to tell me what she'd say to them if she could talk to them.

Recalling is *too steep* for a starting pc. They can't recall well really until about Level IV when they can be cleaned up on their ARC Breaks with Life.

Here we have the whole design of Level 0:

"Recover the pc's ability to talk to others freely."

If you realize that a pc can't be in session unless he is willing to talk to his auditor, you will also realize that he can't be in life until he is able to communicate freely with others.

Thus *any* process that does not forward this end is *not* for Level 0, no matter how frantic the case may be to become clear yesterday.

The more hysterical a pc is about getting advanced processes or a case gain, the less strenuous the process administered must be. The psychiatrist erred on this one point and it wiped him out as a social benefactor. The more desperate the case, the more desperate were his measures. He was just echoing his patients. It is *very* important for an auditor to realize this one datum for it is the second guiding rule of Level 0. It is a very senior datum. One must not become desperate and use desperate measures just because the pc is desperate or the family or society is desperate about the pc. The worse off the pc, the lighter the approach to that pc must be.

Psychotics (real, gibbering ones) are below auditing treatment in sessions. The measure used for them should be just rest and isolation from their former environments. And the first process used should be just getting the person to realize you are safe and safe to talk to.

So, although a few cases are psychotic, this still holds good. The auditor must get

the pc to realize he is safe—won't punish, scold, reprimand or betray confidences—and that the auditor will listen.

It doesn't give the auditor a withhold to not speak of another's withholds. One can only withhold what one oneself has done. What the pc did or said isn't even subject for a session on the auditor for withholding it had *no* aberrative value.

Even when we're Class IV, we still start all our pcs at the pc's level, which is, for a beginning pc, Level 0.

So what we are trying to do with our pcs at Level 0 is the following:

1. Recover the pc's ability to talk to others freely;
2. Teach the pc by example the auditor is safe to talk to and won't scold, reprimand, punish or betray, and
3. Refuse to engage in desperate measures just because the pc is desperate; and therefore get a real, lasting gain for the pc.

## ROUTINES

A routine is a standard process, designed for the best steady gain of the pc at that level. The *remedy* is different. It is an auditing process which is designed to handle a non-routine situation. The only real remedy at Level 0 is patching up having failed to hear or understand the pc. The rest is all done by routine. The Case Remedies are at Level II and while we all realize that every Level 0 case *needs* a lot of Level II remedies, we also know that no remedy will work well until the pc is able to talk to others. When you run into trouble at Level 0, there are only 3 reasons possible:

1. The pc was not run in a direction or on a process to improve his or her ability to communicate to others;
2. The auditor failed to understand the pc's statements, either words or meanings; or
3. The auditor engaged in desperate measures, changed processes, or scolded or did something to lower the pc's feeling of security in the session.

That's all. As you go on up through the levels, you will find many other ways a pc can get upset. But at Level 0, the pc is not close enough to reality on his own case to even be touched by these at first. The pc is a long way off when he first starts getting audited. He can only approach his own case by degrees. So a pc, no matter how wildly he or she dramatizes at Level 0, is really only capable of a reality of the smallest kind about self. And such a pc must be able to talk before anything else can happen. Pcs can be ruined by someone who doesn't grasp that simple fact. Psychiatrists, failing to grasp it, murdered several million people—so it's no light matter. It's an important one.

A pc at Level 0 usually can't even conceive of an overt (a harmful act) done by himself. When they can, they go religiously guilty and seek to atone or some such thing. Become a monk. Or commit suicide.

The reason 33 1/3 percent of all psycho-analytic patients are said to have committed suicide in their first three months of treatment is not that they "came too late" but that a lot of wild data was thrown at them to get at their "source of guilt" and they went head on into the reactive bank, sought to demonstrate their "guilt" by making others guilty and killing themselves.

You don't want anything out of the pc but an increased ability to talk relaxedly to others without fear, embarrassment, suspicion or guilt. So all processes at Level 0 are arranged accordingly.

## WORDINGS

To give all possible wordings of routines that will accomplish the above is completely beyond need.

Once you have the idea of it straight, you can invent them by the dozens.

One doesn't even have to think of a particular pc. All Level 0 processes are good only when they apply to all pcs.

### ROUTINE 0-0 (Zero-Zero)

The starting routine is the most basic of all auditing routines. It is simply "What are you willing to talk to me about?" Pc answers. "What would you like to tell me about that?"

At Level II, the first question alone becomes a remedy. Here the two questions make a routine—and a very effective one it is!

### ROUTINE 0-A

This is how the auditor puts together Routine 0-A:

1. Make a list of people or things one can't generally talk to easily! That includes parents, policemen, governments and God. But it's a far longer list. The auditor must do this. It must never be published as a "canned" list.
2. Using any one of the listed items: "If you could talk to \_\_\_\_ (listed item) what would you say?"

All right, that's all there is to finding the commands for Routine 0-A.

One doesn't get the pc to do the list. The list isn't done in session. The auditor does it himself on his own time. And each auditor must do his own list for his pcs and add to it from time to time as he thinks of new ones.

The pc isn't necessarily given any choice of items. The auditor picks one he thinks may fit. That's easy to do after one session. The pc keeps complaining about parents. OK. Run 0-A on parents.

And flatten it!

By flatten is meant to use that one subject until the pc is darned sure he or she could now talk to the item chosen. If the pc still wants to abuse the item, it isn't flat. If the pc still wants to *do* something about the item, it is not flat. When the pc is cheerful about the item or no longer fascinated with it, it's flat.

Remember, there's no need to find out what the pc can't talk to. In fact, most cases you're better off just to take an item of your own for 0-A and use it. May seem strange, but you'll have a smoother time of it with the pc. Further you'll not restimulate (churn up) the pc's bank so hard.

### ROUTINE 0-B

The second routine consists of things to talk *about*.

One puts the routine together this way:

1. The auditor makes a list (not from the pc but himself) of everything he can think of that is banned for any reason from conversation or is not generally considered acceptable for social communication. This includes non-social

subjects like sexual experiences, W.C. details, embarrassing experiences, thefts one has done, etc. Things nobody would calmly discuss in mixed company.

2. An item from the list is included in the auditing command, "What would you be willing to tell me about ?" Add the item you choose.
3. When they have "run down" (as in clocks) ask them, "Who else could you say those things to?"
4. Rechoose a subject on the list.
5. Repeat 3.
6. Continue to repeat 4. and 5.

Above all, don't be critical of the pc. And very calmly hear and seek to understand what the pc said. (You never, by the way, seek to find out why the pc reacted or responded in some way. A real blunder at Level 0 is "Why did you feel that way?" Or "Why do you think you can't say that?" You're *not* after the causes of things at Level 0. You will find out why at Level VI!) At Level 0, just keep them talking while you listen. And you use only the subject chosen to keep them talking.

#### ROUTINE 0-C

Routine 0-C is, of course, old R-1-C renamed. It is done without a meter and it has any subject under the sun included in its command. It is elsewhere covered.

In all the above routines it is vital not to alter the commands given above.

-----

There are many more possible routines. But to be a Level Zero Routine it must have as its goal only freeing up the ability of the pc to talk freely to others.

This is not a level to be regarded with a brush-off. It takes a lot of skill to restore a pc's ability to communicate freely.

When an auditor has that skill he will succeed at all higher levels.

When a pc has that skill regained, his world will look to him to be a far, far better place.

So it is very important to get over this first hurdle. And very important not to dodge it and try to climb the hill anyway. It will become an awfully steep hill.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jw.cden  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is corrected by HCO B 26 December 1964, *Routine O-A (Expanded)*.]

#### SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

15—22 December 1964

- |            |          |   |
|------------|----------|---|
| ** 6412C15 | SHSBC-49 | Communication—A Gradient on Duplication |
| ** 6412C22 | SHSBC-50 | Mastery of the GPMs (film)              |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 DECEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Co-audit

*SCIENTOLOGY ZERO*

(Corrections to HCO Bulletin of 11 December 1964,  
“Processes”, and to HCO Bulletin of 10 December 1964,  
“Listen Style Auditing”)

**ROUTINE 0-A (EXPANDED)**

An additional command increases the usefulness of this routine. It is therefore rewritten as follows:

The auditor makes a list of things people generally can't talk to easily. That includes parents, policemen, governments and God. But it's a far longer list. The auditor must compile this list himself or herself out of session. It may be added to by the auditor from time to time. It must never be published as a “canned list”. Scientology Instructors and Scientology Personnel should not be listed on it as it leads to upset in sessions.

*STEP 1.* The auditor chooses one of the subjects off the list and uses it in Steps 2 and 3 below until the pc is comfortable about it. Subjects from the list can be chosen in sequence or at random. A chosen subject is not left until the pc is comfortable about it. By this is meant, the pc would not feel disturbed talking to the subject chosen.

The auditor does not ask the pc which subject or if it is all right to choose that subject as the pc at the moment of selection is not likely to feel comfortable about any of the listed subjects and so will just reject. No, the auditor just chooses one and starts on it.

*STEP 2.* The auditor asks, “If you could talk to \_\_\_\_\_ (chosen subject), what would you talk about?” Pc answers one or more things at greater or shorter length.

*STEP 3.* When the pc seems satisfied the question has been answered, the auditor then says, “All right, if you were talking to \_\_\_\_\_ (chosen subject in 1 ) about that what would you say, exactly?”

The pc is expected to speak as though talking to the subject chosen in 1.

*STEP 4.* The auditor notes whether pc is comfortable about the subject chosen in Step 1, yet without asking pc. This is done by noting the voice tone or text of what the pc would say. If it is shy, diffident, or if it is belligerent or annoyed, the same subject is retained for a new go with Steps 2 and 3. If the pc seems bright and cheerful, a new subject is chosen from the list for a working over with Steps 2 and 3. If the subject in 1 is retained, the auditor again does Steps 2 and 3 above over and over until the pc is cheerful. A subject chosen in 1 is not left until the pc really can respond cheerfully. When this is accomplished, a new subject is chosen as Step 1 and the process is continued with Steps 2 and 3 using the new subject.

The whole of Routine 0-A is flat when the pc feels far more comfortable about talking to specific items and isn't shying off from items on the list. It is flat, therefore, when an ability is regained on specific items on the list and the list items aren't producing big new changes in the pc's communication ability.



## LISTEN STYLE CO-AUDIT

It is expected that by the time an auditor is permitted to do the Zero Routines, Individual Listen Style will have been entered upon.

Until the class seems able to run individual sessions, old "R-1-C" can be used by the auditing supervisor on a group basis using Listen Style Co-audit until the group has the idea of sessions.

Routines work best on Individual Listen Style. The pc is always wondering, in Listen Style Co-audit, if the auditing supervisor is listening to him personally. The auditor is not the receipt point of the pc's comm in many instances.

Old R-1-C is the best training mechanism to get auditors to run sessions. In this process the auditing supervisor just chooses something for all the pcs to talk to the auditors about, like a dynamic or a common social problem.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE

30 December 1964

\*\* 6412C30      SHSBC-51      Pattern of the Bank (film)

# SUBJECT INDEX

1962-1964

## A

A=A=A, identification is most easily present when time sense is awry, 330  
 aberration, aberrative,  
   basic aberration is withheld flow, 16  
   common denominator—interiorization into past and unawareness of PTenvironment, 50  
   fundamental of aberration: all wrong actions are result of an error followed by an insistence on having been right, 322  
   is composited of unknowns, therefore pc can't tell what is to be run, 76  
   self-determined (not other-determined) flows can be aberrative, 14  
   single source of aberration is time, 277, 287  
 ability regained, gradient scale of, 342  
 abridged style auditing; *see* auditing, abridged style  
 Academy, teach fundamentals of Scientology, 52; *see also* training  
 accused, don't run a process that makes pc feel ~, 441  
 acknowledge (ment); *see also* TR 2  
   all auditors acknowledge too little, 292  
   big or multiple is taught at Level 11 to shut pc off when pc is going off subject, 501  
   E-Meter dependence is created by invalidation or poor acknowledgement by auditor, 334  
   half-acknowledgement, *defn.*, ways of keeping pc talking by giving pc feeling he is being heard and yet not chopping with overdone TR 2, 501  
   over acknowledgement, *defn.*, acknowledging before pc has said all, 336  
 actions, only realization of actions done will key out a GPM, 435  
 "afraid to find out" type of case, 36  
 all style auditing; *see* auditing, all style  
 alter-is auditor, changes when the pc changes, 75  
 alter-is, squirrels are only Case Levels 7 or 6 dramatizing ~ on Scientology instead of their track, 327  
 analysis, case; *see* case analysis  
 anchor points, don't drive in ~ by shoving things at or gesture toward pc, 161  
 apathy, misery and desire for suicide and death, cause of, 252  
 apathy, pc in grief or apathy, cause and remedy of [R2, R3], 251  
 apathy, pc rises in tone up to lower levels of Tone Scale, he comes up to apathy, 419  
 apparency, time is actual but is also an ~, 330  
 ARC; *see also* communication  
   all after charge is based on prior ARC, 442  
   care should be taken not to heavily run an out-of-ARC type process, command which asks for out-of-affinity moments, out-of-reality moments and out-of-communication incidents, 441

ARC (*cont.*)  
   CCHs, ARC in the CCHs, 46  
   essence of auditing is ARC handled and controlled by auditor, 426  
   with existence, 347  
 ARC break (s), ARC broken; *see also* rudiments, 293, 438  
   assessment, 306, 338, 352, 418  
   by-passed charge assessment and ARC break assessment, two different actions, 470; *see also* *Book of Case Remedies*  
   continuing ~ after pc has cognited invalidates pc's cognition and cuts its a line and may cause a new ARC break, 418  
   don't ever do an ~ until pc has given up trying to untangle it, 338  
   four ways of using lists, 306  
   how to do, 306, 345, 469  
   if pc's attention is still on auditor correct charge has not been found, 346  
   isn't auditing because it doesn't use auditing comm cycle, 469  
   L-1, General ARC Break Assessment, 307  
   L-2, listing sessions, assessment sessions, 307  
   L-3, R3R engram running by chains, 308  
   L4, Routine 3N, GPMs, all Goals sessions, 308  
   natter is handled by ~, 332  
   often has to be done through a dirty needle, 306  
   purpose of ARC break assessment, 346  
   sources of trouble in doing ~, 348  
   uses for ~, 345  
   what it consists of, 469  
   what it requires in an auditor, 345  
 auditing is not possible in presence of ~, 468, 469  
 auditing over top of ~ can reduce a graph, hang pc up in sessions or worsen case, 470  
 auditor or student who has trouble with an "ARC breaky pc", how to handle, 58  
 by-passed charge, 281, 285; *see also* ARC breaks, cause of ARC breaks  
   does not always = ARC break, but ARC break always = by-passed charge, 417  
   is never what pc says it was if pc is still ARC broken, 465  
   by-passed charge assessment on an ARC broken pc, never do a, 469  
   cause of ARC breaks,  
     all ARC breaks stem from missed withholds, 58  
     charge restimulated and left prior to where auditor is working can cause an ~, 282, 290, 416  
     cut pc off, get in more actions than pc is allowed to answer and you'll have a dirty needle, then stuck TA and then an ~, 419  
   double question [Q and A] is primary source of ~ and out rudiments, 74

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### ARC break(s), ARC broken (*cont.*)

#### cause of ARC breaks (*cont.*)

- high percentage of ~ occur because of failure to understand pc, 162
- leaving an overt touched on case and calling it clean will cause a future ~ with auditor, 439
- missing a withhold or not getting all of it is sole source of ~, 23
- people do not, on known charge; it is always hidden or earlier charge that causes ~, 347, 417
- prime source of ~ in engram running sessions is by-passing charge by time mishandling by auditor, 287
- Q and A causes ARC breaks by by-passing charge, 283, 285, 419
- source of all ~ is BPC, 281, 306, 417
- charge left after (later) (nearer pt) than where auditor is working hardly ever causes ~, 282
- cycle of the ARC break, 253, 417
- dirty needle, its cause is cut itsa or an LI session ARC break, 384, 414
- double ARC break; *see Book of Case Remedies*
- E-Meter and ARC breaks, 102, 362
  - ARC breaks stop a meter from reacting, 73, 96, 102, 361, 362
  - E-Meter can go dead in presence of monstrous ARC break and it can go gradually dull in presence of out rudiments, 96, 361
  - E-Meter is invaluable in locating by-passed charge and curing an ARC break, 418
- engrams contain heaviest ARC break with thetan's environment and other beings, 291
- handling ARC breaks, 469; *see also* ~ assessment don't use a process, find the missed charge, 284 find and indicate the correct BPC, 281, 282 in R3R, 293, 300
- living, two conditions of, ARC broken, not ARC broken, 347
- missed withholds and ARC breaks, 20, 23, 58
  - natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, are restimulated but missed or partially missed withholds, 26
  - no ARC breaks when missed withholds have been cleaned up, 58
- overts, don't ARC break pc in getting overts off, 464, 468
- permitted auditor statements, 464
- preclear and ARC break,
  - auditing over top of ~ can reduce a graph, hang pc up in sessions or worsen case, 470
  - auditor ARC breaks pc by demanding more than is there, 439
  - if pc knows what charge it is he does not ARC break or he ceases to be ~, 347, 465
  - never discipline or Q and A with ~ pc, 286
  - pc becomes critical of anything outside engram (room, auditor, Scientology, the technology) it is an ARC break, 293
  - pc can always be told what has been missed and will almost always settle down at once, 282

### ARC break(s), ARC broken (*cont.*)

#### preclear and ARC break (*cont.*)

- pc in an ~ is in grip of reaction which was in incident, now fully on automatic, 286, 417
- pc is ARC breaky because of M/WIH, 20
- pc never knows why the ARC break, 282, 417
- rule: if pc ARC breaks, issue no further auditing commands until pc and auditor are satisfied cause of ARC break has been located and indicated, 293, 418
- to tell pc what his PTP is and then audit what auditor said it was will inevitably ~ pc, 463
- when pc is talking and you're getting no TA you already have an ARC break or are about to get one, 336
- PTPs, overts and ARC breaks, 468; *see also BCR*
- rudiment, if you miss on one rudiment the next even if really hot can seem to be null by reason of ARC break, 105
- R2 and R3 ARC breaks, 251
  - auditor's and D of P's views on, 253
  - different than other ARC breaks, 251
  - fifteen principal causes of, 251, 252
- R2H—ARC Breaks by Assessment, 297
- R2-12A ARC break always equals wrong Routine 2, how to handle, 237
- R6 ARC breaks, 418
- ARC Break Process(es) [1963], 284
  - Co-Audit ARC Break Process, commands of, 319
- ARC Process, commands of, 95
- ARC Processes, dub-in case should be running ~ as case is over-charged for engrams, 293
- ARC Straight Wire, new [1963]: "What attitude was not received?" "What reality was not perceived (seen)?" "What communication was not acknowledged?"", 284
- as-is(ness),
  - chronically tired pc who is not eating won't get TA for there's no as-is of locks, 434
  - it takes lower grades to raise pc's cause level so that pc, on reaching Grade VI, can as-is the bank, 433, 434
  - mass, as-isness of, 49
  - pc who makes no gain is the pc who will not as-is, who will not confront, 36
  - time track, unless time track is made available it cannot be as-is-ed by pc and so remains aberrative, 276
- "asserted", another name for suggested, used mainly in checkout, and occasionally in routine nulling when pc is declaring "It is my goal", 119
- assessment (s), 208, *defn*, whole action of obtaining a significant item from pc [1962], 203; *see also* listing
- by-passed charge assessment is auditing because you clean every tick of needle on list being assessed, 469
- by-passed charge, pc will feel better moment right type of by-passed charge is identified by ~ and indicated by auditor, 418

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### assessment(s) (*cont.*)

- by TA, no ~ list is continued in Levels I to III beyond seeing a TA move until that TA motion is handled, 373
- development of assessments, 300
- for clearing intensive, Pre-Clearing Scale, 166
- make sure it was the bank the meter read, not breath or body motion, 394
- preclear interest as a method of assessment, 325
- Prehav assessment; *see* Prehav assessment
- R2H assessment; *see* Routine 2H
- R3R assessment; *see* R3R
- slow assessment; *see* slow assessment
- tone arm assessment, 369, 372
- what assessment is prevented by during 2-10, 2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21, 203
- 3DXX assessment; *see* Routine 3DXX
- 3GAXX assessment; *see* Routine 3GAXX
- assist(s), 141, 505
  - like a session, has a beginning and an end, Auditor's Code is observed and auditing comm cycle is used, but it lacks any Model Session, 505
  - O/W is best repetitive process for, 99
  - Remedies A and B are not always used as ~, 507
- assumptions, safe, 357; *see also* service facsimiles attention,
  - ARC break assessment: if pc's attention is still on auditor correct charge has not been found, 346
  - control pc's attention, 30
  - master one action and center people's attention upon it, 432, 433
  - R3R, interest is only absorbed attention and a desire to talk about it, 301
- audit(ing), *def.*, auditor gives pc something to answer, pc answers it and when pc has answered it to his satisfaction, auditor acknowledges it, 426
- abridged style auditing, 501
  - sticks to essentials and drops rote where it impedes case advance, 502
- all style auditing, 503
- any system which reduces charged condition of time track without reducing but increasing awareness and decisionability of pc is valid processing; any system which seeks to handle charge but reduces pc's awareness and decisionability is not valid processing but is degrading, 287
- ARC break and auditing; *see* ARCbreak
- assist is different from auditing as such in that it lacks any Model Session, 505
- auditor's perception of pc, 357
- basic auditing, 335, 336
  - dirty needle, its cause lies in basic auditing not in technique errors, 384, 414
  - handling of pc as a being, auditing cycle, meter, comprise the segment of processing known as, 385
  - is necessary for technique to work, 385
- by Lists—L.1 and L.4, 423

### audit(ing) (*cont.*)

- by-passed charge assessment is auditing because you clean every tick of needle on list being assessed, 469
- case level as an index of ~ ability is discarded, it is only an index of how-hard-to-train, 316
- CCHs; *see* CCHs
- Clay Table Auditing; *see* Clay Table Auditing
- "coffee shop auditing" described, 505
- commands; *see* commands
- comm cycle, 340
  - ARC break assessment isn't auditing because it doesn't use auditing comm cycle, 469
  - auditor who interrupts or changes an ~ before it is complete is Q and A-ing, 410
  - charge is removed from case only by comm cycle pc to auditor, 335, 414
  - is a cycle of action; it starts with auditor asking a question pc can understand, getting pc to answer it and acknowledging that answer, 410
  - line pc to auditor is somewhat senior to comm line auditor to pc, 335, 336
- covert auditing, 491
- cycle, basic error of auditing cycle (diagram), 337
- cycle, get your pc trained into what auditing cycle is, 490
- cycle, violations of, can bring about overwhelm, 400
- Definitions Processing; *see* Definitions Processing
- direct style auditing means straight, concentrated, intense, applied in a direct manner, 502
- discipline is needed to make processes work, 263
- essence of auditing is not finding what is wrong with pc and hammering at it; it is ARC handled and controlled by auditor, 426
- faults present in the auditing if clearing did not occur [R3SC], 355
- gradient scale of ability regained, 342
- gradient scale of auditing, 493
- gross auditing errors (GAEs), 509
- guiding secondary style is steering pc toward revealing something or something revealed and handling it withitsa, 506
- guiding style auditing consists of two-way comm that steers pc into revealing a difficulty followed by repetitive process to handle what has been revealed, 500, 506
- guiding style auditing is two-way comm and formal auditing, 500
- is an exact science, not an art, 59
- itsa line, when it is cut ~ ceases to work, 337
- level of auditing, each, controls pc's attention a little more than last, 371
- listen style auditing, 377, 498, 511
- listing is auditing, 53
- listing is slightly contrary to early auditing philosophy, 160
- masses are released off body and out of thetan's bank in auditing, 256

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### audit(ing) (*cont.*)

muzzled auditing is stark total of TRs 0 to 4 and not anything else added, 499

new pc,  
liabilities of auditing new pcs, 491  
R-factor to new pcs, 490

no auditing means “while seeming to deliver auditing, actually get nothing done”, 220

pc, audit the pc in front of you, not some other pc or generalized object, 47

present time problems and overts, other auditing is not possible in presence of, 468

question, pcs can say whatever else they please, but they must answer auditing question or no auditing occurs, 490

remedy is something you do to get pc into condition for routine auditing, 485

required skills of processing and why, 314

restimulated charge that is then blown gives us the action of auditing, 290, 347, 416

results are best achieved in a session and a session depends upon a self-determined agreement to be audited, 491

rote style auditing, 499

rough auditing reduces havingness, 225

rule: don’t demand more than pc can tell you or receive less than pc has to say, 336

secondary styles, 505

session; *see* session

skills, 218, 314  
by Scientology levels [1964], 411  
five basic auditing skills, 326

sold by intensives, 153

student auditing assignments, 431

student auditing, inability to clean up needle is biggest hole in ~, 214

styles of auditing, 377, 498, 505

tape recording sessions, points to look for, 378

theory of charge erasure, 291

three parts: basic auditing, technique and case analysis, 385

to get auditing into a state of perfection, know basics, know practical, 61

tone arm action, most vital necessity of ~ at any level of Scientology is to get, 369

TRs must contain the correct data of auditing, 79

Scientology to handle situations in life is a whole subject in itself and it isn’t ~, 491

watch pc’s eyes, don’t take auditing actions if pc is not looking at you, 336 -

“without the person knowing anything about it”, 491

you are running a thetan and his bank while helped and hindered by body, 255

Auditing by Lists, 423

auditor(s)(’s),  
alter-is auditor, changes when pc changes, 75  
ARC break assessment and auditor; *see* ARC break assessment  
bad “auditor”, 32

### auditor(s)(’s) (*cont.*)

becomes an auditor when he or she finds out that it’s the basics that count, 425

by-passed charge, indicating BPC is a necessary auditor action which at first glance may seem evaluative, 465

CCHs and auditors; *see* CCHs

Class VI auditor, things he should know [1964], 412

confidence, importance of, 326

dangerous auditor, characteristics of and remedy for, 32, 36

dirty needle and auditor; *see* dirty needle

don’t drive in anchor points by shoving things at or gesture toward pc, 161

E-Meter goes null on a gradient scale of misses by ~; the more misses the less meter reads, 105

evaluation, accidental evaluation may occur when auditor repeats what pc said, 161, 414

evaluation, auditor never says what overt is for that’s evaluation, 464

field auditor targets, 432

good auditor, actions of, 426, 427

invalidation, avoid use of “you” to pc, 161

is in absolute control of bank—it always does what you tell it to do, 413

itsa, a silent auditor invites itsa, 370

job of auditor is to free thetan by digging him out of his time track, 288

judgment, 316

means “a listener”, 335

natural and dangerous, difference between, 32

not understanding what pc said or meant, how to handle, 161, 414

object is to get pc to look so that pc can tell the auditor, 23, 335, 415

observation of pc, 357, 360

outnesses,  
acknowledging too little, 292  
acting like a spectator instead of being in control, 74, 273  
asserting rightness, making others wrong, 327  
auditor errors add charge; pc then is overwhelmed, 401  
cleaning a clean meter is asking for trouble, 335  
consistently missing charge or consistently fail using ing to anticipate missed charge, result of, 286  
disagreement with data measures degree of unworkability he’ll enter into processing, 326  
failure to take pc’s data; you take pc’s data, never take his orders, 292, 415  
out TRs and no impingement get no reads, 82  
Q and A, 37, 74, 410  
repeating what the pc said, 161, 414  
perception of pc, 357  
poorer he is, the simpler actions he’s assigned, 217  
preclear actions all have an exact ~ response, 59  
raising cause level of, 434

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- auditor(s)('s) (*cont.*)
- reasons why some auditors cannot run engrams on pcs, 287
  - requirements,
    - complete precision required of today's ~, 52
    - has to be skilled on one process at least and know all about it before he can do two, 432
    - must be perfect on a meter, defined, 104
    - must know basic laws and mechanics of time track in order to run engrams, 273
  - responsible for session, 161, 414, 425, 426
  - skill, 315, 326
    - by case level [1963], 314
    - is directly measured by amount of TA he can get, 373, 413
    - mark of skilled is ability to remedy a case and then get on with routine auditing, 485
  - staff ~, groove in for wins and TA action, 327
  - statements, permitted auditor statements, 464
  - takes pc's data, never his orders, 415
  - three hats of, 387
  - time track obeys auditor; time track does not obey a preclear (early in auditing), 274
  - training; *see* training
  - trouble with an ARC breaky pc or no gain, how to handle auditor who has, 58
- Auditor's Code is observed in giving an assist and auditing comm cycle is used, 505
- Auditor's Code, processes do not work when administered outside and without skillfully practiced TRs, 263
- Auditor's Report, use of, 444; *see also* Auditor Admin Series [IX-3]
- auto-control, no-confidence induces a sort of ~ in session which induces a dirty needle, 93
- automaticity is discharged by indicating area of charge only, 282
- awareness, E-Meter locates charged areas below ~ of pc and verifies that charge has been removed, 334, 416
- ### B
- bad "auditor", 32
- indicators; *see* indicators
- bank; *see* reactive mind
- basic, *defn.*, first incident (engram, lock, overt act) on any chain, 274
- charge is held in place by basic on chain, 41, 290
  - first incident of any chain is fully or partially unknown to person, 28, 41
  - incidents, later than ~ incidents are run either to uncover more ~ (earlier) incidents or to clean up chain after ~ has been found and erased, 290
- basic auditing; *see* auditing, basic auditing
- basic basic, *defn.*, first engram on the whole time track, 274
- beginning rudiments; *see* rudiments, beginning behavior, two types—that calculated to be constructive and that calculated to be disastrous, 407
- being at different lifetimes is good and evil, 408
- being who *is* something cannot observe it; being who looks at something ceases to be it, 50
- between lives implants, 333
- big mid ruds; *see* rudiments, middle
- Big Tiger Drill, 196
- blow, by-passed charge can cause person to blow out of session, a course or the org, 346
- blows, student is slow or blows, reason for lies in failure to understand words used in his training, 451
- blow, students trying to blow do so only after matter has not been confronted and handled in routine supervision; left unhandled, situations become blows, 431
- body,
  - discolors when mass from bank is brought in on it, 255
  - GPM, more advanced the GPM the more careful you have to be of the body, 256
  - in auditing, masses are released off body and out of thetan's bank, 256
  - motion, 394
    - doesn't count as TA, 413
    - TA conscious body-moving pc, how to cure, 373
    - TA is never touched during sneezing, ~, etc., and no recording is made, 397, 443
    - TA shifts because of body motion, yawning, asking questions, and particularly because of protests do not count in reading TA position [R2, R3], 241
  - pain, person could feel pain only as himself (thetan plus body), 176
  - thetan vs. body, 255
- boiling off pc, equals missed withhold, 59
- bonus package (BP), 189
- Book Mimicry; *see* CCH 4
- bouncer throws pc backward, forward, up or down from the track and so makes it apparently unavailable, 275
- BPC; *see* by-passed charge
- bronchitis, example of case analysis on chronic bronchitis, 388
- button, never ask the meter after a pc volunteers a button, 285, 415
- buttons, order of big mid rud buttons [1963], 248
- by-passed charge(s), 417
  - ARC break and BPC; *see* ARC break
  - blowdown of tone arm is meter reaction of having found correct by-passed charge, 346
  - can cause person to blow out of session, or out of an org or a course or Scientology, 346
  - case is the whole sum of past BPC, 347
  - does not always = ARC break, but ARC break always = by-passed charge, 417

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### by-passed charge(s) (*cont.* )

- E-Meter is invaluable in locating by-passed charge and curing an ARC break, 418
- how charge can be by-passed, 281
- indicating BPC, relationship to evaluation, 465
- is explanation for violence of M/W/Hs, 285
- is in some degree a missed withhold, missed by both auditor and pc, 306, 417
- pc's subjective reality on gain will not compare to TA action, if charge by-passed, until BPC located, 368
- pc will feel better moment right type of is identified by assessment and indicated by auditor, 418
- several can exist and be found on one list, 418
- by-passed charge assessment and ARC break assessment, two different actions, 470; *see also* BCR
- by-passed charge assessment is auditing because you clean every tick of needle on list being assessed, 469
- by-passed charge assessment on an ARC broken pc, never do, 469
- by-passed item defined, 182

## C

case(s), *defn*, whole sum of past by-passed charge, 347; *see also* preclear

“afraid to find out” type of case, 36

analysis, 385

establishes two things: what is going on with case and what should be done with it, 386

health research and ~, 388

steps, 386, 388

betterment, without TA motion, no charge is being released and no actual ~ is observed, 329, 335

charge is removed from case only by comm cycle pc to auditor, 335, 414

condition of ~ day to day, what it depends on, 290

destimulation of case can produce some astonishing changes in beingness [ 1963 ], 373

dub-in case should be running ARC Processes as case is over-charged for engrams, 293

gain; *see* gain

grind case, the audit forever case, is an afraid to find out case, 37

level(s),

as an index of auditing ability is discarded, it is only an index of how-hard-to-train, 316

auditor skills by case level [1963], 314

percentages of case levels, 331

sanity and ~, relationship to training, 327

time sense compared to case level, 330

1-8 [1963], 289

must not be run without TA action or with minimal TA action, 331, 413

### case(s) (*cont.* )

- natural auditor and dangerous auditor, difference between is not case level but a type of case, 32
- no case progress, persons with heavy overts on Scientology make, 185
- non-gain or slow-gain cases, 185, 187
- programming cases [1963], 331
- progress marked by rock slams, 212
- remedies, *The Book of Case Remedies*, 495
- repair, 67
- R3R, which cases can run, 331
- State of Case Scale, Levels 1 to 8, 289
- worsen when audited over an ARC break, 470

case folder, almost only way to completely bar door on pc is to lose his ~ or fail to put all lists and reports in it, 220

Case Supervisor, establishment and purpose of, 395

cause level of auditors, raising, 434

cause level of pc, raising, 434, 436, 438, 439

cause, preclears who are insufficiently cause in their daily lives cannot as-is bank, 433

cause, state of high ~ is also keyed-out Clear, 435

CCHs, 310

are “familiarization” processes that permit pc to confront control and duplication, 43

are good on auditors, 34

flatness, forget the 20 minute test, 3 times equally done are enough to see a CCH is flat, 46, 127

gains vanished when the ARC ran out, 46

must be taught exactly as they are used in session, complete with two-way comm, 79

Opening Procedure by Duplication different than CCHs, 45, 68

originations and CCHs, 126

handling originations, 47

pick up a physical origination when it happens, 126

take up each new physical change manifested as though it were an origin by pc and query it, 46, 47, 49

preclear kept in two-way comm, 46

produced tone arm action while higher level processes did not, 43

producing change do not go on but flatten that CCH, 127

purpose of the CCHs, 47, 50

repair of CCHs, 67, 68

running CCHs, 44, 46, 127

alternated with Prepchecking [1962], 51, 127

correct: no antagonism to pc, Tone 40 not shouted, no endurance marathon in progress, 45

correct version of CCHs, 127, 310

done right flatten CCHs done wrong, 68

run wrong can drive pc out of PT, 50

Tactile Havingness is a CCH type of process, 43

Upper Indoc attitude makes CCHs grim, 47

when to use CCHs, 43, 44

CCH 1, Give Me That Hand, commands and how to run, 310

use only right hand, 127

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- CCH 2, Tone 40 8-C, commands and how to run, 311
- CCH 3, Hand Space Mimicry, commands and how to run, 312
- CCH 4, Book Mimicry, commands and how to run, 312
- CDEI Scale, goals listing using Create ~, 143
- CDEI Scale on inflow and outflow, 16
- central org and field auditor targets, 432
- chain(s),  
*defn*, series of incidents of similar nature or similar subject matter, 28  
*defn.*, series of similar engrams, or of similar locks, 274  
*defn*, chain of incidents, makes up a whole adventure or activity related by same subject, general location or people, understood to take place in a long time period, weeks, months, years or even billions or trillions of years, 275  
 basic of chain; *see* basic  
 engram running by chains; *see* engram running  
 of incidents has only one basic which is earliest engram received from or overt act committed against subject, location or beings which make it a chain, 275  
 overt chain; *see* overt  
 R3R and chains; *see* R3R  
 unknown incident pins chains, 41  
 will not go nul until its basic is reached, 41  
 withhold chain behaves exactly like any chain, 28
- change, prior confusion to self-determined ~, 1 1 6
- charge, 290, 416  
*defn*, stored quantities of energy in time track, 289, 416  
*defn*, stored energy or stored or recreatable potentials of energy, 290  
 all after charge is based on prior ARC, 442  
 ARC break and charge; *see* ARC break  
 auditing and charge; *see* auditing  
 automaticity is rendered discharged by indicating area of charge only, 282  
 by-passed charge; *see* by-passed charge  
 chronic, 291  
 E-Meter and charge; *see* E-Meter  
 erasure, auditing theory of charge erasure, 291  
 gains on pc can be measured in terms of charge discharged, 325  
 how it reacts on needle and TA, 290  
 is held in place by basic on chain, 290  
 overwhelms; auditor errors add charge; pc then is overwhelmed, 401  
 postulates at time of incident contain ~, 349  
 removed from case only by comm cycle pc to auditor, 335, 414  
 slows down responses, 400  
 stuck TA is always caused by running pc above pc's tolerance of charge, 350  
 TA slows down when pc goes into more ~ than he can itsa easily, 374, 413  
 time track and charge; *see* time track
- charge (*cont.*)  
 tone arm motion, without, no charge is being released and no actual case betterment is observed, 329, 413
- checkouts must consult student's understanding, 480, 488
- checksheets, 227
- chronic somatics; *see* somatics, chronic
- circuits key out with knowingness, 6
- circuits, valences are circuits are valences, 6
- Class II Model Session [1964], 398, 428
- Class VI auditor, things he should know, 412
- clay, causes and handling of a pc just doodling in clay, 496, 497
- clay demos, how to make, 452, 453; *see also* clay table
- clay, physical handling of, 455
- clay table,  
 any part of mind or any term in Scientology can be demonstrated on a, 452  
 construction of clay tables, 451  
 goofs, 476  
 IQ increased by HGC use of ~, 454  
 label each clay object, 452, 477, 509  
 mass parts are done by clay, significance or thought parts by label, 452  
 thin-edged ring of clay with a large hole in it is usually used to signify a pure significance, 452  
 use, 452, 487  
 work,  
 in training and processing, 451, 453  
 is Level III, 466  
 is not for cases who get no TA in general, 486  
 on definitions, 451  
 pc *must* label *everything* made in ~, 509  
 what clay table work handles, 466
- Clay Table Auditing, importance of getting auditing questions answered in ~, 490
- Clay Table Auditing, two activities of, 456
- Clay Table Auditing, who may use, 487
- Clay Table Clearing, 456, 457, 475, 483, 484  
 auditing cycle vital in ~, 497  
 auditor is handling chief urges of pc, not trying to teach pc, 457
- Clay Table Healing and ~ are different, 472
- direct style auditing, 502
- does not go into physical ills, 458
- errors, 475, 476, 477, 483, 493, 496
- is Level IV, 487
- is used to achieve pc's rehabilitation and raised IQ in various fields, 456
- pc should have TAaction on lower levels first, 486
- process of clearing words and symbols, 474
- representing the word, 496
- steps of Clay Table Clearing, 458
- was called Clay Table IQ Processing, 454, 456
- Clay Table Healing, 453, 472  
 abridged style auditing, 501  
 Clay Table Clearing and ~ are different, 472



## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- Clay Table Healing (*cont.*)  
 don'ts, 473  
 is Level III, 487  
 steps, 472  
 used to get rid of physical discomfort of psychosomatic origin, 457, 474
- Table IQ Processing, 454, 456; *see also* Clay Table Clearing
- cleaning deans; *see* E-Meter, cleaning cleans
- clean needle,  
*defn*, responsive to instant reads only, 84  
*defn*, one which flows, producing no pattern or erratic motions of smallest kind with auditor
- looking at it and doing nothing; not just something that doesn't react to particular question; a lovely slow flow, usually a rise, most beautifully expressed on a Mark V at 64 sensitivity, 224
- in order to null a list, 224  
 medium clean needle, *defn*, offers many prior and latent reads, but reads instantly when a question is asked, 84
- Clear, *defn.*, somebody with no "held down fives" in this lifetime (*see Evolution of a Science*), 353  
 don't try to make an OT before you make a Clear, 260  
 "first goal clear", state of, 112, 316  
 state of high cause is also keyed-out Clear, 435  
 steps to make a Clear [1963], 354  
 test [1963], 259, 353  
 theta clear, *defn*, a Case Level 2 that is exterior, 317  
 Operating Thetan and theta clear, road to, 213  
 various roads to it described, 275
- clearing, 316  
 altered goal wording prevents clearing, 150
- line, 153  
 assessment for clearing intensive, 166  
 completing clearing, 355  
 difficulty of clearing, 317  
 free needles and clearing, 112  
 HGC clearing [1962], 152  
 why it works, 493
- Clearing Success Congress in Washington, 137
- coaches, coaching, coachless,  
 Coaches' Drill [1963], 272  
 coachless training, use of a doll, 103  
 theory coaching is not examining, 489  
 TRs done solo in absence of good coaches, except TR 04, 103  
 what coaches should look for, 194
- co-audit, co-auditor,  
 ARC Break Process, 319  
 husband-wife co-auditor team, unlucky as a general rule, 37  
 listen style co-audit, 511, 521  
 O/W dropped on Co-Audit, 25
- "coffee shop auditing" described, 505
- cognite, no ~ soon becomes overwhelm, 401
- cognite, pc who doesn't cognite, cause of, 36
- cognition, invalidation of pc's, 418
- combined terminal, *defn*, an item or identity pc has both been and opposed produces therefore both pain and sensation when it is "late on the track", 176  
 item turns on both pain and sensation, it is a comClay bination terminal, 177  
 most PT terminals and oppterminals look more like coterminals than clean terminals or opposition terminals when first contacted, 230
- command(s),  
 auditor's ~ restimulates charge in pc; only way this charge can be blown is by pc telling auditor, 335, 415  
 dangerous auditor misses withholds and refuses to permit pc to execute auditing ~, 33  
 effect of accusative auditing commands, 442  
 give them crisply and definitely and get them executed, 501, 502  
 its a line, don't use new commands to cut, 338  
 no auditing ~ is ever let go of until that actual ~ is answered by pc, 490, 501  
 words not to use in auditing commands, 439
- communication; *see also* ARC
- auditing comm cycle; *see* auditing comm cycle
- auditor has to assume responsibility for all comm breakdowns in session, 161, 414
- dirty needle phenomena usually traced to auditor having cut pc's ~, 364, 447
- failure keys in by-passed charge, 417
- itsa isn't a comm line; it's what travels on a comm line from pc to auditor, if that which travels is saying with certainty "It IS", 370
- compartmenting the question, 77, 78
- complete list; *see* list, complete
- condensation, tendency of physical universe is con assembly densation and solidification, 276
- confidence, ability to predict equals, 93
- confidence, auditor confidence, importance of, 326
- confront(ed)(ing),  
 CCHs are "familiarization" processes that permit pc to confront control and duplication, 43
- charge prevents pc from ~ time track, 290  
 havingness is proportional to pc's ability to confront in session, 225  
 pc who makes no gain is pc who will not as-is, who will not confront, 36  
 TA "drift up", pc's refusal to confront, 48  
 time track, unavailability, cause of, 275
- confusion, prior ~ to self-determined change, 116
- confusion, TA motion is caused by energy contained in confusions blowing off case; ~ is held in place by aberrated stable data, 375
- constructive and destructive people, difference between, 408
- control factor, asking for missed withholds is a totally acceptable ~, 59
- coterm; *see* combined terminal
- Create CDEI Scale, goals listing using, 143
- criminality, why punishment doesn't cure, 439

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- critical, criticisms,  
     critical thought is a symptom of overt, not the  
     overt itself, 469  
     pc becomes critical of anything outside engram, it  
     is an ARC break, 293  
     pc ~ of or angry at auditor, organizations or  
     people of Scientology equals missed withhold,  
     59  
     there are no criticisms in absence of overts com-  
     mitted earlier by pc, 464, 468  
 C/S; *see* Case Supervisor  
 cycle of action is redefined as start—continue-  
     complete, 410
- ### D
- “dangerous auditor”; *see* auditor, dangerous  
 dating,  
     argument with pc can group track, 293  
     how to date, 288  
     pc’s contrary data unspoken and untaken can give  
     you a completely wrong date, 293  
     use meter to date and verify date only after pc has  
     been unable to come up with date, 334  
 dead horse, *defn.*, list which even with good auditing  
     failed to produce a reliable item, 203  
 death: ARC broken: incapable of affinity for, reality  
     about and communication with environment,  
     347  
 death, cause of desire for, 252  
 decided and protested used to get pc easier in session,  
     447  
 defensive person, 321  
 definition(s),  
     clay table work on definitions, 451  
     cycle of mis-definition, 508  
     wrong definitions cause stupidity or circuits, fol-  
     lowed by overts and motivators, 489  
 Definition Processes are not clay table processes, 505  
 Definitions Processes, when used as remedies are nor-  
     mally processed by guiding secondary style, 506  
 Definitions Processing, purpose of, 507  
 demonstrate, glib students can’t demonstrate, 488  
 demos; *see* clay demos  
 denier obscures a part of track by implying it is not  
     there or elsewhere (a mis-director) or should  
     not be viewed, 275  
 destructive actions are not necessarily overts, 321  
 destructive people and constructive people, 408  
 dictionaries, 489  
 difficulty stems from no responsibility, 9  
 Director of Processing’s case handling, 357  
 Director of Processing’s view on R2 & R3 ARC break,  
     253  
 direct style auditing; *see* auditing, direct style  
 dirty needle(s), 119, 236, 335, 364, 384, 414, 447  
     *defn.*, agitated throughout check, making reading  
     difficult; pc’s attention obviously dispersed, 84  
     *defn.*, a small rock slam, 129  
     dirty needle(s) (*cont.*)  
     *defn.*, a quarter of an inch agitation of needle as an  
     instant response, 141  
     *defn.*, that erratic agitation of needle which covers  
     less than a quarter of an inch of E-Meter dial  
     and tends to be persistent, 177  
     *defn.*, one that jerks, tips, dances, halts, is stuck or  
     has any random action on it with auditor sitting  
     looking at it doing nothing, 224  
     ARC break assessment often has to be done  
     through a dirty needle, 306  
     can be cleaned both with auditing (like rrlid ruds)  
     and with Routine 2, 224  
     causes of dirty needles, 93, 384  
     auditor failing to hear all pc had to say, 335,  
     414  
     basic auditing not technique errors, 384, 414  
     cut itsa, 364, 384, 414, 447  
     cutting pc off, getting in more actions than pc  
     is allowed to answer, 419  
     earlier item is wrong [3DXX], 57  
     incomplete lists [3GAXX], 180, 181  
     missed withholds, not withholds, 57, 59, 129  
     no-confidence induces a sort of auto-control in  
     session which induces a dirty needle, 93  
     don’t ever try to nul a list with ~, 224  
     how to get rid of, 93, 364, 447  
     jitters all the time, different from a dirty read, 384  
     medium dirty needle, *defn.*, agitated throughout  
     check but with periods of no agitation when a  
     read can be obtained easily; reacts to checker’s  
     voice, 84  
     persistent and always recurring, handling of, 129  
     rock slams and dirty needles, 129  
     what a ~ means on an oppose list, 232  
     dirty read, *defn.*, that more or less instant response of  
     needle which is agitated by a major thought; it  
     is an instant tiny (less than quarter of an inch)  
     agitation of needle and is in fact a very small  
     cousin of rock slam, but is not a rock slam; it  
     does not persist, 177  
     dirty read, different from a dirty needle, 384  
     dirty read, rocket read is superior in value to an RS;  
     RS is superior in value to a DR; DR is superior  
     in value to a fall, 212  
     dissemination, broad ~ depends upon technical quali-  
     ty, 324  
     dissemination failures, 59  
     dizziness, *defn.*, feeling of disorientation and includes  
     a spinniness, as well as an out-of-balance feel-  
     ing, 175  
     opterm produces dizziness or “winds of space”  
     sensation, 5  
 DN; *see* dirty needle  
 D of P; *see* Director of Processing  
 doingness, Prehav Scale gives degrees of ~, 173  
 doll, use of a doll in coachless training, 103  
 dope-off [R2-12], 237  
 double questioning, changing because pc changes, and  
     following pc’s instructions, 74

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

DR; *see* dirty read  
dramatizing pc may not be a tough pc, 36  
dub-in, *defn.*, any unknowingly created mental picture that appears to have been a record of physical universe but is in fact only an altered copy of time track, 274  
dub-in case, run ARC Processes as case is over-charged for engrams, 293  
duplication, CCHs are “familiarization” processes that permit pc to confront control and , 43  
Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam, 131, 135, 138, 142  
demonstration of, 137

### E

echo invalidation; *see* invalidation, echo  
E-Meter(ing); *see also* needle characteristics by name  
ARC breaks and E-Meter; *see* ARC break, E-Meter and  
body motion vs. bank’s reaction, 394  
can operate on last word (thought minor) only of question, whereas question (thought major) is actually null, 102, 362  
charge, how it reacts on needle and TA, 290  
checking needle in rudiments checks, 84  
cleaning cleans, 335, 415  
asking pc for something that isn’t there develops a withhold of nothing, 102, 104, 335, 415  
howto prevent, 439  
never clean a clean needle, never miss a read, 105  
overt acts, commonest cause of failure in running overt acts is cleaning cleans, 438  
clean needle; *see* clean needle  
between pc and meter, take pc’s data, reason why, 335  
dangerous to audit without a meter, 22  
dating; *see* dating  
dependence, how it is created, 334, 416  
minimize dependence, 293, 415  
dirty needle; *see* dirty needle  
dirty read; *see* dirty read  
operate on an ARC broken pc, 96, 102, 362  
drills must stress only meaningful and significant instant reads coming at end of full question, 79  
echo E-Metering, 285, 415  
end words reading by themselves, cause of, 102  
everything reading, 402-03  
on a gradient scale of misses by auditor;  
the more misses the less the meter reads, 105  
how to smooth out needles, 93  
to clean up needle is biggest hole in student auditing, 214  
instant reads; *see* instant reads  
invalidation, 73, 335, 415  
latent reads; *see* latent reads  
lists, needle gets stiffer on wrong way oppose; needle looks looser on right way oppose, 233

E-Meter(ing) (*cont.*)  
locates charged areas below awareness of pc, verifies that charge has been removed, 290, 334, 416  
missed withholds, fruitful source is poor metering, 105  
miss on needle reaction is basis of all unsuccessful sessions, 105  
needle characteristics defined, 84  
needle reaction, *defn.*, rise, fall, speeded rise, speeded fall, double tick (dirty needle), theta bop or any other action, 264  
never ask ~ after pc volunteers button, 285, 415  
out rudiments, meter can go gradiently dull in presence of, 73, 96, 361  
perfection means only accurate reading of needle on instant reads, 104, 105  
prior reads; *see* prior reads  
reacts on reactive mind, never on analytical mind, 78  
reading; *see also* reads  
ability to read an E-Meter, 369, 402  
if pc is in session E-Meter will read, 96  
inability to read ~ is state of case, remedy of, 214  
RIs and use of E-Meter, 334  
rocket reads; *see* rocket reads  
sensitivity is vital to get rudiments in, 91  
standards, 91  
steering, 60, 63, 78  
tone arm action, that which moves only needle seldom gives good TA, 369  
TR 20—Reach and Withdraw on ~, 264  
TR 21—Reading E-Meter accurately, 265  
emotion and misemotion include all levels of conflict plete Tone Scale except pain, 175  
emotionlessness, pc has to come up to emotion on Tone Scale, 286  
end rudiments; *see* rudiments, end  
end words of rudiments questions; *see* rudiments, end words  
energy,  
charge is stored ~ or stored or recreatable poten does not tials of ~, 289, 290, 416  
flow is progress of energy between two points, 16  
motion is matter with energy in space, 330  
TA motion is caused by contained in confusions blowing off case, 375  
will not flow in absence of time, 330  
engram(s), *defn.*, those parts of time track that con goes null tain moments of pain and unconsciousness, 274  
assessment, development of, 301  
contains heaviest ARC break with a thetan’s en inability vironment and other beings, 291  
contains moments when it was necessary to have moved and degrading to hold a position in space, 291  
mid ruds will mush an engram, 296  
missed withholds, do not pull until chain is flat or engram will mush, 296

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### engram(s) (*cont.*)

pc is stuck not just in ~ but in past identities, 50  
 postulate sometimes lies ahead of actual ~, 349  
 running, 273, 287, 292, 299; *see also* R3R  
   auditor must know basic laws and mechanics of  
     time track and engram character and behav-  
     ior in order to run engrams, 273  
   case level to run on engrams, 289  
   later the incident is (further from basic), the  
     more lightly it is run, 290  
   perceptions aren't there—wrong time or wrong  
     duration or both or it's a GPM or it's false  
     track, 329  
   prime source of ARC break in engram running  
     sessions is by-passing charge by time mis-  
     handling by auditor, 287  
   purpose, to release charge from case, 290, 291  
   reasons pc can't run engrams, 329  
   reasons why some cannot run engrams on pcs,  
     273, 287  
   R3R, don't mix with earlier data on engram  
     running, 294; *see also* R3R  
   simplified, 273  
   why engram running by chains is designated  
     Routine 3-R, 294  
 thetan has engrams being automatically (involun-  
 tarily) created by him, 301  
 entrapment, main method of causing aberration and  
 ~ is found in actions which create or confuse  
 time track, 277  
 erasure, auditing theory of charge ~, 291  
 evaluation, accidental evaluation may occur when  
   auditor repeats what pc said, 161, 414  
 evaluation, auditor never says what overt is, 464  
 evil, being at different lifetimes is good and evil, 408  
 evil, man is basically good, but reactive mind tends to  
   force him into evil actions, 439  
 evil, may not be evil people, but there are people  
   currently devoted to doing evil actions, 408  
 examination, correct, is done by asking for meanings  
   of words and demonstrating how the data is  
   used, 481  
 examination, instruction and ~, raising the standard  
   of, 478  
 examining, coaching is not ~, 489  
 exhausted pc equals missed withhold, 59  
 eye pouches, used as an indicator in R2-12, 235

### F

facsimile, *defn.*, any mental picture that is unknow-  
 ingly created and part of the time track,  
 whether an engram, secondary, lock or pleas-  
 ure moment, 274; *see also* mental image  
 picture  
 “failed to reveal” [R3GA], 119  
 fast checking on rudiments; *see* rudiments, fast  
 checking,  
 field auditor targets, central org and, 432

floating needle, free needle is not a stage 4 needle or  
 an inverted stage 4; it is floating and free, 112  
 flow(s),  
   basic, 14, 16  
   basic aberration is withheld flow, 16  
   is a progress of energy between two points, 16  
   running too long on one flow is conducive to with-  
     holds developing, 66  
   self-determined flows can be aberrative, 14  
   withhold ~, reverse of is “afraid to find out”, 33  
 Flow Process, commands of, 15  
 forbidden words, 439  
 free needle; *see* floating needle  
 free track, *defn.*, that part of time track that is free of  
 pain and misadventure; pc doesn't freeze up on  
 it, 274

### G

GAEs; *see* gross auditing errors  
 gain(s),  
   cleaning up an old session will give all the latent  
     gain in that session, 21  
   no gain(s),  
     handling of auditor or student who has trouble  
       with an ARC breaky pc or no gain, 58  
     lack of TA action means no gain for pc, 325  
     occur in presence of PTPs or overts, 468, 470  
     pc who makes no gain is pc who will not as-is,  
       who will not confront, 36  
     rock slammer is a slow-gain or non-gain case,  
       185, 187  
   pc gains measured in terms of charge discharged,  
     325  
   pc's gain is directly proportional to TA action, 367  
 game, degrees of responsibility for, 8  
 General Overt/Withhold before session, 101  
 glib students can't demonstrate, 488  
 goal(s),  
   abandoned item or ~ makes everything read, 403  
   accidental goal finding, 154  
   allow no self listing of goals [R2-12], 238  
   altered goal wording prevents clearing, 150  
   below Level VI one is striving to complete his  
     goals, 456  
   check, 246  
   constructive and destructive people, depending on  
     their goals, 408  
   don't use repeater technique any more on lists of  
     goals [3GA], 121  
   fast goals check [3GA], 115, 165  
   find agoal [R3 or 3G], 64, 66  
   finding, designation of Routines, 262  
   finding goals [R3-21], 170  
   first goal clear; *see* Clear  
   formulae [3GA], 132  
   gains, goals and, in Model Sessions, 280, 383, 399,  
     422, 429, 450  
   Goal Finder's Model Session, 157

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### goal(s) (*cont.*)

- how a goal is checked [3G], 54
  - if a goal is a real GPM it will read with great, intermittent, inconsistent slashes, 396
  - line plot, rule: put any item ever found on pc by any process on line plot; every one will add up to a goal, 250
  - list(s),
    - how to do [3GA], 118
    - length of [3GA], 92
    - lost, how to reconstruct [3G], 55
    - pc must be warned not to read list back to himself [3GA], 118
    - things which cause “everything to read” on, 402
  - listing a bum goal results in a pc’s getting sick and dizzy [3GA], 92
  - listing, using Create CDEI Scale, 143
  - never set agoal for apc, 463
  - nulling by mid ruds [3GA], 1 18
  - opposition goal or wrong goal can get pc in real trouble [3GA], 118
  - pc’s actual goals and GPMs are more aberrative and important than implants, 366
  - Prepcheck Form [3GA], 106
  - Prepchecking and goals, 201
  - presented in Problems Intensive, how to handle, 201
  - reliable items and goals found on students, staff or HGC pcs must be checked out, 246
  - reliable iterns, too many found without finding pc’s goal turns off a pc’s rocket read or rock slam [R2-10, R2-12, R2-12A], 249
  - rocket read is the read of goal or rock itself, 213
  - rock, just below the rock lies pc’s goal [R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX], 213
  - rock slam channel, what it is, 213
  - symptoms of a right goal listed wrongly, 167
  - symptoms of a right goal unlisted, 169
  - things that hide a goal or make one read falsely [3GA], 119
  - “to be” goals line listing [3GA], 139
  - which is an overt against Scientology, 140
  - will go null if the middle ruds are out, 83
  - wrong goals, 404
    - importance of repair of, 167
    - symptoms of a wrong goal listed, 168
  - wrong wording of item or goal [R2, R3], 257
  - 24 line listing for a beingness type goal, 139
- Goals Problem Mass(es),
- defn.*, made up of past selves or “valences”, 8
  - defn.*, black masses of the reactive mind, 175
  - defn.*, consists of items (valences) in opposition to one another; any pair of these items, in opposition to each other, constitute a specific problem, 185
  - application of Twenty-Ten Procedure to ~, 7
  - at Level VI GPMs are run out, but before that can be achieved, one is thrust into the GPMs by effort to accomplish, 456
  - best locator of ~ is from goals, 53

### Goals Problem Mass(es) (*cont.*)

- charge in GPM, what it consists of, 349
  - common denominator of GPM is “no responsibility”, 8
  - curved out of shape, cause of, 7, 213
  - failing to fully clear each GPM, result of, 260
  - getting cases to RR on GPMs, 332
    - GPM item in present time constitutes a PTP, 185
  - how a real goal reads, 396
  - how to restore ability of pc to RR or RS, 250
  - implant GPM, how its goal reads, 402
  - is full of pairs of terms and oppters, 179
  - item from another GPM, 258
  - item that RSeS was part of GPM and has another item in opposition to it, 212
  - left uncleaned gives liabilities, 261
    - List L4, 308-09
  - lock valences are appended to a real GPM 3-D item, 7
  - lock words found and destimulated, effect on ~, 493
  - more advanced the GPM, more careful you have to be of the body, 256
  - non-gain or slow-gain cases have a GPM item in their present time environment, 185
  - one does have wishes-to-do of his own having nothing to do with ~ but only being blocked by them, 456
  - partial anatomy of ~, identification in auditing and behavior of E-Metertowardsit, 178
  - pc’s actual goals and ~ are more aberrative and important than implants, 366
  - pc who rock slams on a PT ~ item in his or her immediate environment is a rock slammer, 186
  - postulates, treat them like ~ items whether in a ~ or an engram [R3R, R3N], 349
  - reactive mind, basis of, is actual GPMs, 493
  - realization of actions done will key out a ~, 435
  - rock and opposition rock, basic items of ~, 182
  - rock slam channel is pathway through pairs of items that compose a cycle of ~ and lead to rock and goal, 212, 213
  - R4MTA process withdrawn, 376
  - terminals are identities in ~ producing pain, 175
  - will key back in by finding modifier to a goal, 4
- good indicators; *see* indicators
- good, is man good or evil, 407
- GPM; *see* Goals Problem Mass
- grades; *see* levels
- grind case is an afraid to find out case, 37
- gross auditing errors (GAEs), 509
- grouper, *defn.*, anything which pulls the time track into a bunch at one or more points, 275
- groupers, bouncers and deniers are material (matter, energy, space and time in the form of effort, force, mass, delusion, etc.) or command phrases (statements that group, bounce or deny), 276
- guiding secondary style; *see* auditing, guiding secondary style
- guiding style auditing; *see* auditing, guiding style

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### H

half-acknowledgement, *defn.*, ways of keeping pc talking by giving pc feeling he is being heard and yet not chopping with overdone TR 2, 501  
 Hand Space Mimicry; *see* CCH 3  
 HAS Course curriculum and requirements [1964], 514  
 have, havingness, *defn.*, concept of being able to reach, 6  
     dropped havingness equals missed withhold, 59  
     is proportional to pc's ability to confront in session, 225  
     rough auditing reduces havingness, 225  
     way not to have is to ignore, combat or withdraw from, 8  
     withholds cut havingness down, 6  
 Havingness Processing,  
     "Look around here and find something you would permit to appear", basic Havingness Process using suppressor mechanism, 37  
     Model Session [1964], 422, 450  
     rudiment, 101  
     R-3 Havingness, 280, 383  
     Security Checking and ~, 20-10 Theory, 6  
     suppression is overcome when you run ~ on a pc, 37  
     TA action on indicates CCHs will move case, 44  
     Tactile Havingness is a CCH type of process, 43  
     use of in 3DXX, 10  
     withholds, ~ must be run to get benefit of pulling most withholds, 6  
 HCO WW Form G3, R3GA, Fast Goals Check, 115, 165  
 "held down fives", jammed thinking because of misunderstood or misapplied datums, 507  
 HGC clearing [1962], 152  
 HGC gains, what they depend on, 324  
 HGC processes, [1962] 51, 116, 141, [1964] 406  
 hidden standard mechanism, 456  
 hidden standard, person with hidden standard won't go clear, 185  
 Course, purpose of, [1964], 461  
 Hubbard Guidance Center; *see* HGC  
 Hubbard, L. Ron, auditors who couldn't audit him, 36  
 husband-wife co-auditor team, unlucky as a general rule, 37  
 hysterical, more hysterical pc is about getting advanced processes or case gain, less strenuous process administered must be, 516

### I

identification (A=A=A), most easily present when time sense is awry, 330  
 ill or misemotional before session beginning, handling of, 101

impingement, auditor with out TRs and no ~ gets no reads, 82  
 implants; *see also* Goals Problem Mass; reliable items between lives, 333  
     pc's actual goals and GPMs are more aberrative, 366  
 inactive and lazy, how a person becomes, 439  
 incident(s), *defn.*, recording of experience, simple or complex, related by same subject, location or people, understood to take place in a short and finite time period such as minutes or hours or days, 274; *see also* chain  
     failure to handle time in incidents, 273  
     "grinding out", 290  
     pc's postulates made at time of incident contained charge, 349  
     unknown incident pins chains, 41  
 indicator(s),  
     every bad indicator is precise, easily observed and has an exact counter-action, 391  
     good indicators [GIs] on R6, 390  
     go on with routine actions as long as GIs are present, 391  
     list of good indicators at lower levels, 445  
 inflow and outflow, accelerated and restrained, CDEI Scale on, 16  
 inflow and restrained inflow can be self-determined actions, 14  
 insanity eradicator, 37  
 in session; *see* session, in  
 instant read(s),  
     *defn.*, any change of characteristic providing it occurs instantly, 77  
     *defn.*, that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor, 77  
     *defn.*, read that occurs instantly after last syllable of the major thought without lag, 78  
     anticipated on rudiments, 113  
     clean needle is responsive to instant read only, 84  
     drills must be used which stress only meaningful and significant ~ coming at end of full question, 79  
     if you miss an instant read, you hang pc with a missed withhold, 104  
     instant rudiment read, *defn.*, 264  
 instruction; *see* training  
 intelligence quotient (or relative brightness of individual) can be rocketed out of sight with HGC use of a clay table, 454, 456  
 intensive(s),  
     assessment for clearing intensive, 166  
     auditing sold by intensives, 153  
     clean up M/W/H before ending, 60  
     Problems Intensive, 116  
     TA amount per intensive, 367  
 interest is absorbed attention and desire to talk about it [R3R], 301  
 interest, pc interest as a method of assessment, 325

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

invalidation, invalidates, 414

avoid use of “you” to pc, 161

can make wrong goal read or steal read from right goal, 119

continuing ARC break assessment after pc has cognited invalidates pc’s cognition, 418

echo invalidation, 415

E-Meter dependence is created by invalidation by auditor, 334

E-Meter invalidation, 335, 415

IQ; *see* intelligence quotient

IRS; *see* rock slam, instant

item (It) *defn.*, any terminal, opposition terminal combination terminal, significance or idea (but not a doingness, which is called “a level”) appearing on a list derived from pc 176

characteristics of terminal, opposition terminal, combination terminal ~ 177

charge piled up on pc, pc ceases to be capable of clear thought and will reject even right items, 400

check the item, how to, [3DXX], 12

complete list, in theory, just fades away and leaves an item [3G], 55

dirty needle in listing 3D Criss Cross means an earlier item is wrong, 57

from another GPM [R2, R3], 258

if the right item or goal on a list has been read and abandoned, all its locks will begin to read like real items or goals [Level VI], 403

is unburdened by making represent list [R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX], 210

line plot, rule: put any item ever found on pc by any process on line plot; every one will add up to a goal, 250

list, things which cause “everything to read”, 402

opposition items, each line is an independent zig-zag of opposition items [3DXX], 10

reliable item; *see* reliable item

rock slamming items [R3-21], 172

that R/Ses, what it is [R2-12], 212

itsa,

dirty needle and itsa; *see* dirty needle

is action of pc saying, “It’s a this” or “It’s a that”, 374, 375, 498

isn’t a comm line; it’s what travels on a comm line from pc to auditor, if that which travels is say-certainty “It IS”, 370

line, don’t use metering, ARC break assessments, dating, or incomprehensible or new commands to cut itsa line, 338

line, when cut, auditing ceases to work, 337

Project 80-itsa line and tone arm, 351

silent auditor invites itsa, 370

slow assessment means letting pc itsa while assessing, 373

TA action slows down when pc goes into more

charge than he can itsa easily, 374, 413

whatsit and itsa, relation to TA, 334, 370 378

## J

justice contains hidden error regarding rightness, 322

justifications, list of Scientology ~, 437

justifications, reasons overts are overts to people is justifications, 436

## K

keyed-out Clear, state of high cause is also ~, 435

key-ins, *defn.*, those parts of time track which contain first moment an earlier engram is restimulated 274

It is pc who mostly keys his bank back in, 354

knowledge, what it is to average person, 26

Know to Mystery Processing Check 1

Know to Mystery Scale, everything above pc finds pc at effect 286

## L

lassitude, cause of a feeling of lassitude, 261

latent reads, *defn.*, reads which occur later than completion of major thought, 264

prior reads and ~ are ignored, 77

steering the pc is only use of latent or random reads, 60, 78

laudatory withholds, 1

lazy and inactive, how a person becomes, 439

level(s),

auditing levels of using overts [1964], 438

auditing skills by levels [1964], 41 1

each level of auditing controls pc’s attention a little more than last, 371

pc will feel accused if run above his level, 441

reads are bigger on higher levels, 396

tone arm action is higher on higher levels, 397

Level 0, curriculum for, [1964], 514

Level 0, purpose and end phenomena, 516, 517

Levels 1 to 8, state of case, 289

Level III, clay table work is, 466

Level VI, drawbacks of, 433

Level VI, reads on ~, difference between, 403

life, Scientology in direct application to life, 491

line, *defn.*, a list of found 3D items each in opposition to the last item on that line [3DXX], 12  
each line is an independent zig-zag of opposition items, 10

3GA line wording; *see* Routine 3GA

line plot, 25, *defn.*, 12

described, 178

put every item ever found on pc by any process on line plot; every one will add up to a goal, 250

list (s), listing, *defn.*, auditor’s action in writing down items said by pc in response to a question by auditor, 203; *see also* assessment

appearances [R2-12], 207

Auditing by Lists, 423

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### list(s), listing (*cont.*)

beyond last rock slam [R2-12A], 233  
 by Prehav [3GA], 163, 164  
 by Tiger buttons [3GA], 147, 148  
 complete list, *defn.*, any list listed for assessment  
     that does not produce a dirty needle while  
     nulling or Tiger Drilling [1962], 181  
     discovery of, [3G], 53, 55  
     in 3DXX, 17  
     rules of a complete list for R2 or R3, 241, 242  
 dead horse is list which even with good auditing,  
     failed for any other reason to produce a reliable  
     item [R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX, R3-21], 203  
 differentiate the list [3DXX], 11  
 difficulties [R2, R3], 255  
     cause of poor list [3DXX], 17  
     getting pc to answer the auditing question  
     [R2-12], 238  
     handling of pc who gets doopey or drowsy dur-  
     ing listing and nulling [3DXX], 10  
     how ~ a wrong item can happen [R2, R3], 256  
     if right item or goal on a list has been read and  
     abandoned, all its locks will begin to read  
     like real items or goals [Level VI], 403  
     long long lists [R2-10, R2-12], 223  
     lost list, how to reconstruct, 55  
     overlisting, dangersignof, [R2-12, 3GAXX], 204  
     pc who "can't quite say exactly what it is"  
     [3DXX], 10, 17  
     right goal listed wrongly, symptoms of, 167  
     wrong goal listed, symptoms of, 168  
     wrong way to symptoms [R2, R3], 255  
 goals; *see* goals  
 handling of mid ruds [3GAXX], 180  
 incomplete lists [R2-12], 221  
     dirty needles stem from incomplete lists or  
     missed items [3GAXX], 180  
 is always derived from pc [3DXX], 10  
 is auditing [3G], 53  
 is not Prepchecking [3GA], 159  
 is slightly contrary to early auditing philosophy  
     [3GA], 160  
 nulling,  
     clean needle is vital in order to null a list  
     [R2-10, R2-12], 224  
     never null lists taken from wrong sources, just  
     abandon [R2-12], 232  
     nullable is a condition a list must be in in order  
     to have an item found on it [R2-10, R2-12,  
     3GAXX, R3-21], 203  
     null the list [3DXX], 11  
     to get a list to differentiate and null rapidly, the  
     list must be complete [3DXX], 17  
 oppose, opposition,  
     done on R/Sing items [R2-12], 221  
     minimize goal oppose lists [R2, R3], 258  
     right and wrong oppose [R2-12], 230  
     right way and wrong way oppose indications  
     [R2], 231, 233  
     what a dirty needle means [R2], 232

### list(s), listing (*cont.*)

random listing [R3N], 394  
 represent list, item is unburdened by making repre-  
     sent list [R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX], 210  
 rules,  
     allow no self listing of goals [R2-12], 238  
     auditor has no business with significances of  
     items [R2-12A], 235  
     don't Tone 40 ack items or goals a pc gives you  
     [3G], 56  
     never force pc to list [R2-12, R3M], 255  
     run all TA action out of listing; list at least 50  
     items beyond point tone arm became mo-  
     tionless [R2-12A], 233  
     test list both ways [R2], 233  
 session [3GA], 130  
 source list, 239  
 to a still tone arm, what it takes [R2, R3], 241  
 wording [3GA], 114  
 writing the list [R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX, R3-21],  
     204  
     wrong way list [R2-12A], 234, 236  
 listen style auditing; *see* auditing, listen style  
 listen style co-audit; *see* co-audit, listen style  
 Listing Prepcheck, HCO WW R-3GA Form 1, 109  
 List L-1, General ARC Break Assessment, 307, 423  
 List L-2, assessment sessions, listing sessions, pre-  
     liminary step R3R, the ARC break for assess-  
     ments list, 307  
 List L-3 and L4, add "Have we by-passed any postu-  
     lates?", 349  
 List L-3, R3R engram running by chains, 308  
 List L4, 309, 423  
     used on Routine 3N—GPMs, all goals sessions, 308  
 List One—the Scientology List [R2-12], 191, 195,  
     202, 215  
 living, two conditions of, ARC broken, not ARC  
     broken, 347  
 location, one of three methods to handle time track,  
     288  
 location, TA change requires two locations—location  
     of pc and location of mass, 49  
 lock(s), *defn.*, those parts of time track which con-  
     tain moments pc associates with key-ins, 274  
     chronically tired pc who is not eating won't get  
     TA for there's no as-is of locks, 434  
     finding and handling lock words of GPMs, 493  
     valences; *see* valences, lock  
 LRH; *see* Hubbard, L. Ron

## M

major thought, *defn.*, complete thought being ex-  
     pressed in words by auditor, 77, 264; *see also*  
     minor thought  
 E-Meter can operate on last word (thought minor)  
     only of a question, whereas the question  
     (thought major) is actually null, 102, 362  
 how to groove in, 78



## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- “make it”, avoid using, because it’s a GPM word [Clay Table Processing], 455
- man is basically good, but reactive mind tends to force him into evil actions, 439
- man, two dominant behavior patterns of, 407
- mass(es),  
     are released off body and out of thetan’s bank in auditing, 256  
     as-issness of, 49  
     “bank is beefing up”, sensation of increasing solidity of masses in the mind, 175  
     body discolors when mass from bank is brought in on it, 255  
     Goals Problem Mass; *see* Goals Problem Mass  
     how a being is hung with persistent masses, 8  
     tone arm moves because mass is changing, 48, 49
- master process, *defn*, one which ran out all other processes and processing, 67
- matter, motion is matter with energy in space, 330
- MD’s diagnosis, cause of antipathy toward, 463
- medicine, operational shock, cause of, 464
- mental image picture, protest is basically responsible for making ~, 301; *see also* facsimile
- mest and time track, 276, 291
- mest universe, intention of, 277, 417
- meter; *see* E-Meter
- middle rudiments; *see* rudiments, middle
- minor thought, *defn*, subsidiary thoughts expressed by words within the major thought; they are caused by reactivity of individual words within the full words; they are ignored, 77, 264; *see also* major thought
- E-Meter can operate on last word (thought minor) only of a question, whereas question (thought major) is actually null, 102, 362
- misemotion and emotion include all levels of complete Tone Scale except pain, 175
- missed withhold(s), 20, 42, 285; *see also* rudiments  
     *defn*, a withhold that existed, could have been picked up and was missed, 20  
     *defn*, is a should have known, 27  
     *defn*, an undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed, 58
- ARC breaks and missed withholds; *see* ARC breaks, missed withholds and
- asking for ~ does not upset dictum of using no O/W processes in rudiments, 60
- asking for is a totally acceptable control factor, 59
- auditing rundown-missed withholds, 318, 328
- auditor can ask if another auditor has missed a withhold, 42
- by-passed charge is explanation for violence of ~, 285
- by-passed charge is in some degree a ~, missed by both auditor and pc, 306, 417
- cleaning up, don’t ask for withholds, 61
- clean up at once if auditor doesn’t ask leading questions, 60
- missed withhold(s) (*cont.*)  
     co-audit and missed withholds, 25  
     command, use “done” not “missed a withhold” in all ~ questions, 71  
     commonest questions to get ~, 60  
     dangerous auditor is afraid to find out, thus causing ~ on pc, 33  
     dirty needle is caused by ~, 57, 59, 129  
     don’t be reasonable about pc’s complaints, with holds have been missed, 61  
     don’t have to clean up all withholds if kept cleaned up, 61  
     help pc by guiding his attention against needle, 63  
     how to audit missed withholds, 21, 23  
     indicators of, 59, 66  
     intensives, do not conclude without cleaning up ~, 60  
     missing a withhold or not getting all of it is sole source of ARC break, 23  
     motivator response to ~ question, how to avoid, 71  
     natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, are restimulated but missed or partially, 26  
     never ask pc if you’ve missed a withhold on him or her with pc off a meter, 67  
     of nothingness, 102, 104, 362  
     partial and missed withholds, 26  
     pc dissatisfied, caused by ~, 20  
     pcs go groggy, lose interest and refuse to list only when session withholds are missed, 66  
     poor E-Metering is most fruitful source of ~, 104, 105  
     Prepchecking, don’t ask for ~ while prepchecking, 63  
     Prepcheck system, do not use in cleaning ~, 61  
     pulled clean up sessions, 21  
     pulling ~ [Model Session], 279, 382, 421, 449  
     rough, angry ARC breaky session, auditor has failed to pick up ~, 20, 58  
     rudiment, 101  
     R3R, don’t use mid ruds or ask for ~, 296  
     sessions go wrong, ask for ~, 58, 61  
     source of all upset is ~, 105  
     wild animal reaction, 26
- “mistake been made” is a combination of auditor or pc asserting and other denying that it is or is not the goal; it is a conflict of positive-negative opinion and forms a ridge impossible to dispel unless auditor asks for “mistake”, 119
- misunderstood, “held down fives”, jammed thinking because of ~ or misapplied datums, 507
- misunderstood word, 1st and 2nd phenomena of, 480
- misunderstood words and overts, 471
- mock-up(s), *defn*, any knowingly created mental picture that is not part of a time track, 274  
     earlier in bank the “power” of the thetan’s mock ups is greater, 256
- Model Session; *see also* session  
     assist not done in Model Session, 505  
     changes [1962], 72, 85, 101  
     Class II Model Session, 398, 428

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### Model Session (*cont.*)

- Goal Finder's Model Session, 157
- Levels III to VI [1964], 420, 448
- R2 and R3 Model Session, 243
- R3 Model Session, 278, 381
- modifier is part of oppterm so its use is dropped, 57
- modifier to a goal, GPM will always key back in by finding the ~, 4
- morale, apparent bad morale, 285
- mores, each valence has its own social ~, 40
- motion,
  - is matter with energy in space, 330
  - overt is forward ~, withhold coming after it is inward~, 14
  - sensation of, a feeling of being in motion when one is not; motion includes the "winds of space", a feeling of being blown upon, especially from in front of the face, 175
  - time is measured by ~, 330
- motivator(s); *see also* overt-motivator sequence
  - missed withhold question, ~ response to, 71
  - persons looking for overt to explain ~, 440
  - wrong definitions cause stupidity or circuits, followed by overts and motivators, 489
- muzzled auditing; *see* auditing, muzzled
- M/W/H; *see* missed withhold

## N

- natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, are restimulated but missed or partially missed withholds, 26
- natter is handled by ARC break assessments, 332
- natter, recognize by pc's natter, or lack of previous gain that pc has overts, 468
- natural auditor and dangerous auditor described, 32
- needle; *see* E-Meter; needle characteristics by name
- newness, urge for, is a deadly disease, 432
- no-change, pc trying to prove himself right and auditor wrong gets no-change sessions, 323
- no-confidence induces a sort of auto-control in session which induces a dirty needle, 93
- no-havingness, *defn.*, concept of not being able to reach, 6
- suppress used to get item to read, 447
- nullable, *defn.*, condition a list must be in in order to have an item found on it, 203
- nulling, [R2-12] 206, [R2-12A] 235, *defn.*, auditor's action in saying items from a list to pc and noting reaction of pc by use of E-Meter [R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX, R3-21], 203
  - by mid ruds [R3GA], 118, 119
  - clean needle is vital in order to null a list [R2-10, R2-12], 224
  - done in a brisk, business-like, staccato fashion [3DXX assessment], 11
  - drill on new nulling procedure, [3GA Tiger Drill] 122, [R2-12, R3-21, 3GAXX] 196
  - null eachlist [R3, 3G], 66
  - pc is expected to be silent during ~ [3DXX], 11

## O

- observation, auditor's observation of pc, 360
- observe, being who is something, cannot ~ it, 50
- Opening Procedure by Duplication (Book and Bottle),
  - CCHs confused with Op Pro by Dup, 45
  - is test of endurance in duplication, 68
  - unflat, remedy for, 68
  - used to develop ability to do repetitive processes, 316
- Opening Procedure by Rock Slam, R2-12, an HPA/HCA skill, 185
- Operating Thetan, *defn.*, a Case Level 1 complete with skills rehabilitated, 317
  - don't try to make an OTbefore youmake a Clear, 260
  - theta clear and Operating Thetan, road to, 213
  - to make an ~ one has to clear time track, 329
- operational shock, cause of, 464
- oppose [opposition] list; *see* list, oppose
- opposition goal; *see* goal, opposition
- opposition item; *see* item, opposition
- opposition rock and rock, two basic items of GPM, 182
- opposition terminal(s) (oppterm), *defn.*, an item or identity pc has actually opposed (fought, been an enemy of) sometime in past (or present), 176
  - GPM is full of pairs of terms and oppterm, 179
  - modifier is part of ~ so its use is dropped, 57
  - most PT terminals and ~ look more like coterm, than clean terminals or ~ when first contacted, 230
  - produces dizziness or "winds of space" sensation, 5
  - rock slam is response of E-Meter to conflict between terminals and ~, 176
  - R2-12A package must have two terminals and two ~, opposing and cross opposing, 235
  - terminals and ~, difference between, 5, 12, 175, 176, 177, 230, 231
  - ways of asking for terminal and ~, 177
- Op Pro by Dup; *see* Opening Procedure by Duplication
- organization,
  - against organization, *defn.*, against ~ or posts and protestingatorgbehaviororexistence, 347
  - with organization, *defn.*, interested in org or post and willing to communicate with or about org, 347
  - field or orgs do badly if they are not doing one technical thing well and not keeping people's attention directed at it and nothing else, 432
- OT; *see* Operating Thetan
- other-determinism, no responsibility for other side of game, 8
- outflow, CDEI Scale on inflow and outflow, 16
- outflow, compulsive ~ and obsessive withhold are alike aberrated, 14

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- outflow, overt act is ~; withhold is restrained ~, 14  
 out of session; *see* session, out of  
 overlisting, danger sign of, 204  
 over-restimulation, 371  
 overt(s); *see also* Security Checking; overt/withhold  
*defn*, an act of omission or commission which  
 does the least good for the least number of  
 dynamics or the most harm to the greatest  
 number of dynamics, 321; *see also* BCR  
 auditing level of fusing overts [1964], 438  
 auditor never says what the overt is for that's  
 evaluation, 464  
 "cleaning cleans", commonest cause of failure in  
 running ~, 438  
 cleaning up, ask frequently, "Have I missed any  
 withhold on you?", 60  
 critical thought is a symptom of overt, not the  
 overt itself, 464, 469  
 cycle of an overt, 471  
 demanding overt is not confined to just running  
 O/W, 465  
 depend on social mores, 40  
 destructive actions are not necessarily overts, 321  
 don't fail to pull the real overts or ARC break pc  
 in getting overts off, 468  
 if pc can't conceive of ~, use "didn't know", 21  
 is forward motion, withhold coming after it is in-  
 ward motion, 14  
 is something that harms broadly; a beneficial act is  
 something that helps broadly; it can be a bene-  
 ficial act to harm something that would be  
 harmful to greater number of dynamics, 321  
 leaving an ~ touched on case and calling it clean  
 will cause future ARC break with auditor, 439  
 misunderstood words and ~, 471  
 -motivator sequence; *see* overt-motivator sequence  
 motivators, looking for overt to explain motiva-  
 tors, 440  
 no gains occur in presence of PTPs or ~, 468, 470  
 not knowing the full definition—misunderstanding  
 —overt—motivator cycle, 476  
 order of effectiveness in processing, 438  
 pc ARC breaks on auditor demanding more than is  
 there or leaving an overt undisclosed, 439  
 pc who dives into past lives when asked for ~, 440  
 persons with heavy overts on Scientology make no  
 case progress, 185  
 Prepchecking, 39, 62  
   ask What question after getting single specific ~  
   to expose and clean a chain of ~, 39, 89  
   going earlier similar, 39  
   working with no TA is a profitless chain, 40  
 reasons overts are overts, 436  
 responsibility for below Level IV, degree of,  
 438, 517  
 rock slam is sign of overt, 129  
 Routine 2-12 removes unwanted valences that  
 commit overts, 190  
 running ~ raises cause level of pc, 438, 439  
 why overts work, 439
- overt(s) (*cont.*)  
   withholds, coming after confusion of ~ hang up  
   on track and tend to stop pc in time, 14; *see*  
   *also* overt/withhold  
   wrong definitions cause stupidity or circuits, fol-  
   lowed by overts and motivators, 489  
 overt-motivator sequence, auditor must make a state-  
 ment to pc and assume initiative in ~, 464  
 overt-motivator sequence, when somebody has com-  
 mitted an overt, he has to claim existence of  
 motivators, 469  
 Overt Process: "In this lifetime what overt have  
 you committed?" "How have you justified it?",  
 436  
 overt/withhold (O/W),  
   assist, O/W is best repetitive process for, 99  
   demanding overt is not confined to just running  
   O/W, 465  
   don't use O/W to clean rudiments for Prepcheck  
   session, 30, 42  
   dropped on Co-Audit, 25  
   General Overt/Withhold before session, 101  
   Its Processes for O/W are almost unlimited, 441  
   justifications, running off, is further south process  
   than any earlier version of O/W, 436  
   missed withholds, asking for, does not upset dic-  
   tum of not using ~ Processes in rudiments, 60  
   Model Sessions and O/W, 244, 279, 382, 398, 420,  
   428, 448  
 overwhelm(s)(ed),  
   consequences of pc being overwhelmed, 400  
   it is charge that overwhelms, 401  
   time track overwhelms pc when charge present in  
   huge amounts, 416  
   violations of auditing cycle can bring about ~, 400

## P

- package, *defn*, always consists of two RIs that are  
 terminals and two RIs that are op terms  
 [R2-12A], 234  
 pain, *defn*, is composed of heat, cold, electrical, and  
 combined effect of sharp hurting, 175  
 person could feel pain only as himself (thetan plus  
 body), 176  
 terminal gives pain, 5, 12, 175, 177  
 tone scale, pcs come up to feeling pain; that is a  
 gain, 286  
 pan-determinism, full responsibility for both sides of  
 game, 8  
 past lives, why they are forgotten, 9  
 pc; *see* preclear  
 people, two types of people, 407  
 perceptions, no ~ in engram running, cause of, 329  
 physical universe; *see* mest universe  
 picture; *see* facsimile  
 PN; *see* pain  
 points, fixedness of points and their opposition pro-  
 duce phenomena of flows, 16

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- postulate-counter-postulate is problem, 185
- postulates, the pc's postulates [R3N, R3R], 349
- practical training goes through the simple motions, theory covers why one goes through the motions, 482
- preclear(s)('s); *see also* case; *BCR*
  - ailing from what pc is ailing from, not from what auditor selects, 464
  - all pc actions have an exact auditor response, 59
  - attempting to leave session equals M/W/H, 59
  - being mass means no TA action, 49
  - boiling off equals missed withhold, 59
  - can say whatever else they please, but must answer auditing question or no auditing occurs, 490, 501
  - case improving, pc becomes more independent of meter, 416
  - charge piled up on pc, pc ceases to be capable of clear thought and will reject even right items, 400
  - chronically tired pc who is not eating won't get TA for there's no as-is of locks, 434
  - confronting ability being driven down by auditor unfrontability [R2-10, R2-12], 225
  - critical, always a symptom of overts, 464
  - critical of organizations or people of Scientology equals missed withhold, 59
  - dating, pc's contrary data unspoken and untaken can give you a completely wrong date, 293
  - demanding redress of wrongs equals M/W/Hs, 59
  - dissatisfied pc caused by missed withholds, 20
  - doodling in clay, cause and resolutions of, 496, 497
  - dramatizing pc may not be a tough pc, 36
  - exhausted pc equals missed withhold, 59
  - failing to make progress equals M/W/H, 59
  - feels accused if he is run above his level, 441
  - foggy at session end equals missed withhold, 59
  - gain is directly proportional to TA action, 367
  - gains measured in terms of charge discharged, 325
  - get pc trained into what auditing cycle is and get question or command that was asked or given answered, 490
  - go groggy, lose interest and refuse to list only when session withholds are missed, 66
  - has something to hide, wants auditor to find rudiments in, 82
  - havingness is proportional to pc's ability to confront in session, 225
  - ill or misemotional before session beginning, handling of, 101
  - influencing agencies for pc are time track and present time, 275
  - in grief or apathy, cause and remedy of [R2, R3], 251
  - insufficiently cause in their daily lives cannot as-is bank, 433
  - interest and TA action tell programming is right, 325
  - it is pc who mostly keys his bank back in, 354
- preclear(s)('s) (*cont.*)
  - less pc cognites the more charge is accumulated, 401
  - lower grades raise pc's cause level, 434
  - makes no gain, is the pc who will not as-is, who will not confront, 36
  - more hysterical pc is about getting advanced processes or case gain, less strenuous process administered must be, 516
  - new, starting to audit, 491; *see also* case supervising, Dianetic C/S 1 [in full index]
  - not desirous of being audited equals M/W/H, 59
  - not looking at auditor, don't take auditing actions, 336
  - overwhelmed, consequences of, 400
  - past identities, pc is stuck not just in engrams but in past identities, 50
  - postulates, 349
  - protest against a question, how it is demonstrated, 439
  - refusing to talk to auditor equals M/W/H, 59
  - responsibility, no reason to expect any great pc responsibility for his own overts below Level IV, 438
  - R-factor to new pcs, 490
  - rough pc, 36
  - R6, why pcs can't run at once, 493
  - self-auditing pc due to lack of auditor control, 74
  - stuck in a past session, clean up the W/Hs, 21
  - subjective reality on gain will not compare to TA action, if charge by-passed, until BPC located, 368
  - telling others auditor is no good equals M/W/H, 59
  - that quits; *see Book of Case Remedies*
  - "thought has no effect on his or her bank", cause of, 36
  - thrown out of session by having responsibility hung on him, 414
  - time, pc's regard for or attitude about time can make it difficult to run R3R or R3N, 330
  - time track does not obey a preclear (early in auditing), 274
  - tone arm conscious body-moving pc, how to cure, 373
  - trying to prove himself right and auditor wrong, gets no-change sessions, 323
  - Type A and Type B pcs, handling of, 434
  - when pc is talking and no TA, you already have an ARC break or are about to get one, 336
  - who dives into past lives when asked for overts, 440
  - who doesn't cognite, cause of, 36
  - will win if run so as to obtain good TA action, 327
  - withdrawn or misemotional in life after Prepchecking, cause and remedy of, 67
  - withhold depends utterly on pc's idea of what is an overt, 40
  - with ruds out blows nothing, 18
- pre-clearing intensive [1962], 166
- predict, confidence is ability to predict, 93

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- Prehav assessment, *defn*, any method of discovering a level on scale for a given pc, 173  
 how to do "Roll Your Own" Prehav, 173, 174  
 you get a wrong assessment if pc has suppressed, invalidated or protested a button, 173
- Prehav level, *defn*., any doingness or not doingness on scale; any word in scale itself, 173  
 3GA—listing by Prehav, 163, 164
- Prehav read, *defn*, any reaction of needle different from its regular action for pc, occurring during or slightly after a level has been called, 173
- Prehav Scale, *defn*, any scale giving degrees of doingness or not doingness, 173
- Prepcheck(ing), 28, 88  
 administration of Prepchecking, 29  
 auditor fault in is going too shallow, 62  
 buttons, order of, 133, 363, 446, 447  
 CCHs run alternated with ~ [1962], 51, 127  
 developed to handle auditor's difficulty in "varying the question" in pulling withholds, 28  
 earlier similar, 29  
 goals and Prepchecking, 201  
 Goals Prepcheck Form—Routine 3GA, 106  
 limitations of use of ~ and 3D Criss Cross, 52  
 listing is not Prepchecking, 159  
 Listing Prepcheck, HCO WW R-3GA Form 1, 109  
 magic phrase of Prepchecking, 29  
 mechanics of Prepchecking, 28  
 middle ruds, 83, 99  
 missed withhold cleaning, do not use ~ system, 61  
 missed withhold, don't ask for while ~, 63  
 pc withdrawn or misemotional in life after ~, cause and remedy of, 67  
 procedure [ 1 962 ], 88  
 purpose of, is to set up a pc's rudiments so they will stay in during further clearing of bank, 31  
 Q and A is a serious thing in Prepchecking, 40  
 question, target of, is a chain of withholds, 28  
 repair, 67  
 Repetitive Prepchecking, 98, 361  
   on Problems Intensive, 116  
   replaces ~ by the Withhold System, 98  
 repetitive rudiments, don't use on end ruds of ~ or R3 session, 96  
 rudiments in Prepchecking, 42, 63  
 rudiments, you can get nice gains by ~ all rudiments, 70  
 rule of, always work specific incidents, 41  
 Sec Checking combined with ~ [1962], 62  
 session, when getting rudiments in avoid any O/W questions, one exception, 42  
 What question(s),  
   asked to expose and clean a chain of overts, 89  
   ask for M/W/Hs only after a What question is null, 63  
   asking the What question, 31  
   ask What question after getting single specific overt, 39  
   formulation of the What question, 89  
   testing What questions, 90
- Prepcheck(ing) (*cont.*)  
 Withhold System used in Prepchecking, 28  
 Zero question(s), 34, 60  
   list of Prepchecking Zero questions, 83  
 Zeros and Zero A questions, how to derive, 30  
 3DXX or ~, if no TA action shift to CCHs [1962], 43
- Prepclearing, preparatory to clearing, use of, 24
- present time, *defn*, response to continuous rhythm of physical universe, resulting in a hereness in nowness, 276  
 rhythm is source of present time, 276  
 thetan's continuous presence in ~, possible explanation of, 276
- present time problem(s); *see also* problem; rudiments  
 how to handle present time problems [1 964], 468  
 is exactly and only what pc thinks or says it is, 463  
 no gains occur in presence of, 468, 470  
 overts, ARC breaks and PTPs, 468; *see also* BCR  
 person with PTP will get no graph change, 185  
 to tell pc what his PTP is and then audit what auditor said it was will inevitably ARC break pc, 463  
 when a GPM item exists in PT it constitutes a ~, 185
- pressure, bank solidity is a form of ~, 175
- prior confusion to self-determined change, 116
- prior reads, *defn*., reads which occur prior to completion of major thought, 264  
 compartmenting the question, exploring ~, 77
- problem, *defn*, postulate-counter-postulate, 185; *see also* present time problem
- Problems Intensive,  
 goals presented in ~ should not be given vast importance or suppressed, 201  
 pattern for a new Problems Intensive, 116  
 Recall a Terminal and ~, alternated with R-2H, 406  
 Repetitive Prepchecking on, 116  
 what Problems Intensive does for pc, 146
- process(es),  
 auditing discipline, Auditor's Code, TRs are needed to make processes work, 263  
 auditor has to be skilled on one ~ at least and know all about it before he can do two, 432  
 commands, one doesn't necessarily give every auditing command the process has in its run down, 501  
 cycle is selecting a ~ to be run on pc, running TA action into it (if necessary) and running TA action out of it, 410  
 don't only deliver "the latest" ~, 324  
 don't run a process that makes pc feel accused, 441  
 end of process [Model Session], 86, 87, 399  
 flatten a process before you change, 76  
 master process, *defn*, one which ran out all other processes and processing, 67  
 remedy is an auditing ~ designed to handle a non routine situation, 517

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

### process(es) (*cont.*)

- repairing unflat processes, 67
- routine is a standard ~, designed for best steady gain of pc at that level, 517
- start of process [Model Session], 86, 399
- that turns something on turns it off, 126
- processing; *see* auditing
- Processing Check, Know to Mystery, 1
- program, programming, *defn*, consecutive techniques
  - or actions a case should have to get adequate tone arm action and achieve a new plateau of ability, 386
- cases [1963], 325, 331
- cycle is selecting an action to be performed, performing that action and completing it, 410
- pc interest and TA action tell you ~ is right, 325
- pcs, 324
- Project 80—itsa line and tone arm, 351
- prompters, 512
- protest(s)(ed),
  - decided and ~ used to get pc easier in session, 447
  - how pc's ~ against a question is demonstrated, 439
  - in a conflict between pc and meter, take pc's data, because ~ and assert and mistake will also read on meter, 335
  - is basically responsible for making a mental image picture, 301
- psychoanalytic patients, 517
- psychosomatic, Clay Table Healing used to get rid of physical discomfort of ~ origin, 457
- psychotics, proper handling of, 516
- PT; *see* present time
- PTP; *see* present time problem
- public, if they don't hear same thing being said at least three times, they believe it is impermanent, 432
- public incredulity is an accidental protection, 332
- punishment is supposed to bring about inaction, 439
- punishment, why it doesn't work, 322, 439

## Q

### Q and A, 74, 410

- defn.*, asking a question about a pc's answer, 74
- defn.*, means that the exact answer to a question is the question, a factual principle; came to mean that auditor did what the pc did, 74
- defn.*, a failure to complete a cycle of action on a preclear, 410
- ARC broken pc, never discipline or ~ with, 286
- auditor Q and A-ing is giving session control over to the pc, 74
- causes ARC breaks by by-passing charge, 283, 285, 419
- dangerous ~ is that action of auditor which corresponds to pc's avoidance of a hot subject or item, 37
- examples of Q and A, 74, 292

### Q and A (*cont.*)

- interrupting or changing an auditing comm cycle before it is complete, 410
- is a serious thing in Prepchecking, 40
- origin of term comes from "changing when pc changes", 410
- types: double questioning, changing because pc changes, and following pc's instructions, 74

## R

- Reach and Withdraw on E-Meter, TR 20, 264
- reactive mind,
  - auditor is in absolute control of bank; it always does what you tell it to do, 413
  - bank beefing up, *defn*, sensation of increasing solidity of masses in the mind, 175
  - bank belongs to thetan, not to body, 255
  - bank is a demon for exactness; mind is not a con fusion, 404
  - basis of, is actual GPMs, 493
  - composed of timelessness, unknownness, survival, 78
  - earlier in the ~ the "power" of the thetan's mock ups is greater, 256
  - E-Meter reacts on ~, never on analytical mind, 78
  - GPM, black masses of the reactive mind, 175
  - mechanics of the reactive bank, 493
  - there are valences, circuits and machinery in ~, as well as reliable items and goals, 275
- read(s)(ing); *see also* E-Meter
  - auditor with out TRs and no impingement gets no ~, 82
  - bigger on higher levels, 396
  - dirty read; *see* dirty read
  - everything reading, 402, 403
  - instant reads; *see* instant reads
  - latent reads; *see* latent reads
  - never clean a clean needle and never miss a ~, 105
  - on Level VI, difference between, 403
  - prior reads; *see* prior reads
  - questions to handle missed meter reads, 73
  - rocket reads; *see* rocket reads
  - steering pc by needle reads, 60, 63, 78
- Recall Process, don't accept only "yes" as an answer, 95
- release, definition of, 338
- reliable item(s), *defn*, any item that rock slams well on being found and at session end and which was last item still in after assessing list; can be terminal, opposition terminal, combination terminal or significance, provided only that it was *the* item found on a list and rock slammed, 176; *see also* combined terminal; opposition terminal; terminal
- always in pairs [R3-2 1 ], 182
- dead horse is a list which even with good auditing, failed for any other reason to produce a reliable item, 203
- E-Meter and RIs, 334

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- reliable item(s) (*cont.*)
  - goals and ~ found on students, staff or HGC pcs must be checked out, 246
  - GPMs, three types of charge existed in GPMs: charge as an engram, charge as RIs, charge as postulates, 349
  - implant RIs, 394
  - never audit an RI in any way but listing for another RI [R2-12A], 237
  - Oppose RIs [R2-10, R2-12], 221
  - potential miscalling a reliable item [R2], 230
  - stray RI is an RI from a GPM of another goal than the one being worked [R2-12A], 258
  - too many found without finding pc's goal turns off a pc's RR or RS [R2-10, R2-12, R2-12A], 249
- remedy, remedies, 506; *see also* BCR
  - defn.*, something you do to get pc into condition for routine auditing, 485
  - defn.*, auditing process which is designed to handle non-routine situation, 517
- Remedy A, 506; *see also* Book of Case Remedies
  - handles immediate subject under discussion or study, 507
- Remedy B seeks out and handles a former subject, conceived to be similar to immediate subject or condition, in order to clear up misunderstandings in immediate subject or condition, 507; *see also* BCR
- remedy for the dangerous auditor, 34
- repair, case, 67
- repair, general, you can get nice gains by prepchecking all rudiments, 70
- repeating what pc says is evaluation, 161, 414
- Repetitive Prepchecking; *see* Prepchecking, Repetitive
- repetitive rudiment; *see* rudiment, repetitive
- represent list, item is unburdened by making ~ [R2- 10, R2-12 , 3GAXX], 210
- responsibility, 438, *defn.*, concept of being able to care for, to reach or to be, 8
  - common denominator of the Goals Problem Mass is "no responsibility", 8
  - determinism and degrees of ~, 8
  - difficulty stems from no responsibility, 9
  - increased will unflatten Zeros, 90
  - no great pc ~ for his own overts below Level IV, 438
  - pc is thrown out of session by having ~ hung on him, 414
  - realization that one has really done something is a return of ~ and this gain is best obtained only by indirect approach, 438
  - Security Checking increases responsibility, 9
- restimulate(s)(ed), restimulation
  - auditing selectively ~, locates charge and discharges it, 290, 335, 347, 416
  - mechanism of permanent ~ consists of opposing forces of comparable magnitude which cause a balance which does not respond to current time and remains "timeless", 276, 416
- restimulate(s)(ed), restimulation (*cont.*)
  - over-restimulation, 371, 413
  - sources of restimulation, 372
  - under-restimulation, 371
  - when prior charge is ~ but not located so that it can be blown, we get ARC breaks, 290, 416
- Revelation Process XI, 34
- Revelation Process X2, commands of, 38
- review, Scientology review, 332
- R-factor to new pcs, 490
- rhythm is source of present time, 276
- RI; *see* reliable item
- right, rightness, 323
  - asserted rightness, 322, 327
  - how to get another less compulsive on their "rightness", 323
  - no absolute rights or absolute wrongs, 321
  - rehabilitating the ability to be right, 322
- rock, 129; *see also* rock slam
  - just below the rock lies pc's goal, 213
  - opposition rock and rock, two basic items of GPM, 182
- rocket read(s); *see also* rock slam
  - always goes to the right with a fast spurt which rapidly decays, 212
  - how to make RRs appear on implant RIs, 394
  - how to restore ability of pc to RR or R/S, 250
  - implant GPMs read with a long clean enthusiastic RR, actual GPM chugs, 402
  - is superior in value to an R/S; R/S is superior in value to a DR; DR is superior in value to a fall, 212
  - is the read of goal or rock itself, 213
  - rock slam and rocket read, relationship, 249
  - traveling rocket read [R2, R3], 257
  - what makes RRs and R/Ses vanish [R2-10, R2-12], 249
- rock slam (s) (ing); *see also* rock; rocket read
  - defn.*, called a rock slam as found on many pcs in effort to locate rock, 129
  - defn.*, convulsion of the mind and can reflect as a convulsion of the body, 142
  - defn.*, response of E-Meter to conflict between terminals and opposition terminals, 176
  - defn.*, repetitive slashing of needle of any width, 205
  - defn.*, read of rock vs. opposition rock and every pair above them on the cycle of GPM; it marks path to rock, 213
  - case progress marked by rock slams, 212
  - depend on reality level of pc, 176
  - dirty needles and R/Ses, 129
  - Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam [3GA], 131, 135, 137, 138
  - everyone alive rock slams on something, 178, 212
  - instant rock slam, *defn.*, that rock slam which begins at end of major thought of any item, 176
  - item, never represent it, always oppose it, 172, 216, 221, 237

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- rock slam(s)(ing) (*cont.*)  
 item that R/Ses was part of GPM and has another item in opposition to it, 212  
 List One, R/S, 210, 216, 220  
 marks path of interest of pc; R/S = interest = cognitions, 213  
 matching [R2-12], 236  
 minute rock slam, 119  
 most difficult needle response to find or attain or preserve, 176  
 “never R/Sing” pcs, 212  
 only package wide ones in R2-12A, 240  
 Opening Procedure by Rock Slam [R2-12], 185  
 persons who ~ on Scientology or associated items are security risks, 185  
 person who ~ on Scientology or auditors can’t audit well, why, 161  
 reliable item and R/Ses; *see* reliable item  
 restoring the RR and R/S, 249, 250  
 rocket reads and R/Ses, relationship, 212, 249  
 scale of, 212  
 Security Check by rock slam, 140  
 sign of overt, 129  
 slash of an R/S is all of the same velocity and doesn’t decay, it just ceases, 212  
 vanished, cause of, 234, 249  
 wide ~ is a quarter of a dial ~ to a full dial ~, 140  
 rock slam channel is pathway through pairs of items that compose a cycle of GPM and lead to rock and goal, 176, 213  
 rock slammer(s), 161  
*defn*, preclear who rock slams on a present time GPM item in his or her immediate environment, 186  
*defn*, one who produces a rock slam during the nulling of Scientology List on that list; persons who produce rock slam reactions on other lists are not rock slammers, 203  
 is a slow-gain or non-gain case, 187  
 persons who rock slam on Scientology or associated items are security risks, 185  
 skills required to accomplish a 3GAXX for ~, 189  
 slow student is always a rock slammer, 185  
 we’re probably all somewhere on List One, 218  
 “Roll Your Own” Prehav, 173, 174  
 Ron; *see* Hubbard, L. Ron  
 rote style auditing; *see* auditing, rote style  
 routine (s), *defn*, a standard process designed for best steady gain of pc at that level, 517  
 designation of routines, 262  
 is for normal case advance, 485  
 Routine Three, Service Facsimile Clear (R3SC), 353  
 slow assessment, 379  
 steps of, 354  
 Routine 0-A, 518  
 (Expanded), steps of, 520  
 Routine 0-B, 0-0, 518  
 Routine 0-C, 519  
 Routine 1a, 67  
 Routine 2, 68, 218, 219; *see also* Routine ~ and/or Routine 3 [avoid R2-12, R3 type processes, 406]  
 opposition lists, right and wrong oppose, 230  
 Routine 2 and/or Routine 3; *see also* Routine 2; Routine 3 [avoid R2-12, R3 type processes, 406]  
 ARC break; *see* ARC break, R2 and R3 ARC breaks  
 Clear test, 259  
 don’t force the pc, 255  
 Drill One, 254  
 item from another GPM, 258  
 listing difficulties, cause and remedy of, 255, 256  
 listing rules, 241, 242  
 midrudrule, 251  
 minimize goal oppose lists, 258  
 Model Session, 243  
 pc in grief or apathy, cause and remedy of, 251  
 rule: completing R2 or R3 package will not turn on the RR or R/S, 249  
 sad effect, 251, 252  
 TA position for the list must be motionless, 241  
 traveling rocket read, 257  
 upsets, how to prevent, 254  
 wrong wording of item or goal, 257  
 Routine 2-G, designation of R2-GPH, R2-GI, R2-G2, R2-G3, R2-G4, R2-G5, 262 [avoid R2-12 type processes, 406]  
 Routine 2H, ARC Breaks by Assessment, 297  
 lecture graphs, 343, 344  
 Routine 2-10, 247, 249, 262, *defn*, R2-12 short form for beginners, 208; *see also* Routine 2-12 [avoid R2-12 type processes, 406]  
 cease to use Routine 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A in HGC and Academy and on staff clearing, with two exceptions, 247  
 target of, is fast result in pc and greater reality for auditor, 213  
 Routine 2-12, 186; *see also* Routine 2-10; Routine 2-12A [avoid R2-12 type processes, 406]  
 assessments, 208  
 what assessment is prevented by, 203  
 auditor responsibility, 219  
 avoid R2-12, R-3 and R4 type processes [1964], 406  
 basic auditing skills needed to audit with ~, 193  
 case errors, points of greatest importance, 217  
 case remedy, 226  
 cease to use Routine 2-10, 2-12 and 2-12A in HGC and Academy and on staff clearing, with two exceptions, 247  
 coaching notes, 194  
 danger of, 263  
 definitions of important terms, 203  
 duration of process, 219  
 eye pouches used as an indicator, 235  
 failure to save records, 220  
 fast step resume, 190  
 fatal error, 216



## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- Routine 2-12 (*cont.*)
    - list(s)(ing), 188
    - appearances, 207
    - incomplete lists, 221
    - item can appear anywhere on a source list so
      - long as 2 items do not R/S or RR, 239
    - never force pc to list, 255
    - never null lists taken from wrong sources, just
      - abandon, 232
    - overlisting, danger sign of, is pc invalidating or
      - questioning items as he or she says them, 204
    - that won't complete, 223
    - writing the list, 204
    - wrong way oppose, tests for, 222
  - List One, the Scientology List, 191, 195, 202, 215
    - failing to find R/Ses on List One, 220
  - never represent a rock slam item, 221
  - "never R/Sing" pcs, 212
  - Opening Procedure by Rock Slam—an HPA/HCA
    - skill, 185
  - practical drills, 193
  - removes unwanted valences that commit overts
    - rather than endlessly sec checking pc, 190
  - rocket reads vs. R/Ses, 212
  - target of, is packages in present time which bend
    - GPM out of shape and give pc PTPs and hidden standards, 213
  - Tiger Drill for nulling by mid ruds, 196
  - vanished R/S or RR, 249
  - when to abandon R2-12 and begin R3M, 250
  - Zero list questions or R2-12, 211
- Routine 2-12A, 240, 247; *see also* Routine 2-10;
- Routine 2-12 [avoid R2-12 type processes, 406]
- allow no self listing of goals, 238
  - ARC break always equals wrong Routine 2, handling of, 237
  - case repair, 237
  - ceased to be used, 247
  - danger of, 263
  - dope-off, 237
  - four item packages, 234
  - listing, auditor has no business with significances
    - of items, 235
  - listing, run all TA action out of listing; list at least
    - 50 items beyond point TA became motionless, 233
  - list is wrong way to, indicators, 234, 236
  - never steer items, 238
  - nulling, 235
  - reliable items, you never audit an RI in any way
    - but listing for another RI, 237
  - right item signs, 236
  - rock slam handling, 235, 236, 240
  - source list is what you choose to get your first list
    - from or List One, 239
  - tone arm is used, 233
  - vanished R/S or RR, 249
  - wrong item signs, 236
- Routine 3; *see also* Routine 2 and/or Routine 3
- [avoid R2-12, R3 type processes, 406]
  - case repair, 69
  - difficulties and liabilities in a ~ process, 64
  - Model Session, 278, 381
- Routine 3A, repair of, 69 [avoid R3 type processes, 406]
- Routine 3D, [avoid R3 type processes, 406]
- lock valences are appended to a real GPM 3D item, 7
  - repair of, 69
  - terminal, produces a painful somatic, 5
- Routine 3DXX (3D Criss Cross), 4, 34 [avoid R3 type processes, 406]
- assessment, 10, 11, 17, 19
- cautions regarding Routine 3G and ~, 57
  - CCHs, Prepchecking and ~ combination, 43, 51, 52
  - complete list in 3DXX, 17
  - differentiation step in 3DXX, 11, 18
  - blows the lock valences, 18
  - finding terminal and oppterm, 5
  - items, 25
  - line, *defn*, a list of found 3D items each in
    - opposition to the last item on that line, 12
    - each line is an independent zig-zag of opposition items, 10
    - ways to start a 3DXX line, 17
  - listing on 3DXX, 17
    - dirty needle in listing = an earlier item is wrong, 57
    - is always derived from pc, 10
  - pc who gets dopey ordrowsy, handling of, 10
  - repairing the process, 69, 70
  - steps, 4, 55
- Routine 3G, 53 [avoid R3 type processes, 406]
- Routine 3GA, 92 [avoid R3 type processes, 406]
- Dynamic Assessment by rock slam, 131, 135, 138, 142
  - experimental, 64
  - goals list, 118
  - length of, 92
  - pc must be warned not to read list back to himself, 118
- Goals Prepcheck Form, 106
- HCO WW Form G3—Fast Goals Check, 115, 165
- HCO WW R-3GA Form 1—Listing Prepcheck, 109
- line wording, 130, 134
- listing, 159
- bum goal results in a pc's getting sick and dizzy, 92
  - by Prehav, 163, 164
  - by Tiger buttons—114 new lines for listing, 147, 148
  - dominant rules of Routine 3GA listing, 159
  - "to be" goals line listing, 139
  - wording, 114
- nulling by mid ruds, 119, 122
- scale of answering comm lags, 159
- steps, 64

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- Routine 3GAXX, [avoid R3 type processes, 406]  
 assessment steps of 3GAXX, 180  
 dirty needles and incomplete lists, 180, 181  
 overlisting, danger sign of, 204  
 skills required to accomplish a for rock slammers, 189  
 straightening up 3GAXX cases, 179  
 target of, is items on which goals lists can be compiled and unburdening, 213  
 Tiger Drill for nulling by mid ruds, 196  
 Zero A steps and purpose of processes, 210  
 Routine 3M & 3N; *see* footnote 240  
 Routine 3SC; *see* Routine Three, Service Facsimile Clear  
 Routine 3-21, 170, 182 [avoid R3 type processes, 406]  
 by-passed item defined, 182  
 target of, is Clear, theta clear and Operating Thetan, 213  
 Routine 4, avoid R4 type processes, 406  
 Routine 4MTA has been cancelled, 376  
 RR; *see* rocket read  
 R/S; *see* rock slam  
 rudiment(s); *see also* ARC break; missed withhold; present time problem  
 beginning rudiments [Model Session], 85, 398, 428  
 beginning rudiments withhold question change, 72  
 check(ing), 81, 82  
 needle characteristics in ~ checks, 84  
 check sheet, 81  
 cleaning a ~ that has already registered null gives pc a M/W/H of nothingness, 102, 362  
 don't let pc use ~ to avoid body of session, 76  
 double question is primary source of ARC breaks and out rudiments, 74  
 E-Meter sensitivity is vital to get ~ in, 91  
 end of session rudiment for withholds, 27  
 end rudiments [Model Session], 86, 399, 429  
 end words of questions, checking pc on, 102, 362  
 fast checking, never say, "That still reads", 97, 361  
 handling [1962], 75  
 Havingness rud, 101  
 how to get the rudiments in, 361  
 instant read anticipated on rudiments, 113  
 instant rudiment read, *defn.*, 264  
 Levels III to VI Model Session ~, 420, 448  
 middle rudiments, 99, 173  
 big mid ruds, 446  
 goal will go null if big mid ruds are out, 83  
 use of big mid ruds, 248  
 Model Session, 86, 244, 279, 382, 399, 421, 449  
 prepchecking the middle rudiments, 83, 99  
 use of, 97  
 willmushanengram, 296  
 missed withholds, asking for, does not upset dictum of using no O/W Processes in ~, 60  
 rudiment(s) (*cont.*)  
 missed withholds rudiment, 101  
 miss on one and the next, even if really hot, can seem to be null by reason of ARC break, 105  
 never ask a question about an answer in cleaning any rudiment, 75  
 out rudiments, E-Meter can go gradually dull in presence of out rudiments, 96, 361  
 pc who has something to hide wants auditor to find rudiments in, 82  
 pc with ruds out blows nothing, 18  
 Prepchecking, rudiments in, 42, 63  
 Prepchecking ~, you can get nice gains by, 70  
 random rudiment [Model Session], 244  
 repetitive rudiment cycle, 96, 361  
 repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking, 361  
 repetitive rudiments, don't use on end ruds of Prepcheck or R3 session, 96  
 room rudiment dropped from Model Session in beginning, remains in end, 101  
 R2 and R3 Model Session, rudiments, mid ruds, random rudiment, 244  
 R3 Model Session, rudiments in, 278, 381  
 steer by repeated meter reaction, 63  
 TA action ignored when a rudiment is used as a rudiment, 76  
 TA action, lots of, on auditor rud, use CCHs, 44  
 TR 1, if it is poor, you'll miss rudiment's outness and there goes your session, 96, 361  
 why rudiments are detested by some pcs, 284  
 won't register when pc is not in session, 96  
 R (number); *see* Routine (number), except R3R and R6 [below]  
 R3R, 294; *see also* engram running  
 ARC breaks, handling of in R3R, 293  
 assessment [1963], 300, 302  
 basic problem in starting a case, 299  
 causes for failure, 294  
 chain once assessed must be fully run, 299  
 don't mix with earlier data on engram running, 294  
 don't use mid ruds or ask for M/W/Hs, 296  
 interest is only absorbed attention and a desire to talk about it, 301  
 it does not matter if pc stays within this lifetime or goes whole track so long as assessed chain is followed and a basic eventually discovered for it, 299  
 List L-3, 308  
 pc's postulates, 349  
 pc's regard for or attitude about time can make it difficult for auditor to run R3R or R3N, 330  
 significance and story content have no bearing on rightness or wrongness of chain selected, 302  
 steps, 294  
 Preliminary Step [1963], 299  
 all rules of listing as developed in R2-12 apply to R3R Preliminary Step, 300  
 TA action exists on the correct chain, 299, 300

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- R3R (*cont.*)  
 visible factors in R3R are: pc's interest, TA action,  
 ability of pc to run incidents, 301  
 which cases can run, 331
- R6,  
 ARC breaks, 418  
 auditor musts, 392  
 don't use Clay Table Clearing after R6 begun, 493  
 list of good indicators on R6, 390  
 why pcs can't run at once, 493
- ### S
- sad effect, 251, 252  
 Saint Hill Special Briefing Course (SHSBC), 32, 156  
 S and Ds; *see* Search and Discovery [in full index];  
*BCR*  
 sanity, case level and ~, relationship to training, 327  
 Scientology,  
   against Scientology, *defn.*, attention off ~ and  
   protesting ~ behavior or connections, 347  
   List One, 191, 195, 202  
   professional attitude of, 59  
   tradition of; *see Book of Case Remedies*  
   using ~ to handle situations in life is a whole sub-  
   ject in itself and it isn't auditing, 491  
   with Scientology, *defn.*, interested in subject and  
   getting it used, 347  
   workability of Scientology, 425  
 scouting, handling the time track, 288  
 S-C-S; *see* Start—Change—Stop  
 secondaries, *defn.*, those parts of time track which  
   contain misemotion based on earlier engramic  
   experience, 274; *see also* engrams  
 secondary styles; *see* auditing, secondary styles  
 Security Check(s)(ing); *see also* Confessional; Integ-  
   rity Processing [both in full index]  
   based on "withhold", "make guilty" and "pre-  
   vent", 1  
   by rock slam, 140  
   if a question doesn't promptly clear on needle  
   then it is part of a chain, 62  
   increases responsibility, 9  
   never leave a question unflat, 1  
   Prepchecking and ~ [1962], 62  
   run also Havingness, 6  
   Twenty-Ten; *see* Twenty-Ten  
   unflat, remedy for, 67  
 security risks, rock slammers are ~, 1 85  
 self-determined, self-determinism,  
   full responsibility for self, no responsibility for  
   other side of game, 8  
   inflow and restrained inflow can be ~ actions, 14  
 sensation (sen.), *defn.*, all other uncomfortable per-  
   ceptions than pain stemming from reactive  
   mind are called sensation; these are basically  
   "pressure", "motion", "dizziness", "sexual sen-  
   sation", and "emotion and misemotion", 175  
 opposition terminal produces dizziness or "winds  
   of space" sensation, 5
- service facsimile, *defn.*, *Advanced Procedure and  
 Axioms* definition accurate; add this: ~ is that  
 computation generated by pc (not bank) to  
 make self right and others wrong, to dominate  
 or escape domination, and enhance own sur-  
 vival and injure that of others, 353, 354  
 finding and running, 354  
 is generated by pc, not the bank, 354  
 keynote of clearing a ~ is interest; if pc isn't inter-  
 ested in it, assessment is wrong, 356  
 student's or auditor's ~ may contest instruction,  
 how to handle, 358
- session(s); *see also* Model Session  
 against session, *defn.*, attention off own case and  
   talking at auditor in protest of auditor, PT  
   auditing, environment or Scientology, 34647  
 auditing results are best achieved in a ~ and a ~  
   depends upon a self-determined agreement to  
   be audited, 491  
 auditor is totally responsible for ~, 161, 425,  
   426  
 body of ~ [Model Session], 280, 382, 421, 449  
 cleaning up an old session will give you all the  
   latent gain in that session, 21  
 control, don't discard it by asking pc what to do,  
   76  
 end body of session [Model Session], 280, 383,  
   421, 449  
 end of session [Model Session], 86, 245, 280, 383,  
   399, 422, 450  
 General Overt/Withhold before session, 101  
 getting the pc sessionable, 491  
 go wrong, ask for missed withholds, 61  
 in session, *defn.*, willing and able to talk to the  
   auditor; interested in own case, 18  
   difficult to keep pc in session, handling of, 58  
   if pc is in session E-Meter will read, 96  
   pc in session will always tell withholds, 23  
   picking up M/W/Hs keeps pcs in session, 58  
   protested and decided used to get pc easier in  
   session, 447  
 must-nots, 463  
 out of session, pc is thrown out of session by  
   having responsibility hung on him, 414  
 out of session, pc with dirty needle is a long way  
   out of session a lot of the time, 93  
 pc attempting to leave ~ equals M/W/H, 59  
 preliminaries [Model Session], 243, 278, 381,  
   398, 420, 428, 448  
 Q and A, ~ without Q and A is a smooth ~, 74  
 rough, angry ARC breaky session, auditor has  
   failed to pick up missed withholds, 58  
 rudiments, don't let pc use rudiments to avoid  
   body of session, 76  
 smooth out session [Model Session], 280, 383,  
   422, 449  
 start of session [Model Session], 85, 243, 278,  
   381, 398, 420, 428, 448  
 TA amount per session, 367  
 tape recording sessions, points to look for, 378

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- session(s) (*cont.*)  
 with session, *defn*, interested in own case and willing to talk to auditor, 346; *see also* session, in  
 if pc is with meter will read; if pc is partially against meter will read poorly, 361
- sexual sensation, *defn*, any feeling, pleasant or unpleasant, commonly experienced during sexual restimulation or action, 175
- shock, operational, cause of, 464
- shock treatment, what it does, 408
- SHSBC; *see* Saint Hill Special Briefing Course
- significance in clay table work; *see* clay table
- significance, one of three methods to move time track, 287, 288
- skunked, *defn*, list with R/Ses on it in listing that failed to produce a reliable item, 203
- assessment [R3SC], 379
- slow assessment, example of, 373
- slow-gain, no-gain cases, 185
- “social conduct”, “suppressor” is often considered ~, 37
- unchangsocialmores, overts depend on~, 40
- somatic(s), *defn*, general word for uncomfortable physical perceptions coming from reactive mind, 175  
 CCHs, take a ~ or twitch or any pc reaction as an origin by pc and call pc’s attention to it, 49  
 chronic somatics are contained in valences, 9  
 3D terminal produces a painful somatic, 5
- source list; *see* list, source
- squirrels are Case Levels 7 or 6 dramatizing alter-is on Scientology instead of their track, 327
- Start—Change—Stop, unflat, remedy for, 68
- start-continue—complete, cycle of action redefined as , 410
- steer, how to ~ pc by repeated meter reaction, 63, 78
- steer, never steer items [R2-12], 238
- student(s) (‘s); *see also* training  
 auditing assignments, 431  
 “bright” students, 488  
 glib students can’t demonstrate, 488  
 in trouble, Remedy A & B, 506, 507  
 quick student who somehow never applies what he learns, 480  
 service facsimile may contest instruction, how to handle, 358  
 slow or blows, reason for, 431, 451  
 slow ~, as well as slow gainer, is always a rock slammer, 185  
 theory checkouts must consult student’s understanding, 480
- stupidity, wrong definitions cause ~, 489
- “suggested” is evaluation, what it does, 119
- suicide, cause of, 252, 517
- Supervisor’s remedies; *see* BCR
- suppress and not-used used to get item to read, 447
- “suppressed” can keep a goal or invalidation, suggestion, mistake, assertion or M/W/H on goal from reading, 119
- suppression is overcome when you run havingness on a pc, 37
- suppressors, *defn*, impulse to forbid revelation in another, 37
- survival, rightness is stuff of which is made, 322
- symbols, Clay Table Clearing is a process of clearing words and symbols, 474

## T

- TA; *see* tone arm
- Tactile Havingness is a CCH type of process, 43
- tape lectures are necessary to get the meaning and ethic of Scientology, 229
- tape recording sessions, points to look for, 378
- technical quality, staff morale, the unit, broad dissallow semination depend basically upon ~, 324
- technique,  
*defn*, process or some action that is done by auditor and pc under auditor’s direction, 385  
*defn*, a patterned action, invariable and ing, composed of certain steps or actions calculated to bring about tone arm action and thus better or free a thetan, 386  
 basic auditing is necessary for ~ to work, 385  
 dirty needle, its cause lies in basic auditing not in technique errors, 384, 414
- technology, auditing session is 50% ~ and 50% application, 58
- terminal (term.), *defn*, an item or identity pc has actually been sometime in past (or present); it is “the pc’s own valence” at that time, 175  
 combined terminal; *see* combined terminal  
 GPM is full of pairs of terms and oppters, 179  
 identities in GPM producing pain, 175  
 most PT ~ and oppters look more like coters than clean ~ or opposition terminals when first contacted, 230  
 opposition terminal; *see* opposition terminal  
 Recall a Terminal and Problems Intensive, alternated with R-2H, 406  
 R2-12A package, 235  
 turns on pain in pc’s body, it is a ~, 12, 177  
 ways of asking for ~ and oppterm, 177, 230  
 3DXX, finding terminal and oppterm, 5
- theory,  
 checkouts must consult student’s understanding, 480  
 checkout system, 488  
 practical goes through the simple motions, ~ covers why one goes through the motions, 482  
 theory coaching, *defn*, getting student to define all words, give all rules, demonstrate things in bulletin with his hands or bits of things, and also may include doing Clay Table Definitions of Scientology terms, 489
- theta clear; *see* Clear, theta

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- thetan(s)(’s),  
 body vs. thetan, 255  
 continuous presence in PT, possible explanation of, 276  
 earlier in bank the “power” of thetan’s mock-ups is greater, 256  
 engrams are being automatically created by , 301  
 fight of ~ is to remain unsolid, mobile or im-mobile at will, and capable of decision, 277, 417  
 person could feel pain only as himself (thetan plus body), 176  
 things which can deteriorate thetan, 277  
 time track and thetan; *see* time track  
 tries to be right and fights being wrong, 322
- thought,  
 critical thought is a symptom of overt, not the overt itself, 469  
 major thought; *see* major thought  
 minor thought; *see* minor thought  
 pc whose “thought has no effect on his or her bank”, cause of, 36
- ticks, not asking right question gives you ~, 396
- Tiger Drill(ing), 122, 150, *defn.*, series of buttons which are capable of preventing a right goal or level from reading or making a wrong level read, combined in an appropriate exercise, 173
- Big Tiger Drill, 196  
 buttons, 148  
 mid ruds (Tiger Drill), 129
- time, 330  
 failure to handle time in incidents, 273  
 handling time on pc’s time track, 287, 288  
 is actual but is also an apparency, 330; *see also* Dn 55  
 mechanics of time, 330  
 sense, compared to case level, 330  
 single source of aberration is time, 287  
 “timeless”, cause of, 276  
 tone arm and time, 325, 329, 330  
 Zero questions time limiter, 99
- timelessness, unknownness, survival, reactive mind is composed of, 78
- time track, 273, 287, 292, 299; *see also* whole track  
*defn.*, a very accurate record of pc’s past, very accurately timed, very obedient to auditor, at least 350,000,000,000,000 years long, probably much longer, with a scene about every 1/25 of a second, 274  
*defn.*, endless record, complete with 52 perceptions, of pc’s entire past, 274  
 argument with pc during dating can group track, 293  
 auditor must know basic laws and mechanics of ~ in order to run engrams, 273, 288  
 charge and the time track, 289, 416  
 charge prevents pc from confronting ~ and submerges ~ from view, 290, 416  
 creation of the time track, 275, 276, 291  
 earlier on ~ pc had stronger postulates, 349
- time track (*cont.*)  
 engram running by chains and the time track bulletins, 273, 287, 292, 299  
 exceeds a trillion, trillion, trillion years, 296  
 faults, there are no faults in recording of ~; there are only snarls caused by groupers, and unavailability and lack of perception of , 275  
 free track, that part of time track that is free of pain and misadventure, 274  
 grouping of time track, causes of, 293, 329  
 influencing agencies for pc are ~ and PT, 275  
 mechanism of, 277  
 move a ~ by any one of these three methods: significance, location, time, 287, 288  
 move only the track; don’t mix it and also move pc, 288  
 obeys auditor; time track does not obey a preclear (early in auditing), 274  
 origin of the time track, 276  
 some parts are permanently in a state of creation, majority becoming created when thetan’s attention is directed to them, 276  
 unavailability, cause of, 275
- tired, chronically tired pc who is not eating won’t get TA for there’s no as-is of locks, 434
- tone arm, 233  
 action; *see* tone arm action  
 body motion and TA, 241, 373, 397, 443  
 “fragile TA”, 329  
 listing to a still tone arm, what it takes, 241  
 motion; *see* tone arm action  
 moving signals auditor not to act; TA not moving signals auditor to act, 373, 413  
 Project 80—the itsa line and tone arm, 351  
 stuck TA, cause of, 350, 419  
 time and the tone arm, 329
- tone arm action; *see also* tone arm  
 as indicator of what to run, 44, 48  
 blowdown of tone arm is meter reaction of having found correct by-passed charge, 346  
 body motion and TA; *see* body motion  
 case must not be run without TA action or with minimal TA action, 331, 413  
 cause of, 370  
 energy contained in confusions blowing off case, 375  
 TA change requires two locations—location of pc and location of mass, 49  
 TA moves because mass is changing, 48  
 that which moves the tone arm down will give tone arm action; that which moves only the needle seldom gives good TA, 369  
 what produces ~ and what doesn’t, 375  
 CCHs produced ~ while higher level processes did not, 43  
 charge and TA action, 290  
 without TA motion no charge is being released, 329, 413  
 continue the process so long as you have tone arm motion, 40, 75

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

- tone arm action (*cont.*)  
 correct track significances run but without will  
   not change but can deteriorate a case, 335  
 “drift down” and “drift up”, 48  
 how it is measured, 367  
 how often one reads and notes TA action, 443, 444  
 how to get, 324, 369, 374, 377, 397  
 inhibitors of,  
   chronically tired pc who is not eating, 434  
   less active the TA the more over-restimulation  
     is present (though restimulation can also be  
     absent), 371, 413  
   slows down as soon as pc goes into more charge  
     than he can itsa easily, 374  
   small if any when pc has a PTP, 468  
   TA action has to have been prevented; it  
     doesn’t just not occur, 370  
   whatsit reduces TA action, 334, 370, 378  
   when pc is talking and you’re getting no TA  
     you already have an ARC break or are about  
     to get one, 336  
 is best index of case levels, 330  
 itsa and whatsit, relation to TA, 334, 370, 378  
 list to assess forTAmotion, 372  
 pc interest and tell you programming is right,  
   325  
 pc’s gain is directly proportional to ~, 325, 327,  
   367, 368  
 quantity of,  
   amount per session and intensive, 44, 367  
   auditor skill measured by amount of TA he can  
     get, 327, 373, 413  
   greater on higher levels, 397, 504  
   lots of TA = bright pc, small TA=dullpc, 373  
 reacts on things that will give TA, 369  
 R3R and TA action, 299, 300  
 superior to what is run, 336  
 time concept of pc and TA action, 325, 330  
 when a rudiment is used as a rudiment, ignore TA  
   action, 76  
 tone arm counters, use of, 443  
 tone scale, pc comes up to degradation, up to apathy,  
   286, 419 ,  
 Tone 40, don’t ~ ack items or goals pc gives you, 56  
 Tone 40 8-C, CCH2, 311  
 track; *see* time track  
 training; *see also* Academy; student  
   case level and sanity, relationship to ~, 316, 327  
   clay table work in training and processing, 451  
   coachless training—use of a doll, 103  
   don’t demand things student has not yet reached,  
     479  
   former training not wasted, 316  
   HGC processes and training, 324  
   instruction and examination: raising standard of,  
     478  
   instruction is done on gradient scale, 479  
   instructor directs student auditor’s attention  
     toward Scientology body of data in order to get  
     effective auditing done, 357  
 training (*cont.*)  
   level of skill at Saint Hill, 51  
   practical goes through the simple motions, theory  
     covers why one goes through the motions,  
       482  
   stress basic auditing skill, 326  
   student auditor training [1964], 431  
   student’s or auditor’s service fac may contest in  
     struction, how to handle, 358  
   why it fails, 359  
   wrong definitions cause stupidity or circuits, fol  
     lowed by overts and motivators, 489  
   X unit, 214  
 training drills or routines; *see* TRs  
 TRs,  
   are important, why, 266  
   are just learned with no other consideration, 461  
   done solo in absence of good coaches, except  
     TRs 0-4, 103  
   invalid TR is one which gives a wrong impression  
     of auditing, 80  
   meter reading TRs, 264  
   must contain correct data of auditing, 79  
   out TRs and no impingement gets no reads,  
     82  
   processes do not work without skillfully practiced  
     TRs, 263  
   TR 0, Confronting Preclear, 266  
   TR 0 (A), 0 (B), 0 (C), 0 (D) [1963], 267  
   TR 1, Dear Alice [1963], 268  
     if poor you’ll miss the rudiment’s outness, 96,  
       361  
     weak TR 1, end words of rudiments reading by  
       themselves occurs mainly in presence of  
       weak TR 1, 102, 362  
   TR 2, Acknowledgements [1963], 269; *see also*  
     acknowledgement  
   TR 3, Duplicative Question [1963], 269  
   TR 4, Preclear Originations [1963], 271  
     be sure it is excellent in that you understand  
       (really, no fake) what pc is saying and  
       acknowledge it (really, so pc gets it) and  
       return pc to session, 362  
   TRs 6-9 are scrapped [1962], 79  
 truth is built by those who have the breadth and  
   balance to see also where they’re wrong, 322  
 Twenty-Ten, application to Goals Problem Mass, 7  
 Twenty-Ten, for every twenty minutes of Security  
   Checking run ten minutes of Havingness, 6  
 Type A and Type B pcs, 434

## U

- understand, auditor fails to ~ what pc said or meant,  
   correct response for, 161, 414  
 understanding, 508  
 unknown incident pins chains, 41  
 unknownness, reactive mind is composed of timeless  
   ness, unknownness, survival, 78

## SUBJECT INDEX— 1962/1964

“unusual solutions” is a phrase describing actions taken by auditor or case or auditing supervisor when he has not spotted the GAE; it seldom resolves any case because data on which it is based (observation or report) is incomplete or inaccurate, 509  
Upper Indoc attitude makes CCHs grim, 47  
upset, source of all is M/W/H, 27,1 05

### V

valence(s),  
are circuits are valences, 6  
chronic somatics and behavior patterns are contained in valences, 9  
GPM is made up of past selves or “~”, 8,185  
least desirable valences persist, 8  
lock valences, 17,18  
are appended to a real GPM 3-D item, 7  
no responsibility for game, for either side of game or for a former self, 8  
Routine 2-12 removes unwanted ~ that commit overts rather than endlessly sec checking pc, 190  
withholds, each ~ has its own social mores, 40  
V unit Class 0, first phase, 227

### W

What question(s), Prepchecking; *see* Prepchecking,  
What question  
whatsit and itsa, relation to TA, 334, 370, 378  
whole track, 41; *see also* time track  
occlusion, cause and remedy of, 9  
R3R, pc going whole track, 299  
winds of space, *defn.*, pc is getting his or her face pushed in, 65  
*defn.*, feeling of being blown upon, especially from in front of the face, 175  
withdrawn, pc looking ~ after Prepchecking, cause and remedy of, 67  
withheld flow, basic aberration is ~,16  
withhold(s), *defn.*, an undisclosed contra-survival act, 58  
beginning rudiments withhold question, 60, 72  
chain behaves exactly like any chain, 28  
cleaning a clean develops a “withhold of nothing”~ 335, 415  
coming after confusion of overt, hang up on track and tend to stop pc in time, 14  
compulsive outflow and obsessive withhold are alike aberrated, 14  
depends utterly on pc’s idea of what is an overt, 40  
dirty needle is caused by M/W/Hs, not ~, 59  
don’t have to clean up all withholds if missed with holds kept cleaned up, 61  
end of session rudiments for ~, 27

withhold(s) (*cont.*)  
flows, running too long on one flow is conducive to withholds developing, 66  
havingness must be run to get benefit of having pulled most withholds, 6  
how to clear withholds and missed withholds, 23  
knowledge to the average person is only this: a knowledge of his or her withholds, 26  
laudatory withholds, 1  
level below withholding that an auditor should be alert to in some pcs, for these “have no with holds” and “have done nothing”, 440  
makes one feel he or she cannot reach, 6  
missed and partial, 26  
missed withhold; *see* missed withhold  
overt is forward motion, withhold coming after it is inward motion, 14  
overts are biggest reason why a person restrains himself and withholds self from action, 439  
pc in session will always tell withholds, 23, 63  
pcs go groggy, lose interest and refuse to list only when session withholds are missed, 66  
pc stuck in a past session, clean up the ~, 21  
Prepchecking was developed to handle auditor’s difficulty in “varying the question” in pulling withholds, 28  
recurring, cause of, 41  
restrained outflow is ~,14  
reverse of ~ flow is “afraid to find out”, 33  
Security Check based on withhold, make guilty and prevent, 1  
since last session,42  
suppressors and ~ are opposite, 37  
Withhold System,  
add “appear, not appear” after “all” in ~, 41  
difficulty, what, when, all, who, 23, 24  
don’t ask it on any late incidents, 89  
Prepchecking uses the Withhold System, 28  
Repetitive Prepchecking replaces Prepchecking by the Withhold System, 98  
W, X, Y and Z units, 227-28

### Z

Zero list questions or R2-12, 211  
Zero question(s)  
don’t forget “guilty” in Zero questions, 40  
Prepcheck(ing) Zero question 34 60  
list of Prepchecking Zero questions 83  
time limiter 99  
Zeros and Zero A questions, how to derive, 30  
Zeros, responsibility increased will unflatten ~ 90

## Numerals

3D; 3GA; etc.; *see* Routine 3D; Routine 3GA; etc.  
8-C, one of HGC allowed processes [1964], 406

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF TITLES

Academy Curriculum—How to Teach Auditing and Routine 2	227	Clay Table Work Covering Clay Table Clearing in Detail	456
Academy Taught Processes	<i>OEC Vol 4-339</i>	Clay Table Work in Training and Processing	451
Account of Congress Goal	137	Clean Hands Clearance Check	<i>OEC Vol 5-358</i>
Adequate Tone Arm Action	367	Clear & OT	260
Analysing Auditing—How to Get TA	377	Clearing	<i>OEC Vol 4-553</i>
ARC Break Assessments (5 July 63)	306	Clearing—Free Needles	112
ARCBreakAssessments(11 Aug.63)	338	<i>ClearingSuccessCongressLectures</i>	136
ARC Breaks by Assessment—Routine 2H	297	Clearing—Why It Works—How It Is Necessary	493
ARC Breaks—Missed Withholds	58	Coachless Training—Use of a Doll	103
ARC Process	95	Co-Audit & Missed Withholds	25
Arrangement of the Academy, An		Co-Audit ARC Break Process	319
	<i>OEC Vol 4-327</i>	CrashProgramme	<i>OEC Vol. 4- 26</i>
Assists in Scientology	<i>see footnote Vol III-264</i>	Current Auditing	239
Auditing Allowed	104	Current Planning	<i>OEC Vol 4-344</i>
Auditing Assignments	431	Curriculum Change	<i>OEC Vol 4-424</i>
Auditing by Lists	423	Curriculum for Level 0—HAS	514
Auditing—Rudiments Check Sheet	81	Definition of Release	338
Auditing Rundown—Missed Withholds—		DefinitionProcesses	505
To Be Run in XI Unit	318, 328	Determining What to Run	48
Auditing Skills	411	Diagrams for LRH Lectures to the SHSBC on	
Auditor Failure to Understand	161	25 July, 7 & 8 August, 1963 see—339	
Authorized Processes	141	Dirty Needles	384
Bad "Auditor", The	32	Dirty Needles—How to Smooth Out Needles	93
Basic Auditing, Technique, Case Analysis		Don't Force the Pc—R2—R3	255
—A New Triangle	385	Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam—3GA	135, 138
<i>Book of Case Remedies, The</i>	495	E-Meter Errors—Communication Cycle Error	334
Bulletin Changes	101	E-Meter Instant Reads	77
Case Analysis—Health Research	388	E-Meter Reads—Prepchecking—HowMeters	
Case Repair	67	Get Invalidated	73
Case Supervisor	395	E-Meter Standards	91
Cause of ARC Breaks	281	Engram Running by Chains—Routine 3R	
CCH Answers	126	—Bulletins 1, 2, 3 & 4	273, 287, 292, 299
CCHs Again—When to Use the CCHs	43	Everything Reading—Meter	402
CCHs—Auditing Attitude	45	Field Auditor Targets	<i>see footnote—435</i>
CCHs—Purpose	50	Flow Process	14
CCHs Rewritten	310	Flows, Basic	16
Central Org and Field Auditor Targets	432	Getting the Pc Sessionable	491
Certificate and Classification Changes		Goal Finder's Model Session	157
—Everyone Classified	<i>OEC Vol 4-360</i>	Goals & Prepchecking	201
Change of Organization Targets		Goals Check	246
—Project 80	<i>OEC Vol 2- 95</i>	Goals Prepcheck Form—Routine 3GA	106
Checking Needle in Rudiments Checks	84	Good Indicators at Lower Levels	445
Classification of Auditors—Class II &		GPMs—Experimental Process Withdrawn	376
Goals	<i>OEC Vol 4-340</i>	Health Research—Case Analysis	388
Class II Model Session	398, 428	HGC Allowed Processes	406
Clay Table Clearing (9 Sept. 64)	475	HGC Clearing	152
Clay Table Clearing (27 Sept. 64)	483	How It Feels to Go Clear	128
Clay Table Data	490	How to Clear Withholds and Missed Withholds	23
Clay Table Healing	472	How to Do an ARC Break Assessment	345
Clay Table Label Goofs	509	How to Get TA—Analysing Auditing	377
Clay Table Levels	466	How to Get Tone Arm Action	369
Clay Table, More Goofs	476	How to Study Scientology	
Clay Table Use	487		<i>see footnote Vol III-426</i>



How to Teach Auditing and Routine 2— Academy Curriculum	227	Q and A (24 May 62)	74
HQS Course	461	Q and A (7 Apr. 64)	410
Indicators—Part One: Good Indicators	390	Recommended Processes HGC	51
Instant Reads	113	Repetitive Prepchecking	98
Instructing in Scientology Auditing— Instructor's Task—D of P's Case Handling	357	Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking	361
Instruction & Examination: Raising the Standard of	478	Repetitive Rudiments—How to Get the Rudiments In	96
Instructor's Stable Data	<i>OEC Vol 4-161</i>	Responsibility Again	8
Itsa Line and Tone Arm, The—Project 80	351	Rock Slams and Dirty Needles	129
Justifications	436	"Roll Your Own" Prehav	173
Laudatory Withholds	1	Routine Three SC	353
Lecture Graphs	339	Routine Two-Twelve—Opening Procedure by Rock Slam—An HPA/HCA Skill	185
Listen Style Auditing	511	Routine 0-A(Expanded)	520
List One—The Scientology List	191, 195, 202	Routine 2 & 3 Model Session	243
Meter—Everything Reading	402	Routine 2-G—Original Routine 2, 3GA, 2-10, 2-12, 2-12A and Others Specially Adapted —Goals Finding—Designation of Routines	262
Meter Level Warning—How to Kill a Pc in Level 5	394	Routine 2H—ARC Breaks by Assessment	297
Meter Reading TRs	264	Routine 2—Opposition Lists—Right and Wrong Oppose	230
Meter Reads, Size of	396	Routine 2—Routine 3—ARC Breaks, Handling of	251
Missed Withholds	20	Routine 2—Simplified	233
Missed Withholds, Asking About	71	Routine 2-10, 2-12, 2-1 2A	247
Model Session Change	72	Routine 2-10, 2-12, 2-12A—Vanished RS or RR	249
Model Session, Class II	398, 428	Routine 2-12	<i>OEC Vol 4-563</i>
Model Session—Levels III to VI	420, 448	Routine 2-12—List One—Add to List One Issue Three	215
Model Session Revised	85	Routine 2-12—List One—Issue One—The Scientology List	191
Modernized Training Drills Using Permissive Coaching	266	Routine 2-12—List One—Issue Two—The Scientology List	195
More Clay Table Clearing Goofs	496	Routine 2-12—List One—Issue Three—The Scientology List	202
More Justifications	437	Routines 2-12 & 2-10—Case Errors—Points of Greatest Importance	217
More on O/Ws	441	Routines 2-12, 3-21 and 3GAXX—Tiger Drill for Nulling by Mid Ruds	196
New Triangle, A—Basic Auditing, Technique, Case Analysis	385	Routine 3—Engram Running by Chains— Bulletin 3—Routine 3-R	292
Order of Prepcheck Buttons	133	Routine 3G (Experimental)	53
Org Technical—HGC Processes and Training	324	Routine 3GA (Experimental)	64
Overts—Order of Effectiveness in Processing	438	Routine 3GA—Goals—Nulling by Mid Ruds	118
Overts, What Lies Behind Them?	471	Routine 3GA—HCO WW R-3GA Form 1— Listing Prepcheck	109
Overwhelming the Pc	400	Routine 3GA—Listing	159
Policies on Physical Healing, Insanity and Potential Trouble Sources	<i>OEC Vol 1-517</i>	Routine 3GA—Listing Wording	114
Pre-Clearing Intensive	166	Routine 3GA—Nulling Drills for Nulling by Mid Ruds	122
Prepcheck Buttons	363, 446	Routine 3R—Bulletin 4—Preliminary Step	299
Prepchecking(1 Mar. 62)	28	Routine 3—R-3 Model Session 278, 381	
Prepchecking (24 June 62)	88	Routine 3-21	182
Prepchecking and Sec Checking	62	Routine 3-21—The Twenty-One Steps— Finding Goals	170
Prepchecking Data—When to Do a What	39		
Prepchecking—How Meters Get Invalidated —E-Meter Reads	73		
Prepchecking the Middle Rudiments	83		
Problems Intensive Use	146		
Processes	156		
Project 80—Change of Organization Targets	<i>OEC Vol 2- 95</i>		
Project 80—The Itsa Line and Tone Arm	351		
PTPs, Overts and ARC Breaks	468		
Public Project One	<i>OEC Vol 2- 93</i>		

Rudiments Checking	82	Training—Classes of Auditors	<i>OEC Vol 4-315</i>
Rudiments Check Sheet—Auditing	81	Training Drills Must Be Correct	79
Rudiments, Repetitive or Fast see footnote—	113	Training—Saint Hill Special	
Rundown on Routine 3GA	92	Briefing Course—Summary of	
Running CCHs	127	Subjects by Units	<i>OEC Vol 4-423</i>
R2—R3—Important Data—Don't Force the Pc	255	Training—Session Cancellation—Auditing	
R2—R3—Listing Rules	241	Section	<i>OEC Vol 4-313</i>
R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX—Data, The Zero A		Training—X Unit	214
Steps and Purpose of Processes	210	Two Types of People	407
R2-12—Practical Drills	193	Use of a Doll—Coachless Training	103
R2-12—The Fatal Error	216	Use of the Big Middle Rudiments	248
R3GA—HCO WW Form G3—Fast Goals Check	115	Valid Processes	145
R3GA—HCO WW Form G3, Revised—Fast		V Unit <i>OEC Vol 4-427</i>	
Goals Check	165	V Unit—New Students—Saint Hill Special	
R3 R—R3N—The Preclear's Postulates	349	Briefing Course	<i>OEC Vol 4-421</i>
R3SC Slow Assessment	379	When to Do a What—Prepchecking Data	39
<i>SaintHill Staff Course Lectures</i>	393	When You Need Reassurance	149
Scientology Review	332	Withholds, Missed and Partial	26
Scientology Training-Technical		Workability of Scientology, The	425
Studies	<i>OEC Vol 4-342</i>	Wrong Goals, Importance of Repair of	167
Scientology 0—Processes	516	You Can Be Right	321
Security Checking—Twenty-Ten Theory	6	2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21 and Routine 2-10—	
Security Checks Again	140	Modern Assessment	203
SessionMust-Nots	463	3DCriss Cross	4
Smooth HGC 25 Hour Intensive, A	116	3D Criss Cross—Assessment Tips	17
Somatics—How to Tell Terminals and		3D Criss Cross Items	25
Opposition Terminals	175	3D Criss Cross-Method of Assessment	10
Styles of Auditing	498	3DXX Flows Assessment	19
Summary of Classification and Gradation and		3GA—Dynamic Assessment by RockSlam	135,138
Certification	<i>OEC Vol 4-373</i>	3GA—Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam—	
Suppressors	36	Dynamic Assessment Tip	131
TA Counters, Use of	443	3GA—Expanded Line Wording	134
Tape Coverage of New Technology	365	3GA—Line Wording	130
Technical Summary-The Required Skills of		3GA-Listing by Prehav	163
Processing and Why, A	314	3GA-Listing by Tiger Buttons—114 New	
Theory Check-out Data	488	Lines for Listing	147
Tiger Drilling	150	3GA—Tips on Dynamic Assessment—Rules of	
Time and the Tone Arm	329	Thumb	142
Time Track and Engram Running by Chains,		3GA—To Be Goals Line Listing	139
The—Bulletin 1	273	3GAXX—Dirty Needles and Incomplete Lists-	
Time Track and Engram Running by Chains,		How to Assess	180
The—Bulletin 2—Handling the Time Track	287	3GAXX—Straightening up 3GAXX Cases	179
Tone Arm Action	413	40-Line List on a Doingness Goal, A	143